

**THE MINUTES OF THE 722ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 OCTOBER 2022, 9:00 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		Left at 1:00 p.m.
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Mark Dodds (Department of Planning and Development)		X	
Kelly Edwards, MUP (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Patrick O'Donnell (Department of Public Property)		X	
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)		X	
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		Left at 1:04 p.m.
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)		X	
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq. (Community Development Corporation)	X		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Marlene Schleifer, Ridge Park Civic Association
Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Julie Scott
Tina Krovetz
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance

David Traub, Save Our Sites
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Amy Lambert
Eric Brown
Khan Shibly
Eileen Lowery
John Toates
Susan Wetherill
Patricia Freeland
Robert Powers
Nancy Pontone
Allan Nadav
Lois Price
Erin Witzel
Dennis Carlisle
Allison Weiss, SoLo
J.M. Duffin
Sister Rosemary Heron
Vince Dolan
Jay Farrell
Celia Jailer, Hidden City
David Landskroner
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Cheryl Feldman
Jordan Leibowitz
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting
Brian Nadav
Patti Brennan
George Matysik
George Earl Thomas
Mandy Doty
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Steven Peitzman
Herb Schultz
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 721ST STATED MEETING, 9 SEPTEMBER 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:30

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 721st Stated Meeting, held 9 September 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 721st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 September 2022. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 721st Meeting					
MOTION: Adoption of minutes					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE

ADDRESS: 914-26 CHRISTIAN ST

Name of Resource: St. Paul's Roman Catholic Parochial School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Christopher Columbus Charter School

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 914-26 Christian Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the school building and site satisfy Criteria for Designation A, B, E, and I. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the site has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation, as the

location of the c. 1833 Moyamensing Hall, which was converted to the first Civil War U.S. Army Hospital in 1861, and then built onto for the 1898 St. Paul's Parochial School. Under Criterion B, the nomination contends that the site is associated with an event of importance to the history of the Nation, the Civil War, which necessitated the hospital. Under Criterion I, the nomination contends that the site, now a paved parking area and school yard but once home to the hospital and school building which were demolished c. 1957, may be likely to yield information important in history should it ever be excavated. Lastly, the nomination contends that the existing school building on the site, constructed in 1905, satisfies Criterion E, and the work of Edwin F. Durang, an architect whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the city.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:56

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property remains under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission during the continuance period.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of the nomination for 914-26 Christian Street to the December 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 914-26 Christian St MOTION: Continue to December 2022 PHC Mtg MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 SEPTEMBER 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:01

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 2340 Cecil B. Moore Avenue. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda					
MOTION: Approval of Consent Agenda					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2340 CECIL B MOORE AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Beech Community Services

Applicant: Thomas Holloman, TMH Associates Inc.

History: 1895; Dox Thrash House; Harold Godwin

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application seeks final approval for a three-story addition with roof deck and pilot house at 2340 Cecil B. Moore Avenue. Originally constructed in 1895, the building was owned and occupied by distinguished Black artist Dox Thrash from 1944 to 1959. In recent decades the building has been neglected, and in 2016 the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) issued a violation for a collapsed roof, party walls, and rear wall. It is currently deemed unsafe by L&I.

The applicant is proposing to restore the front façade and rehabilitate the building for future use with commercial space on the first floor and apartments on the second and third floors. In addition to the structural work required, the side walls will be extended, and a new rear wall constructed. A new roof will be added and will include a roof deck and pilot house to house mechanical units and trash receptacles. The side wall and rear wall will be clad in stucco to match the existing party wall. The rear bay window will be clad in cement board.

The applicant submitted a revised application after the 27 September 2022 meeting of the Architectural Committee. The revised application incorporated the Committee's comments on the rear windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Restore front façade.
- Rehabilitate interior for commercial and residential space.
- Construct three-story addition with roof deck and pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*
 - o The applicant plans to preserve and restore the existing features of the historic front façade, satisfying Standard 5.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Most of the roof, large sections of the side walls, and all of the rear walls are no longer extant. The new walls and roof are compatible in terms of massing, size,

scale, and architectural features. Therefore, the proposed new construction meets Standard 9.

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o If the applicant reduces the height of the pilot house to the minimum allowed by code, the roof additions will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way and will meet the Roof Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and Roof Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rear windows have a traditional appearance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9, and Roof Guidelines.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 3600-30 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Install sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CA Residential Drexel LLC

Applicant: Natalya Atroshyna, EZ Signs Inc.

History: 1878; William Fennell Row

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to install a 9'-5" x 6'-5" vinyl wall film on the 36th Street side elevation of the building at 3600-30 Lancaster Avenue. The sign would be adhered to the historic masonry.

The staff has already approved additional signage for this commercial unit and encourages the applicants to pursue signage that is limited to the storefront portion of the property, such as a smaller wall sign located on the pier to the right of the storefront window on the 36th Street elevation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install sign

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

- o The proposed sign is extremely large and out of scale with the historic property. Furthermore, the vinyl material may trap moisture against the masonry, causing long-term damage. The application fails to satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:43

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed sign would not be located on the building in which the business advertised is located. The proposed sign would be located on the wall of the building at the corner. The business will be located in a building several storefronts down from the corner.
- The signage would be more appropriate at the pier in the storefront area of the building in which the business is located.
- The vinyl material of the proposed sign may trap moisture against the masonry, causing long-term damage.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed sign is extremely large and out of scale with the historic property and the sign may damage the masonry; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 3600-30 Lancaster Ave MOTION: Deny MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 339 AND 341 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Combine properties; construct 3rd floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Brooks Tanner

Applicant: Julie Scott, Reku Design

History: c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to make modifications and additions to two contributing two-story rowhouses in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District to create a double-wide three-story house. The proposal calls for the demolition of the entire party wall between the two buildings and the demolition of both roofs and chimneys. A third floor, set back five feet from the front façade, would span the rear ells of the buildings and a small deck would be located on the rear roof of the 341 portion of the property. The new construction would be clad in Hardie shingle siding.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application in August 2022 that also called for the demolition of most of the rear and side walls of the ells of the properties. Since that time, the application has been revised to retain the rear ell walls and to relocate a deck from the front to the rear. In March 2021, the Historical Commission approved a rooftop addition at 341 S. 25th Street that was set back five feet from the front façade.

