

**THE MINUTES OF THE 657TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 MAY 2017
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Yvonne Boye, Commerce Department
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Michael Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Antonio Fiol-Silva, AICP, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
Melissa Long, Division of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Frederick Purnell Sr., Division of Housing & Community Development
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Welry Bogan, Boys and Girls Club
Michael Oliver, Boys and Girls Club
Elijah Dickenson, Boys and Girls Club
Eric Lawton, Boys and Girls Club
Daniel Kelchner, Boys and Girls Club
Kelly Lemberger, Boys and Girls Club
Brian Sullivan, Boys and Girls Club
Suche Subramaniam
Ari Abramson
Sue Gilfillan, Penn Knox
Pamela Bracey, SOLO Germantown Civic Association
Catharine K. Franklin, Penn Knox
Barbara Mitchell, Penn Knox
Richard Thom
Malcolm Burnley, Plan Philly
Stephen Paulmier, Penn Knox
Nicholas Kolah, Penn Knox
Jenny Lee Maas, Penn Knox
Connie Winters, WCGN
Forrest Patterson, Boys and Girls Club
Michael Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr

Kathleen Schaeffer, Boys and Girls Club
Cindy Sabatino, Boys and Girls Club
Allen Lark, Boys and Girls Club
William Franks, Boys and Girls Club
Alyn Wallen, Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church
Jahlil M. Gainey
Kevin Colavita, Boys and Girls Club
Jackly Rivera, Boys and Girls Club
Rohelio Rivera, Boys and Girls Club
Genesis Perez, Boys and Girls Club
Hunter Conn, Boys and Girls Club
Bryant Snyder, HSA
Marjorie Cohen, Boys and Girls Club
Dustin Moore, Boys and Girls Club
Jamie Shipton, Boys and Girls Club
Mare Shipton, Boys and Girls Club
Caroline Slama, PAGP
Allison Weiss, SoLo/GCA RCO
Dean Padget, Boys and Girls Club
Amani Smith, Boys and Girls Club
Zaakir Harrison, Boys and Girls Club
Keenan Mosley, Boys and Girls Club
Letitia Curry, Boys and Girls Club
Shenice Tende, Boys and Girls Club
Nate Torok
Brett Feldman, Klehr Harrison
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Neil Sklaroff
Brett Peanasky, KHHB
Isaac Adams, Boys and Girls Club
Katie Williams, Boys and Girls Club
Eric Hawthorne, Boys and Girls Club
Shanif Debman, Boys and Girls Club
Jerry Houck, Boys and Girls Club
Oscar Beisert
Justin Spivey, WJE
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Jada McCurry, Boys and Girls Club
Nayyar Tenner, Boys and Girls Club
Lamar Moore, Boys and Girls Club
Zakariah Abdullahi, Boys and Girls Club
Daushanah Pearson, Boys and Girls Club
Semaj Pettigren, Boys and Girls Club
Diane Jones, Boys and Girls Club
Lauren Feder, Boys and Girls Club
Jude Leriche, Boys and Girls Club
Sue Patterson, Penn Knox
Harrison Haas
Ben Leech
Jason Newman, Boys and Girls Club
Denise Matza, Boys and Girls Club

Donald K. Travers, Boys and Girls Club
Tina Lecoff, Penn Knox
Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch
J. M. Duffin
J. F. McCarthy, BHN and Historic Germantown
Aaron Wunsch, University of Pennsylvania
Andrew Palewski, PAGP
Bernard Lambert, WCGN
Shanelle Coleman, Boys and Girls Club
Ted Stones
Aikia Richardson, Boys and Girls Club
Carl Dash
Ruth Thornton, Boys and Girls Club
Emaleigh Doley, Germantown United CDC
Georgette Bartell
Gary Vernick, Franklin Bridge North
Diane Tucker, Franklin Bridge North
Jim Crossan, A. Taus & Associates
Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture & Design
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Charlette Caldwell, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kathy Dowdell
Peter Winslow, PAIPL
George Poulin, PVCA
Kiki Bolender, DAG
Fred Baumert, Keast & Hood
Suzanna Barucco, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joe Marziello, Boys and Girls Club
Lisabeth Marziello, Boys and Girls Club
Jerald Goodman, Drinker Biddle & Reath
Ariel Goldring, Boys and Girls Club
Max Weisman, Boys and Girls Club
Catherine Hayes Lodwell, Boys and Girls Club
Robyn Chan, Boys and Girls Club
Sam Blank, Boys and Girls Club
Susan Moskal, Boys and Girls Club
Angela Luke, Boys and Girls Club
Alex Aquino, Boys and Girls Club
Krista Wenger, Boys and Girls Club
Lindsay McKenna, Boys and Girls Club
Karen Olgzewski, Boys and Girls Club
Paige Borelli, Boys and Girls Club
Sarah Winkowski, Boys and Girls Club
Christina Whitaker, Boys and Girls Club

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Boye, Cooperman, Fink, Fiol-Silva, Gupta, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, Royer, Schaaf, and Turner joined him. Mr. Purnell replaced Ms. Long during the meeting.