Following the initial resubmission, the applicant has provided a secondary option showing a mansard treatment for the third-floor addition. That application was further revised following the Architectural Committee to keep the addition to the footprint of the existing main block and rear

ells. It had previously been shown spanning the space between the rear ells. The applicants also revised the dormer windows to show casements as opposed to double-hung windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop addition spanning two buildings

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed project is differentiated from but not compatible with the historic properties and alters the spatial relationships that characterize the properties, failing to satisfy Standard 9.
- *New Exterior Additions Guideline:*
 - o *Recommended: Ensuring the addition is stylistically appropriate for the historic building type; considering the design for a new addition in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district, neighborhood, and setting.*
 - The staff suggests that rather than an addition with a minimal setback that has no relationship to the historic buildings, a simple mansard addition limited to the main blocks of the buildings would be more appropriate for these properties and in keeping with the character of the district, provided the massing, fenestration, and details were appropriately scaled.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:10:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Julie Scott represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application has been revised several times to address the concerns of the staff and Architectural Committee.
- The use of mansard additions on two-story rowhouses has historical precedence in the neighborhood.
- The dormer windows should not appear as single sheets of glass. Casement windows that appear as double-hung windows would be more appropriate, and the

dormers should have at least four divisions, to be in keeping with the scale of the divided lite windows on the floors below.

- Two dormer windows on the 341 portion of the property would be more appropriate than the single one currently proposed.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application does not destroy materials that characterize the historic property and is differentiated from but compatible with the historic property, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided that the buildings each have two dormers with multi-pane windows that look like double-hungs, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Sanchez seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 339 and 341 S 25th St					
MOTION: Approve with conditions					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Sanchez					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 2023 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct addition, roof deck and pilot house; replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nguyet Chau and Eric Brown

Applicant: John Toates, John Toates Architecture and Design, LLC

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW:

This application proposes to make modifications and additions to 2023 Delancey Place. On the front façade, the application proposes to install 2-over-2 windows at the upper floors, restoring

the windows to their original appearance. At the first floor, the application originally proposed to install 1-over-1 windows, but was revised following the Architectural Committee to propose 2-over-2 to be in keeping with the design of the row.

At the rear, the application proposes to remove a circa 1989 addition and remnant of an original bay window and to construct a two-story addition with decks and a raised parapet over the existing garage. The addition would be clad in brick and feature divided-lite windows and detailed metalwork. The parapet of the addition was revised following the Architectural Committee to provide greater visual relief.

On the roof, the application proposes to construct a deck with a glass railing. The application originally proposed to set the back five feet from the front façade, but only 3 feet 2 inches from the front of the mansard, and to rise directly from the rear mansard. The application was subsequently revised to set the deck back from both elevations. It would be accessed by a central headhouse and two existing chimneys would be raised.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace windows
- Construct rear addition
- Construct rooftop penthouse and deck
- Raise chimneys

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The existing front windows are not original to the property. This application proposes to restore most of the windows to their original appearance. Based on neighboring properties that retain their original windows, the appropriate first-floor window configuration also appears to have been two-over-two; however, there are some similar, but not identical, neighboring properties that feature one-over-one first-floor windows as proposed. The application partially complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed addition calls for limited removal of historic fabric and is deferential to the historic building and compatible in scale, massing, materials and features, satisfying Standard 9.
- **Roofs Guideline | Recommended:** Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.

- o The proposed roof deck is visible from the public right-of-way. If the was pulled back from the front façade so that it is not visible from Delancey Place, it could satisfy this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the first floor windows are two-over-two and the roof deck is pulled back from the front façade to the point that it is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:20:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect John Toates represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application addressed the concerns of the Architectural Committee. The revisions include removing the proposed entrance railing, using two-over-two windows at all floors, setting the roof deck railing back from both the front and rear, and breaking up the parapet around the rear garage.
- The application shows the raising of chimneys on both 2023 Delancey and the neighboring property at 2025 Delancey.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application proposes to install two-over-two windows that replicate the historic appearance, satisfying Standard 6.
- The proposed addition calls for limited removal of historic fabric and is deferential to the historic building and compatible in scale, massing, materials and features, satisfying Standard 9.
- The revised application pulls the roof deck back from both elevations to the point that it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.
- The approval covers the raising of the chimneys on both 2023 and 2025 Delancey if necessary.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application including the chimney extensions if needed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2023 Delancey PI MOTION: Approval of revised application MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish building, construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Herb Schultz, Studio HS4

History: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street would be reconstructed based on photographs as part of the addition. Currently, only the lower three stories of the original five-story façade at 704 Chestnut Street survives.

Both buildings, 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District. The applicant had requested that the Historical Commission reclassify the building at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, but the Commission denied that request at its August 2022 meeting. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for an earlier version of the demolition and addition and commented that the proposed demolition did not comply with the preservation ordinance and the proposed addition was too tall for its context.

The addition would be constructed at 704 Chestnut Street and would extend onto the six-story historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The addition would include a recreation of the original façade at 704 Chestnut. The addition would be 13 stories tall, with seven new stories on the six-story historic building. The historic building is 76'-5" tall to the cornice. The enlarged

building would be 157'-3" to the roof and 171'-7" to the top of the mechanical penthouse. The original façade at 704 Chestnut would be reconstructed as part of the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish the three-story building at 704 Chestnut Street;
- Construct an addition on and adjacent to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street with a reconstruction of the historic facade at 704 Chestnut Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.*
 - o The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street will destroy historic materials and features, even if the façade is reconstructed, and therefore will not satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The addition will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and will not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... or of a building ... 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 ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
 - o The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. No such claim of financial hardship or public necessity has been made.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:37:15

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and architect Herb Schultz represented the revised application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips stated that he and his team had revised the application since last appearing before the Historical Commission. He also stated that they had revised the application since the last meeting of the Architectural Committee, improving the plan to rebuild the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut and amending the design of the addition. He clarified that they plan to demolish and reconstruct the building at 704 Chestnut Street including the entirety of the historic façade. The upper floors of the building at 704 Chestnut have been missing since the 1930s. He added that they cannot build directly on the surviving building at 704 Chestnut. The existing structure would not support an addition. He stated that they would salvage and reuse materials when demolishing the building at 704 Chestnut. He stated that they recently revised the design to allow the reconstructed façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street to stand out from the addition. They also revised the application to differentiate between the old and new more clearly. He stated that they increased the setbacks of the addition and removed one floor from it, reducing it from 13 to 12 floors. He stated that they are seeking to add density and bring life back to this commercial corridor. He noted that some had suggested that the move the addition to the back of the building and make it taller; he explained that such a solution does not work from cost and construction standpoints.
- Mr. Schultz explained that they have increased the setbacks of the addition from the facades of the historic building at 700-02 Chestnut at both the Chestnut and 7th Street elevations. He noted that they have added what he called a “transition” floor between the old and new buildings. The transition floor provides a shadow line and some breathing room between the historic building and the addition. He said that their goal is to make the addition disappear.
- Mr. McCoubrey opined that the design should be revised so that the section of the addition above 704 Chestnut is somehow differentiated from the section of the addition above 700-02 Chestnut. As currently designed, the addition is monolithic and does not reflect the differences between the historic buildings. He also suggested that they move some of the mass of the addition from the northern end along Chestnut Street to the southern end of the site. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he appreciates the “interstitial space” directly above the historic buildings, separating them from the addition, but objected to the second “interstitial space” further up the addition. He claimed that the inclusion of the second weakens the use of it between the historic buildings and addition. Mr. McCoubrey concluded that the Architectural Committee did not object to the idea of an overbuild but did request additional refinements to the design. He stated that Architectural Committee could accept the demolition and reconstruction of the façade if his historic materials were salvaged and reused, and the façade was reconstructed to its historic appearance. He observed that access to the 704 Chestnut site would facilitate the construction of the addition. He remarked that the addition above 704 Chestnut should relate to the historic façade and should be set back more to give the historic façade plenty of room. He reiterated that the addition should be redesigned so that it acknowledged the differences of the two historic buildings below.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that they had set the section of the addition above 704 Chestnut back more than the addition above 700-02 Chestnut.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the transition from the very tall building with the addition to the shorter buildings to the west will be difficult.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that he sees the proposed building as a transition from the taller buildings to the east to the shorter buildings to the west. He added that

- the set the addition back at the corner of 7th and Chestnut out of deference to the corner.
- o Mr. McCoubrey again suggested that the sections of the addition need to better relate to the historic buildings below them. The addition should not be as monolithic but should acknowledge and reference the historic buildings below.
 - o Ms. Carney agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and stated that the sections of the additions should have some “vertical alignment” with the historic buildings below.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey agreed and observed that the addition should reflect the fact that the building at 700-02 is much larger than the building at 704 Chestnut. He noted that the distinction could be made with color.
 - Mr. Thomas stated that he sees very good reasons for allowing the building at 704 Chestnut Street to be demolished and then reconstructed. The demolition would allow the construction to be staged from 704 Chestnut Street. It would allow the floors in the buildings to be aligned. And it would ensure that the larger building had a new use and was sustainable.
 - o Ms. Cooperman objected to an acceptance of the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street, even if it is reconstructed. She observed that the Historical Commission just confirmed the contributing status of the building and asserted that the reconstruction of a façade does not compensate for the demolition of a contributing building. She contended that the Historical Commission should not allow the demolition of the building without a finding of financial hardship.
 - o Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Cooperman. He stated that the Historical Commission should require a hardship application before approving the demolition. He added that he thinks that a hardship case could be made in this instance.
 - o Mr. Phillips argued that the façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot stand on its own, after the building behind it has been removed. He acknowledged that the removal and reconstruct could technically be construed as a demolition in the legal sense, but they would reconstruct the building to match in color, texture, and materiality reusing salvaged materials. He stated that the resulting building would be better than the remnant that survives.
 - o Mr. Schultz agreed with Mr. Phillips and observed that the Architectural Committee was supportive of the demolish and rebuild plan. He also noted that members of the public were supportive of the plan.
 - o Mr. Thomas noted that his firm rebuilt parts of buildings on Parkside Avenue.
 - o Ms. Cooperman reiterated that demolition and reconstruction does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, in her opinion.
 - o Mr. Phillips again stated that their intention is to restore the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street to its condition before the upper floors were removed in the 1930s. He asked the Historical Commission to confirm that that plan was acceptable, even if a financial hardship application was needed to obtain the permit.
 - o Mr. Thomas stated that that was the Historical Commission’s guidance, that the project could move forward but would require the submission of a financial hardship application.
 - Mr. Thomas asked if the current window-sill heights would be maintained at the front façade of the reconstructed building at 704 Chestnut Street.
 - o Mr. Schultz responded that the sill heights would be maintained, and the front façade would be faithfully reconstructed.
 - Mr. Phillips asked the Historical Commission to formally approve or endorse the concept of the project with the understanding that his team would submit a revised

application, perhaps with a financial hardship component, when they sought final approval.

- o Mr. Thomas responded that an in-concept application is a request for guidance and the Historical Commission has provided that guidance, which will be reflected in the meeting minutes. He suggested that the Historical Commission decline to formally approve or deny the application.
- o Mr. McCoubrey agreed with him.
- o Mr. Lech suggested that the Historical Commission approve in concept the scale and massing of the overbuilding but not the demolition and reconstruction at this time. He suggested that the applicants deserve some reassurance that they are moving in the right direction.
- o Mr. McCoubrey stated that he still has some concerns about the massing.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the proposal to reconstruct the front façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street to its historic appearance. He stated that it is important to preserve and restore the streetscape and reconstructing this building would do just that. He said that the reconstruction “would be an amazing win.” He stated that the buildings on the 700 block of Chestnut are an important group of historic commercial buildings and reconstructing this façade would enhance the historic appearance of the entire block. He stated that he supports the concept.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the overbuild should be more homogeneous in its coloration and materiality. He objected to the cut-out or setback at the corner and stated that the mass should be located at the corner. He pointed to the Public Ledger Building across the street, which he called the Benjamin Franklin Hotel. He suggested that the reconstruction of the façade should not be considered a financial hardship because the project will generate significant revenue.
- Steven Peitzman stated that “many such buildings in the older days had a tower at the corner.” He stated that the building at 704 Chestnut is contributing to the historic district and should not be demolished.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 21 SEPTEMBER 2022