MINUTES OF THE 656TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 656th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 April 2017. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REQUESTS TO CONTINUE NOMINATION REVIEWS

Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman recused from the discussion of the continuance request for the review of the nominations for 100 S. Independence West Mall. Ms. Turner took the chair in place of Mr. Thomas.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nominations for 100 S. Independence West Mall to the September 2017 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Farnham presented the requests to continue the reviews of the nominations for 1642 Fitzwater Street, 1600-06 and 1608-10 E. Berks Street, 1401 S. Water Street, 5356 Chew Avenue, 18 and 20 E. Johnson Street, 6369 Germantown Avenue, and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue to the June 2017 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and for 227 E. Allen Street to the July 2017 meeting of the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the reviews of the nominations for 1642 Fitzwater Street, 1600-06 and 1608-10 E. Berks Street, 1401 S. Water Street, 5356 Chew Avenue, 18 and 20 E. Johnson Street, 6369 Germantown Avenue, and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue to the June 2017 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and for 227 E. Allen Street to the July 2017 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 APRIL 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 912 Winter Street, 2036 Sansom Street, 2218-22 Walnut Street, 208 N. Lawrence Street, 200 S. Broad Street, and 231-37 Race Street. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 912 Winter Street, 2036 Sansom Street, 2218-22 Walnut Street, 308 N. Lawrence Street, 200 S. Broad Street, and 231-37 Race Street. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 212 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Alter façade

Type of Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Jonathan and Kate Jay Zweifler

Applicant: Michelle Shlomo, Star Painting and Wallcovering and Sons, LLC

History: 1970, Hassinger & Schwam, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the change to the 45-degree corner of the building, but offered no recommendation on the addition of windows in the masonry return.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to square off an angled corner at the front façade and add a set of windows on this circa 1970 property in the Society Hill Historic District. The squaring off would remove the 45 degree corner wall at the first floor and replace it with a 90 degree corner, clad in vertical cedar boards. Turning the corner of this projecting area of the front façade, three windows are proposed where there is currently a solid brick wall.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owners Jonathan and Kate Zweifler represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the Architectural Committee could not reach a consensus with regard to the proposed addition of windows at the side facade.

Mr. Zweifler explained that the proposal is driven by two primary objectives, those being subtraction and alignment. He distributed supplemental materials. He explained that he desires approval to remove elements that have been added over time, including a purple canopy, grates, plaques, and an elaborately painted front door.

Greg Paulmier, a member of the audience, approached the Commissioners' table and interrupted the meeting, exclaiming that the meeting must be stopped. He claimed that the occupancy limit for the room had been exceeded. Mr. Farnham stated that Mr. Paulmier was out of order and that he had no authority to suspend the proceedings. Mr. Paulmier continued to interrupt the meeting. Mr. Farnham informed the audience that he would consult with the facilities manager regarding the occupancy. He directed Mr. Paulmier to cease his interruptions. He offered to address the matter with Mr. Paulmier in the hallway outside the room. Mr. Mattioni likewise directed Mr. Paulmier to cease interrupting the meeting. Mr. Paulmier feigned calling 911 on his cell phone and reporting that the Historical Commission had exceeded the capacity of the conference room. He then left the room. Mr. Farnham discussed the matter with Mr. Fink, the Department of Licenses & Inspections representative on the Commission, and Mr. Hartner, the Department of Public Property representative on the Commission. They decided that they could establish a fire watch to allow the meeting to proceed. Mr. Hartner established the fire watch with the facility management staff. Mr. Farnham requested that everyone in attendance for designation matters move to an adjacent conference room while the Historical Commission reviewed the building permit applications on its agenda. About half the members of the audience left the conference room to wait in the adjacent room.

After the interruption, Mr. Zweifler continued the discussion of his application. He stated that the second objective is alignment, not only to surrounding architecture but also to the lot itself. He stated that the building was not designed by a famous architect. He referenced the original announcement of the building from 1969, which he included with the supplemental materials.