ADDRESS: 2901 W ALLEGHENY AVE

Name of Resource: Catholic Home for Destitute Children/Mercy High School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mercy Career and Technical High School

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Catholic Home for Destitute Children, constructed in 1912 on a design by Edwin F. Durang, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and H. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the Home’s history is significant as part of the City and Commonwealth’s response to the aftermath of catastrophic events that left children without parents or care. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Gothic, and specifically that of King Henry VIII’s sixteenth-century Hampton Hall. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the design is the work of Edwin F. Durang, a significant ecclesiastical architect. Under Criterion H, the nomination explains that the large T-

shaped building is an established visual feature, situated on elevated ground and occupying an unusual triangular parcel at the confluence of several major thoroughfares.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and H and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with a period of significance from 1910 to 1920.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:27:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Celest Morello represented the nominator.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, consultant George Thomas, owner representatives Vince Dolan and Sister Rosemary Heron represented the property owner and opposed the designation, suggesting that Historical Commission limit the designation to the front façade along W. Hunting Park Avenue.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.
- George Matysik opposed the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman of the East Falls Historical Society supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building was constructed between 1910 and 1912, when its siting was completed. The same architect many have altered the building prior to 1920.
- Designation does not include the interior of the property or limit interior renovations.
- The Historical Commission can take development plans such as the conceptual renderings of a potential rear addition submitted by the owners into consideration during designation.
- The Historical Commission has reviewed and approved numerous additions to designated properties owned by charitable organizations such as the one shown in the conceptual drawings submitted by the owners.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Gothic style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building was designed by the firm of Edwin F. Durang & Son. Durang was a significant and prolific ecclesiastical architect, satisfying Criterion E.
- The large building is an established visual feature of the neighborhood, situated on elevated ground and occupying a triangular parcel at the confluence of several major

- thoroughfares and standing out among the largely industrial and residential context, satisfying Criterion H.
- Owing to existing plans for renovations and additions at the rear, the portions of the property considered contributing should be limited to the main block of the building, which fronts along W. Hunting Park Avenue, the side elevations of the main block, and the roof and massing of the main block.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and H, designate the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, limiting the contributing portion of the property to the main block of the building, including the front and side elevations, roof and massing, and excluding the rear elevations. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2901 W ALLEGHENY AVE MOTION: Designate (main block only); Criteria D, E, H MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 234 AND 240 HERMITAGE ST

Name of Resource: Holy Family Church, formerly Church of the Holy Family

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street, today known as Holy Family Church, formerly known as the Church of the Holy Family, and associated rectory, convent and school buildings, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church building is designed in the “seldom-seen ‘German Romanesque’” style of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues

that the buildings are significant for their associations to “award-winning, pioneering and nationally-known” architects Patrick C. Keely, Thomas P. Lonsdale, and George I. Lovatt. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that the complex is majestically positioned on a “summit overlooking the rooftops of the residences nearby,” making it a familiar site within the neighborhood. The nomination claims that the site is also significant under Criterion F, that it “contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation”; however, no specific argument is presented.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street satisfy Criteria D, E and H, but not Criterion F.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and H, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with a period of significance from 1897 to 1922.

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

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Edward Gross, a neighbor and former student, supported the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.
- Eileen Lowry, a resident of Roxborough/Manayunk, supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street form a complex of several buildings including a church formerly known as the Church of the Holy Family, and the associated rectory, convent, and school.
- The buildings were constructed between 1897 and 1922.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the German Romanesque style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The buildings were designed by several significant architects, including Patrick C. Keely, Thomas P. Lonsdale, and George I. Lovatt, satisfying Criterion E.
- The complex is prominently positioned and is an established visual feature in the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and H, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with a period of significance from 1897 to 1922. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 234 AND 240 HERMITAGE ST MOTION: Designate; Criteria D, E, H; period of sig 1897- 1922 MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 148-54 E MT AIRY AVE

Name of Resource: Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church, one building on a larger parcel at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church building satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the English Gothic style of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the building is significant for its design by prolific Philadelphia architect Henry D. Dagit. Under Criterion F, the nomination contends that the church building's use of sculpture is unique for its integration into the building's structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, with the clarification that the style is Late Gothic Revival and is not "English Gothic." The staff also recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the building satisfies Criterion F; sculptural elements have been incorporated into religious buildings for millennia, and the use of such elements at Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church does not represent a significant innovation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, but not Criterion F, and

should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance from 1928 to 1929.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:58:50

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jim Duffin commented in support of the designation.
- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Minutes of the Committee on Historic Designation note that the style classification of “English Gothic” in the nomination is incorrect.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Late Gothic Revival style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building is significant for its design by prolific Philadelphia architect Henry D. Dagit, satisfying Criterion E.
- The nomination fails to demonstrate that the building satisfies Criterion F; sculptural elements have been incorporated into religious buildings for millennia, and the use of such elements at Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church does not represent a significant innovation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the church building at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance from 1928 to 1929. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 148-54 E Mt Airy Ave MOTION: Designate, Criteria D and E MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 1400, 1406-18 AND 1420 S 3RD ST

Name of Resource: Sacred Heart of Jesus Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street, known as the Sacred Heart of Jesus Church and associated rectory and former convent buildings, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Under Criteria C, D, and H, the nomination contends that the complex exemplifies the evolution of the “Picturesque Eclectic Style” by incorporating variations of architecture associated with the movement across the three buildings. The nomination also argues that the siting of the nominated properties, along the expanse of Moyamensing Avenue, provided a welcome open space close to the congestion of Washington Avenue, further demonstrating how the complex reflects the “Picturesque Eclectic Style.” Under the Criterion E, the nomination argues that the church building is significant for its association with the prolific architect Edwin F. Durang, whose designs shaped ecclesiastical architecture in Philadelphia.

The steeple of the church has been removed, but the complex is otherwise in nearly in original condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street, satisfy Criteria C, D and E, but not Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1400,

1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and H, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance from 1872 to 1887.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:03:10

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The complex was constructed between 1872 and 1887 as the Sacred Heart of Jesus Church and associated buildings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The complex exemplifies the evolution of the “Picturesque Eclectic Style” by incorporating variations of architecture associated with the movement across the three buildings, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The church building is significant for its association with the prolific architect Edwin F. Durang, satisfying Criterion E.
- The church, rectory, and former convent buildings represent an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved to find that the properties at 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and H, and to designate the properties as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance from 1872 to 1887. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1400, 1406-18, and 1420 S 3rd St MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, E, and H MOVED BY: Edwards SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 1106 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Doctor Scholl's Store

Proposed Action: Rescission

Property Owner: Joseph Nadav

Applicant: Roger F. Perry, Esq.

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to rescind the designation of the property at 1106 Chestnut Street.

The Historical Commission individually designated the property in 1986 for its unique Art Deco façade that featured glass and metal panels designed by architect Markham Asberry in 1933.

On April 13, 2014, L&I inspected the building and deemed the Art Deco façade unsafe because panels were loose, falling, and hazardous. The property owner's contractor, William Proud Masonry, removed the entire Art Deco façade, which was composed of glass and metal panels hung with mastic and revealed the earlier brick facade. The property owner claims that an on-site L&I inspector ordered the removal of all panels. On April 22, 2014, after the facade had been removed, L&I issued a violation stating that only unsafe and loose façade materials should be removed and that the Historical Commission's approval was required to replace the panels. The violation was later closed without any work being undertaken.

In 2016 and 2017, the staff of the Historical Commission approved two permit applications to repoint and repair of the back-up brick façade and install new and salvaged glass and metal panels to restore the Art Deco appearance. The work was never undertaken. The property owner claims that the approved plans were not feasible.

In July 2021, the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application proposing to legalize the removal of the panels and repair the exposed brick wall.

In 2017, L&I issued a second violation, this time for failing to restore the facade. In January 2020, the City initiated an enforcement case against the property owner based on the newer violation. In July 2022, the Court of Common Pleas held a hearing on the enforcement case and ordered the property owner resolve the matter with the Historical Commission, through the rescission of the designation, the legalization of the removal of the facade through the hardship process, or the restoration of the facade. To comply with the court order, the property owner is seeking to rescind the designation.

The rescission application argues that the Art Deco facade was removed because it was not structurally sound and posed a safety hazard, that it was removed pursuant to an L&I directive, that any new facade would not be historically significant, and that the extant brick facade is not capable of supporting a restored facade.

Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations authorizes the Commission to "rescind the designation of a building ... and remove its entry or entries from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places if ... the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed." In this case, the qualities that caused the designation, the glass and metal Art Deco facade, have clearly been lost and destroyed. However, the question remains whether the property owner has an obligation to re-create the Art Deco facade. Given that the rescission request does not raise questions about historical or architectural significance, but only about facts associated with the removal of the facade as well as legal questions about the owner's obligation to re-create the facade, the matter exceeds the Committee on Historic Designation's purview. The Historical Commission itself will need to determine whether the owner is obligated to re-create the facade.

At the Committee on Historic Designation meeting in September 2022, it was suggested that perhaps the designation of the property could be amended to indicate that the building behind the Art Deco facade has its own significance, thereby allowing the brick facade, not the Art Deco facade, to be restored. The staff conducted some preliminary research and found that the building at 1106 Chestnut Street has a fascinating history as the George B. Evans Apothecary. Evans is legendary in the history of the retail drug business and paved the way for the drug stores of today like Walgreens and CVS. He is credited with creating the modern drug store, a place that sold candy, snacks, beauty products, patent medicines, gifts, housewares, and seasonal items, in addition to prescriptions. Evans is a nationally significant figure in the history of retailing. To resolve this complicated case, perhaps the Historical Commission and property owner could agree to amend the designation to focus on the Evans Apothecary significance and the owner could restore the brick facade to its late nineteenth-century appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Committee on Historic Designation decline to offer a recommendation for approval or denial of the request because the questions raised by the request are outside of the Committee's purview.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to decline to recommend approval or denial of the rescission request.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:06:50

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the rescission request to the Historical Commission.
- Property owners Allan and Brian Nadav participated in the review.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham presented a timeline of the matter from 2014, when the Art Deco façade was removed, to the current enforcement case. He stated that the open issue preventing the resolution of the matter is whether an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections ordered the property owner to remove the entire façade in 2014. He stated that, if the inspector ordered the removal of the entire façade, then the Historical Commission may want to consider whether requiring its reconstruction is an equitable resolution. If the façade was removed without the Department's direct order, then perhaps the Historical Commission may decide to require the owner to reconstruct the façade. Mr. Farnham then suggested that the Historical Commission might decide to pursue a third option. He explained that the building behind the Art Deco façade that was removed is historically significant as the site of George B. Evans's first drug store. Evans created the first modern American drug store and is extremely important in the history of retailing in the United States. Mr. Farnham showed photographs of the building at 1106 Chestnut Street when it was used as the George B. Evans Apothecary. He suggested that the Historical Commission could amend the designation of 1106 Chestnut Street, citing the Evans history and not the Art Deco façade as the basis for its designation.
- Mr. Allan Nadav asked if he would be required to restore the building to the appearance of the Evans Apothecary.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission could, at some point in the future, decide to amend the designation of the property to reflect the Evans history, but it was considering the rescission request at this time. He stated that he had not intended to sidetrack the discussion of the rescission request with the information about Evans but only wanted to offer the Evans amendment as a potential path forward at some point in the future.
- Mr. Allan Nadav stated that they requested the rescission because they are stuck in gridlock and have been since 2014. He stated that engineers have reviewed the plans to reconstruct the Art Deco façade and have concluded that it is not feasible. He explained that the façade reached the end of its life and the panels, which were held on with mastic, a glue of sorts, just started falling off. Once the panels started to fall off, an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections ordered them to remove all of the panels for public safety. He stated that the cost of reconstructing the Art Deco façade is not feasible. It would cost \$3 million dollars because the entire front wall of the building would need to be reconstructed. The extant wall is unable to support the panels. He stated that they just want to run their business from the property. He stated that the requirement to rebuild the façade is "an attack on a local business." He concluded that "the whole thing is ridiculous."
 - o Mr. Thomas stated that he is also a small businessman and that he understood the situation. He asked Mr. Allan Nadav if he would be willing to restore the brick façade.
 - o Mr. Nadav recounted past applications and past disappointments. He stated that the brick façade is deteriorating. He asked the Historical Commission "to take off our handcuffs so that we can continue to operate."
 - o Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Allan Nadav what he would like to do with the brick façade.