Ms. Cooperman asked about the purpose of the addition that would square off the beveled corner. Mr. Zweifler responded that it is not to gain square footage, but rather it is an aesthetic change, and will facilitate the construction of an outdoor storage space. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that the proposed changes make the building look better. Ms. Cooperman stated that the chamfered corner is a character-defining feature of the design, which is reflected in the neighboring building. She opined that the non-historic greenhouse window is unfortunate, but the fact that the chamfer still exists is a character-defining feature of the design, as documented in the newsletter provided. She agreed that the architecture can feel fortress-like, but that feeling is representative of its historic moment. She agreed that the removals of the canopy, door, and plaque are appropriate, and that the addition of windows is in a different category of alteration. It does not result in changing the historic shape of the building. Mr. Zweifler opined that the district is historic, but this is a builder-designed property. Ms. Cooperman responded that Hassinger & Schwam were architects, not builders. Mr. Zweifler acknowledged that they were architects, but questioned if they were of a prize-worthy nature. Mr. Thomas commented that the period of significance for the Society Hill Historic District includes Redevelopment Era buildings. He stated that it was common to mix metalwork and brick, but changing the metalwork to cedar would be changing a character-defining feature. He agreed that the addition of windows on the side elevation does not affect the overall appearance of the block. Ms. Cooperman explained that the building is an ensemble with 210 Delancey Street, and, although it may not feel as warm as the owners would like, that is the historic condition. She suggested opening the greenhouse window to a larger sheet of glass as it would have been historically, to match 210 Delancey Street.

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

Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that cedar looks great for a very short amount of time. He suggested dark metal instead. Mr. Zweifler responded that he would be amenable to a change in materials.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the change to the 45-degree corner of the building, but approve the remainder of the application including the addition of windows in the masonry return, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 5. Ms. Boye and Messrs. Fiol-Silva, Fink, Gupta, and Mattioni dissented.

Mr. Thomas announced that the Historical Commission would consider the application for 222-24 Vine Street next, out of order, at the applicant's request because he has an airline flight at mid-day.

ADDRESS: 222-24 VINE ST

Proposal: Construct five-story multi-family building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 222 Vine LP

Applicant: Nathan Torok, Rock Construction & Development, LLC

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story, multi-family building with roof deck to replace a one-story, non-contributing building within the Old City Historic District. The north and east elevations would have an industrial appearance created with the incorporation of brick piers, multi-pane, metal-clad windows, and corrugated metal wall panels. A small side yard would separate the building from its eastern neighbor. The rear wall, which would be visible from New Street, would be stuccoed, and each story would contain one tripartite or single, metal clad window. The west elevation would function as a party wall.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Brett Feldman, architect Judy Robinson, and owner Nate Torok represented the application.

Mr. Feldman stated that the applicant received feedback from the Architectural Committee members and that significant changes have been made since that review, which, he added, makes the design even better. He held up a large, printed rendering of the revised design and noted that he appreciated the feedback from the Architectural Committee.

Ms. Robinson commented that she placed emphasis on the Vine Street elevation to differentiate it from the east elevation. To emphasize the first floor, she explained that she changed the brick piers to limestone and added a limestone band. The first iteration, she continued, contained corrugated metal between piers that have since been changed to brick. She further clarified that she increased the feeling of horizontality by incorporating limestone heads and sills. The east elevation, she added, was only slightly modified from the original design to include one additional brick pier to achieve more uniform spacing between windows. She noted that the wood at the ground floor was eliminated. Ms. Robinson stated that she believes she addressed every major issue identified by the Architectural Committee.

Ms. Cooperman asked whether the project requires excavation beyond what is already excavated. Ms. Robinson and Mr. Torok answered that it does not.

Mr. Thomas noted that brick piers extend vertically at the east elevation, but inquired about the material between windows. Ms. Robinson replied that the material between windows will be corrugated metal, adding that she is considering using a copper tone similar to the brick color. She asserted that the metal is not meant to resemble brick but the color and material should offer a subtle textural change. Mr. Thomas responded that the elevation is quite dark in the large, printed rendering provided by the applicant and asked if there is another rendering of the east elevation to show the proposed appearance. Mr. Feldman brought the rendering closer to the Commission members to allow them to more closely observe the east elevation. Ms. Robinson reiterated that the Vine Street elevation had been revised to eliminate the corrugated

metal; the elevation is now entirely brick. Mr. Feldman added that the east elevation is set back from the property line and that the adjacent lot could be developed in the future.