- o Mr. Allan Nadav stated that he wanted to clean and repair and repoint the façade, and then install new windows.
- o Mr. Thomas stated that amending the designation and letting the property owner repair the brick façade sounded like a good solution that would allow everyone to move forward.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Evans Apothecary appears to have important historical significance. She stated that the reconstruction of the glass façade does not seem practicable or necessary, given the Evans significance.
- Mr. Mattioni questioned the Historical Commission's authority to amend the designation at this time, given that the property owner has requested the rescission of the designation. He asked if the Historical Commission could simply decide to redesignate the property under different criteria at this juncture.
 - o Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, stated that the Historical Commission could amend the designation to call out the Evans connection instead of the glass façade. He also noted that the Historical Commission could not unilaterally order the property owner to restore the façade to the appearance of the Evans Apothecary, but the Commission would have the authority to review within the scope of work proposed by the owner. For example, if the owner proposed to repoint the front facade, the Historical Commission would have to review that proposal and would only approve if the proposed pointing satisfied historic preservation standards.
 - o Ms. Carney asked if a new nomination would need to be written for the Evans significance, or if the Historical Commission could simply find that the property satisfied a Criterion for Designation and amend the designation today without any additional paperwork or review.
 - o Mr. Thomas suggested that the Historical Commission could decide today that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation A, that the property has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of the city. He stated that the Evans Apothecary is part of the cultural history of the city.
 - o Mr. Allan Nadav asked if they could alter the façade in such a way that it did not look like the Evans façade. He stated that they retained some of the metal panels from the Art Deco façade and would like to reuse them. He asked the Historical Commission to relinquish its control over the property and let him do what he wants with it.
 - o Mr. Brian Nadav stated that he is aware of the Evans significance and is already celebrating that significance in his store. He stated that his store, which is located in the building, Lapstone & Hammer, also has cultural significance. He offered to install the remaining Art Deco façade pieces in a new lobby on Sansom Street.
 - o Ms. Carney stated that the applicants should be allowed to repair the brick façade and run their business as best they can.
 - o Mr. Brian Nadav stated that they want to repair the brick façade and install new windows. He asked if they could install any windows.
 - o Mr. Thomas stated that the windows must be appropriate and approved by the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. McCoubrey stated that the building is historically significant, and the Historical Commission should retain some jurisdiction over it. He stated that the staff can assist the property owners by reviewing applications to restore the front façade.
 - o Ms. Cooperman agreed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the compromise of amending the designation to reflect the Evans Apothecary history and then allowing the property owners to restore the front façade.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Art Deco façade was removed on orders of the Department of Licenses and Inspections because it was failing and posed a public safety hazard.
- The building served as the first store and headquarters of the George B. Evans Apothecary. Evans is legendary in the history of the retail drug business and paved the way for the drug stores of today like Walgreens and CVS. He is credited with creating the modern drug store, a place that sold candy, snacks, beauty products, patent medicines, gifts, housewares, and seasonal items, in addition to prescriptions. Evans is a nationally significant figure in the history of retailing.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Art Deco façade, the reason for the original designation, has been lost. The property is no longer historically significant because of the Art Deco façade.
- The property is historically significant for its connection to the George B. Evans Apothecary, thereby satisfying Criterion for Designation A.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the historical significance of the property at 1106 Chestnut Street is limited to Criterion for Designation A, for its association with the George B. Evans Apothecary, and to amend its designation to reflect that significance. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1106 Chestnut St MOTION: Amend designation MOVED BY: Carney SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				4

ADDRESS: 1001 W LUZERNE ST

Name of Resource: Little Flower High School for Girls

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1001 W. Luzerne Street, known as the Little Flower High School for Girls as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Located in the Hunting Park neighborhood, the school was constructed in 1938 with an addition built in 1958. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the Little Flower High School for Girls was strongly influenced by two significant figures, St. Therese (Martin) of Lisieux and Cardinal Dennis J. Dougherty. Cardinal Dougherty's role in St. Therese's canonization in the 1920s and his relationship with her family were pivotal in the naming of the school. The nomination further contends that the nomination satisfies Criteria D and E, as an example of a modern school building designed in the International Style by prominent Catholic Church architect Henry D. Dagit & Sons and constructed by builder McCloskey & Company. Under Criterion H, the nomination maintains that the property represents an established and familiar visual feature to the neighborhood and community owing to the size of the building and its location directly adjacent to Hunting Park.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1001 W Luzerne St satisfies Criteria A, E, D, and H. The staff does not agree with the description of the school building's design as International Style but more appropriately embodies features of Stripped Classicism. The nomination does not include an end date for the period of significance. The staff recommends that the period of significance mirror the period of construction, 1938 to 1939.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1001 W. Luzerne Street satisfies Criteria for Designation Criterion D, E, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:55:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner. Attorney Tony Forte sent a letter to the staff prior to the meeting on behalf of the owner the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. The letter, dated 20 September 2022, stated that the owner opposed the designation.
- Celeste Morello attended as the nominator.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save of Site supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The style is not International Style as described in the nomination. All references to this should be updated to Stripped Classicism or Moderne.

- The building's architecture is a good representation of changing ideas within the Philadelphia architectural community in the late 1930s and how this new style was applied to institutional buildings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination does not demonstrate that the property satisfies Criterion A. The nomination's argument that Little Flower High School for Girls was strongly influenced by two significant figures, St. Therese (Martin) of Lisieux and Cardinal Dennis J. Dougherty, is incorrect.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criteria D and E, as an example of a school building by prominent Catholic Church architect Henry D. Dagitt & Sons and constructed by builder McCloskey & Company that shows the influence of new architectural concepts emerging internationally and regionally in the 1930s.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion H because the property represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood and community, owing to the size of the building and its location directly adjacent to Hunting Park.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion J, owing to the school's influence on the cultural, historical, and social heritage within Hunting Park and throughout Philadelphia by way of the school's alumnae.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 1001 Luzerne Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1001 W. Luzerne St MOTION: Designation under Criteria D, E, H, and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	8				5

GATES STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Ridge Park Civic Association

Number of Properties: 24

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate 24 properties along the 300 block of Gates Street in Central Roxborough as a historic district. The nomination states that the Gates Street Historic District is significant under Criteria for Designation D and J with a period of significance of 1887 to 1927. For Criterion D, the nomination contends the buildings on this block exemplify Philadelphia's diverse architectural periods constructed for a working and middle-class population. Styles such as Italianate, Folk Victorian, Second Empire, Gothic Revival, and Colonial Revival are applied to modest homes set back from the street, often on large lots. For Criterion J, the nomination asserts that the 300 block of Gates Street possesses significant character, interest, and value as a representative part of the development of the neighborhood as a dense Philadelphia suburb and represents the economic, social, and historical heritage of the Roxborough communities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that this nomination does not satisfy Criterion D and J. While the nomination offers well-researched, detailed, and factual documentation about the 300 block of Gates Street, it does not offer a compelling argument for significance under Criteria D and J. The type of argument for significance presented in the nomination for Criteria D and J could be made for almost every older, residential block in Roxborough. The staff recognizes that the nomination is indicative of the pride of this residential block and the desire to protect the existing character of the neighborhood and landscape, but questions whether this area merits designation as a historic district under the current system. The Historical Commission is currently exploring options for creating a second type of historic district that focuses on conserving the historic character of a community rather than preserving the architectural details. This area would be better served by that historic district option when it becomes available in the future.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Gates Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:00:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Marlene Schleifer, president of the Ridge Park Civic Association, and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Multiple owners of properties in the proposed historic district attended the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Schleifer claimed that the staff opposed the nomination of the historic district because it only supports the designation of "fancy-schmancy" buildings.
- Ed Gross, a property owner, opposed the nomination.
- Lois Price, a property owner, supported the nomination.
- Mandy Doty, a property owner, supported the nomination.

- Nathan Doty, a property owner, supported the nomination.
- Eileen Lowery, a property owner, supported the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patty Brennan, a former resident of Gates Street, supported the nomination.
- Dennis Carlisle, a Roxborough resident, supported the nomination.
- Cheryl Feldman, head of the Historic Preservation Committee of the Ridge Park Civic Association, supported the nomination.
- Erin Wetzel, a Roxborough resident, supported the nomination.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.
- Stephen Peitzman of the East Falls Historical Society supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Many property owners in the proposed historic district support the creation of the district.
- The proposed historic district is described by owners and neighbors as having unique characteristics including a sense of place.
- The 300 block of Gates Street and the surrounding Central Roxborough community is experiencing ongoing real estate development that is altering the architectural and physical landscape of the overall neighborhood.
- This specific block retains a high degree of architectural integrity.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criterion D as the 300 block of Gates Street exemplifies Philadelphia's diverse architectural periods constructed for a working and middle-class population. Styles such as Italianate, Folk Victorian, Second Empire, Gothic Revival, and Colonial Revival are applied to modest homes set back from the street, often on large lots.
- The nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criterion J as the 300 block of Gates Street possesses significant character, interest, and value as a representative part of the development of the neighborhood as a dense Philadelphia suburb and represents the economic, social, and historical heritage of the Roxborough communities.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the Gates Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Gates Street Historic District MOTION: Designation under Criteria D and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	7				6

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 2301 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Name of Resource: Rothacker-Orth Brewery and Lager Beer Saloon

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Fairmount LG Holdings LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property has significant interest or value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation, as a survivor of the early stage in the development of the city's lager brewing industry, for which Philadelphia was nationally known by the late-nineteenth century. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the corner building, constructed in 1845, exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community, serving as the first location of what eventually became two of the largest lager beer breweries in the adjacent Brewerytown neighborhood of Philadelphia during the late-nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue 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 2301 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the recommendation to

amend the period of significance to 1845 through circa 1900, and to classify any post circa 1900 rear additions as non-contributing.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:27:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Meredith Trego and preservation consultant Nick Kraus represented the property owner.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry reminded the Commissioners that this nomination was reviewed at the September 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission, at which time the Commission voted to continue the review of the nomination to allow for the owner's representatives to provide additional information about the rear of the building.
- Mr. Grossi summarized the historic significance of the property. He stated that all agree that the greenhouse portion of the rear is non-contributing. He stated that evidence from historic surveys and atlases suggests historic fabric survives within the historic footprint of the brewery, and that there are no demolition or alteration permits on record for the rear of the property. He noted that designation of everything but the greenhouse as contributing does not preclude later approval of alterations to the rear of the property by the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Trego reminded the Commissioners that the owner's representatives are appearing in non-opposition to the nomination, but with the request to exclude the rear additions, owing to their lack of visible historic fabric, or any proof that these parts of the building date to the period of significance. She directed the Historical Commission's attention to the second report by Heritage Consulting, which was prepared in response to the prior review and the Commission's request for additional information about the metal-clad rear addition.
- Mr. Kraus presented slides documenting the exploration of the building to try to locate any historic fabric which may remain, specifically when viewed from the interior. He stated that, from the exterior, there is no visible historic material visible from the public right-of-way at the rear. He explained the photographs in the presentation, stating that they all showed no evidence of historic fabric remaining. He presented photographs showing the mechanical equipment hidden behind the modern raised parapet wall which is clad in metal.
- Ms. Trego noted that there were some statements made at the prior Historical Commission meeting regarding the motion of the Committee on Historic Designation when it reviewed this nomination. She stated that she went back and listened to the recording to confirm her understanding that the Committee had only asked for further exploration of the second story of the rear bump out, not of everything but the greenhouse at the rear. She explained that that was why they only provided information to the Historical Commission last month about the lack of historic material under the metal cladding of the second story on the bump out. She stated that it is important to remember that the regulation of historic properties in Philadelphia should relate to the existence of visible historic fabric which tells a story. She stated that there is no evidence here that the existing rear additions date to the period of significance. She asked that the Historical Commission exclude the rear