Mr. Schaaf asked whether the brick at the ground level of the Vine Street façade is intended to provide privacy for a residential unit. Ms. Robinson replied that it is. Mr. Schaaf stated that it presents a dissonance with the nicely articulated storefront and that the brick does not contribute to the vocabulary of the first floor. Ms. Robinson responded that she originally incorporated a different material at that location, but she changed it based on feedback from the Architectural Committee. She questioned whether she chose the wrong material. Mr. Schaaf asked whether the material could be fritted glass. Mr. Fiol-Silva agreed, commenting that the proposed storefront area looks like a new building that has been inappropriately altered. Mr. Fiol-Silva also expressed concern over the sheen and color of the building and questioned whether it would blend as indicated in the rendering. He suggested that the staff review samples of the exterior materials.

Ms. Cooperman contended that the color of the corrugated metal would be better if it reads as steel or aluminum, because the proposed copper color confuses the material. She added that the material is not bronze or terra cotta, and questioned why it should not look like a metal panel. Ms. Royer agreed with Ms. Cooperman and asked that the metal contrast with the brick rather than attempt to match the color. Ms. Cooperman added that the contrasting color would make clear that this is a new building, and it would be compatible new construction. Ms. Robinson asked whether the Commission would recommend more of a galvanized color. Ms. Cooperman replied that a galvanized color would be appropriate. Ms. Robinson responded that she hesitated to include a galvanized color at the corrugated panels because of her concerns over intense reflection caused by the sun. However, she noted that she would be glad to consider other colors to identify one that is more appropriate and has more contrast.

Mr. Fiol-Silva remarked that the metal panels in the rendering are unobjectionable because they read as brick. He argued that the metal panels should be acknowledged as metal, though possibly dark metal, which the staff could approve. He contended that the building should not pretend to be historic and should be presented as a sympathetic new building. Ms. Robinson asked whether gunmetal would be appropriate or if it would be too dark. Several Commission members agreed that gunmetal would be a good choice. Mr. Thomas generally advocated for a dull gray finish.

Richard Thom recommended a terne metal color and suggested that it wrap at the cornice to continue the element and tie together the front and side facades. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that he likes the terne metal color but disagreed with wrapping it at the cornice.

Mr. Thom then stated that he helped create the Old City Historic District, with the Historical Commission staff, and added that he, his client, and others came to the meeting to support the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial. In his 30 years of coming before the Commission, he continued, he has never seen a project completely turned around from where he opposed the project to where he fully supported it. He added that he cannot remember a project that was so thoroughly redesigned based on the comments offered by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thom congratulated the developer, architect, and attorney, adding that they did everything that was requested. However, he agreed that the brick at the first floor appears as infill, but noted that the problem can be resolved at the staff level.

Mr. Schaaf commented that looking at the rendering instead of the drawings was incredibly helpful.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the revised design, provided that the first-floor residential entrance is modified to reflect the Commission's comments and the metal panels of the east elevation are non-reflective in a color like gun metal or terne coat, with the staff to review details. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 102 PENSDALE ST

Proposal: Remove addition and rebuild wall; add dormer and screen; restore front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4201 Main Street, L.P.

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

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the front façade, new window openings in the former party wall as per the revised drawing, removal of the rear addition, equipment screen and a simple baluster, and rear wall with French doors as originally proposed, with the staff to review details; denial of the rear dormer as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this rowhouse to allow for future commercial use. The front façade would be restored with new doors, windows and shutters. A new dormer would be constructed at the rear roof to create headroom for a new stair leading to the attic, in addition to a new equipment platform and screen on the lower shed roof. The application proposes to demolish what it considers to be a later addition at the rear, and to construct a new rear wall with French doors at the first floor and a window wall at the second floor. The French doors would allow access to an expanded rear yard with six-foot high wood fence. New window openings are proposed for the north elevation, which historically was a party wall prior to Station Street connecting through to Pensdale Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and property owner Mike MacCrory represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the application has been revised since the review by the Committee. The windows on the side have been reduced in number, and the rear dormer has been made into a shed dormer so as to reduce visibility from the street.

Mr. Rosenberg directed the Commission's attention to the historic photographs, which show the building historically as part of a row. The adjacent building was demolished, which exposed the party wall. He explained that the proposed rear dormer was originally hipped, but has been changed to reduce its height and therefore reduce its visibility from the street.