additions if it designates the property. She provided examples where the Historical Commission excluded similar sections in the past, including 1822 and 1824 Chestnut Street, and in the Chestnut Street East Commercial historic district. She noted that if the Historical Commission were to designate the rear additions as non-contributing, it would still retain jurisdiction over the review of building permit applications to this portion of the property. She stated that the property owner has been very supportive of the nomination thus far and has cooperated with the multiple requests for further investigation of the building. She concluded that the Historical Commission should agree to a compromise, supported by the facts, that the rear additions of the property be excluded or classified as non-contributing, owing to their complete lack of visible historic fabric.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Bob Powers, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, commented in support of the designation of the entire property. He noted that he is also Board Chair of the Preservation Alliance. He noted that the Historical Commission received numerous letters of support for the designation from City Council, Spring Garden Civic Association, Fairmount Civic Association, Eastern State Penitentiary, and nearly 50 members of the Spring Garden community who signed a letter of support. He commented that the interior of the rear of the property is not being considered for interior designation, and so this portion of the property is being held to a much higher standard than is typically applied to a building being proposed for designation. He commented that the historic maps show the continued presence of the rear ell, and there is no record of a demolition permit for the rear. He commented that the report by Heritage Consulting is flawed because it focuses on interior finishes within the ell and does not evaluate any other building features. He stated that the interior finishes are irrelevant to the larger discussion of significance. He commented that the consultant focused solely on existing finishes and fails to prove there is no historic fabric extant in the rear ell. He stated that the report fails to peel away the existing finishes to reveal and assess potentially significant features behind the current finishes. He argued that the masonry walls and timber framing members are extremely important and should have been fully evaluated in the report. He stated that, given the lack of compelling historic and physical evidence in the report owing to the work that was not done, one must conclude that the rear of the building minus the greenhouse and screening is historic and should be considered contributing.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED:

- Mr. Kraus responded to the comments made by Mr. Powers. He stated that the idea that investigatory demolition must be conducted as a standard to determine if historic fabric remains in an area not visible to the public, is not a standard that he has ever encountered. He stated that the comments made by Mr. Powers are inconsistent with how the Historical Commission designates and regulates properties. He stated that the burden of proof regarding the existence of historic fabric sits with the nominator or Historical Commission, not with the property owner, who did not initiate the designation process.
- Ms. Trego explained that the rear of the building is cinderblock and metal paneling, and that there is nothing visible on the exterior which indicates that this portion of the building dates to the period of significance. She explained that the Commission's direction from the prior meeting was to determine if there was any clear indication on the interior of that structure as to historic fabric. She suggested that the comments by Mr. Powers require a heavy lift of property owners, putting the burden of proof on the

owner rather than the nominator, and that this property owner has spent considerable time and money on exploratory demolition to determine if any historic fabric remains at the rear of the building. She concluded that there is simply nothing visible at the rear which indicates that it is historic.

- Mr. Mattioni noted that there appeared to be unanimous agreement that the greenhouse portion of the rear is non-contributing.
- Ms. Sánchez summarized the Historical Commission's comments from the prior meeting, where Mr. Kraus presented information about the second story of the rear bump out because the Committee on Historic Designation had determined that the greenhouse and metal clad ell was non-contributing. She stated that there was some confusion then, and the Historical Commission asked Mr. Kraus to reappear before the Commission because of confusion surrounding the metal-clad ell and the Committee's recommendation on it. Ms. Sánchez stated that she then went back and read the Committee minutes and that Ms. Trego was correct that the only remaining part to discuss was the second-story metal clad bump out, for which information was presented to the Commission at the last meeting.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that nothing has been presented to suggest that the second-story piece is historic or part of the original fabric.
- Mr. Thomas reviewed the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation, which recommended to classify any post circa 1900 rear additions as non-contributing.
 - o Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that the Committee could not determine if the rear additions were historic. She stated that the first-floor brick bump out at the rear was never in question and was contributing. She referenced the 1947 photograph in the nomination and stated that the Historical Commission must rely on visual evidence and has not been provided with information to confirm if any parts of the rear in question predate 1900.
 - o Mr. Lech noted that the 1947 photograph shows a structure further back, and if the mechanical screen were removed, the cornice line would match the roof line. He opined that if it is not the same structure, it was built in the same location as the 1947 photograph shows.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission needs to decide if it is going to vote that the historic material at the rear is not important and should not be designated. She noted that the Historical Commission made this determination during an earlier review in this meeting, although in that case the Commission was also considering the important community benefit of the institutional owner.
- Mr. Thomas asked about what is under the metal cladding and why an owner went to that expense.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that it was likely for fire rating, as mechanical equipment is located there.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The greenhouse addition at the rear was constructed in 1986 and is non-contributing.
- Information provided by the property owner's representatives shows that the mechanical screen on the second story of the rear ell is not enclosing interior space and is non-contributing.
- Information provided by the property owner does not conclusively demonstrate whether historic fabric survives at the rear ell. No historic fabric is visible on the

exterior or interior of the ell but historic fabric may survive behind the non-historic finishes.

- The period of significance should begin with the construction date of the building, being 1845.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property has significant interest or value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation, as a survivor of the early stage in the development of the city's lager brewing industry, for which Philadelphia was nationally known by the late-nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion A.
- The property exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community, serving as the first location of what eventually became two of the largest lager beer breweries in the adjacent Brewerytown neighborhood of Philadelphia during the late-nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion J.
- The property owner has not proven that historic fabric does not survive behind the non-historic interior and exterior finishes at the rear ell; therefore, historic fabric may exist at the rear ell and it should be considered a contributing element of the designation

ACTION: Mr. Lech moved to find that the property at 2301 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria A and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the rear greenhouse addition and second-story non-enclosing mechanical screen on the ell classified as non-contributing. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of six to one. Ms. Sánchez dissented.

ITEM: 2301 Fairmount Ave					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A and J; greenhouse and mechanical screen on rear ell non-contributing					
MOVED BY: Lech					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)		X			
Washington	X				
Total	6	1			6

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:11:15

ACTION: At 2:13 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: Adjourn					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)					X
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)					X
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel	X				X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	7				6

PLEASE NOTE:

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

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;

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