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

ACTION: Mr. Fiol-Silva moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 12 May 2017. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 912 WINTER ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition with deck at rear; remove Permastone from front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Brent Wong

Applicant: Tommy Tran, JTRAN Expediting

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 4/25/1974

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that no brick veneer is added to the front façade, the new addition does not result in blocking up, reducing, or moving the rear windows, and the addition is constructed to sit below the rear cornice line, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the Permastone from the front façade of this brick house. At the rear, the application proposes to construct a one-story addition with deck on the rear ell. The deck would be accessed through the existing rear dormer, which would be altered. The work at the rear is not visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1801-35 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct bridge

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Thomas McCreesh, Temple University

History: 1870; Park Mall houses, Temple University

Individual Designation: 9/24/1986

District Designation: Park Mall Historic District, Contributing, 11/14/1990

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the application due to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a bridge across Liacouras Walk at Temple University. It would connect two buildings at the Fox Business School, one designated, the other not designated. The designated building to the west is located in the Park Mall Historic District. The building to the east is not designated. The designated building consists of series of historic facades along Liacouras Walk and Montgomery Street and a contemporary building behind and beside the historic facades. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of all but the facades and the construction of a new building behind the facades in 2004. At its most recent meeting, in April 2017, the Historical Commission approved additions to the non-historic part of the designated building. At that time, the Commission reviewed the original design for the bridge and then remanded it to the Committee with suggestions for revisions. The Commission suggested that the architect redesign the bridge to be lighter and more transparent. The current design for the bridge reflects the architect's response to the Commission's direction.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Long recused, owing to her husband's employment at the law firm representing the applicant. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.

Attorney Neil Sklaroff, Temple University administrators Nnadozie Ibeh and Edward Newson, and architects Leonardo Diaz and Mary Ellen represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff started by assuring the Commission that the design they have shown can be built. Mr. Diaz explained some of the particulars of the design including the use of “Apple Glass” as a material. He said that they have removed the cornice and otherwise minimized the bridge. He said that the floor will be solid. He said that they may even be able to eliminate some of the structure holding the glass together and instead butt glaze the joints for a more streamlined appearance. He showed frosted glass covering the steel elements at the bottom of the bridge. He showed both a dark metal panel and a glass panel. Mr. Diaz explained that the lighting in the bridge will be LED strips. Water will drain off the roof onto the ground.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced two students to speak about the bridge. First, Suchetha Subramaniam spoke about the need for the bridge. She said that, as president of the College Council, she represents the interest of many students. She explained how she herself had been on crutches last year and how important this bridge will be for access for disabled students. She explained that there are approximately 9,000 business students and they only have 10 minutes to get between classes. She said that bridge will allow for quick transitions between classes.

Ari Abramson, another student from the Fox School of Business, emphasized the importance of the bridge for accessibility. He said that there is one narrow ramp for disabled students and that it backs up at the security desk, where students must show their identification. The bridge will allow students to get between classes without going through a security checkpoint. He said that, in terms of design, he thinks that the bridge adds a fresh modern touch without harming the historic facades of the buildings.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance spoke about the negative precedent that the approval of this bridge would set. He said that, in general, bridges hide facades, block sun, and deaden streets. He claimed the Architectural Committee tried so hard to lighten this bridge because it will have a negative influence on the district. He argued that it will change the context of the historic facades. Mr. Thomas said that he is aware of bridges that do adversely impact their environments, but concluded that the proposed bridge is more like the one at the Marriott Hotel, connecting it to the Convention Center. He contended that this bridge will not damage the vibrancy of Liacouras Walk. He suggested that the staff could work with the applicant to refine the details.

Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that he initially opposed the bridge, but acknowledged that the revised design is much better for removing the “lid” on top. He said that he has come around to supporting this bridge. He said that this is a very specific case on a vacated street and should not be used as a precedent.

Mr. Mattioni stated that, if the Historical Commission were to approve this bridge today, it would not set a precedent for future bridge applications. Every subsequent bridge application would be reviewed on its merits and would not simply be approved because this application had been approved.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 12 May 2017, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Mr. Schaaf dissented.

ADDRESS: 2036 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition with decks and pilot house; install new storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2036 Sansom LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architecture

History: 1870; altered for commercial, c. 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the front façade, a single-story third-floor addition on the rear ell, and a roof deck on the rear half of the roof with access from a stairhouse located on the rear of the third floor, but denial of a fourth-story addition, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one and two-story addition on this building. The addition would be set back 22 feet from the front façade. A deck with a stair house would be located on the addition. Another deck would be located on the roof of the original building, in front of the addition, set back 14 feet from the Sansom Street or front façade. The staff visited the site to review a mock-up of the proposed additions. Because the building is taller than the buildings to the west, these additions are quite visible from Sansom Street.

The applicant also proposes work to the front façade, restoring the second-floor windows and modifying the storefront with a cornice and new windows and doors.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2218-22 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Alter storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Post Brothers

Applicant: Albert Taus, Albert Taus & Associates

History: 1927; Roosevelt; J. Margolis, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised application submitted at the meeting, provided wood windows are installed in the small openings and the metal storefront windows match the remainder of the windows at the first floor, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove infill from storefront window openings and other first-floor window openings and install new windows. Cafe windows would be installed in the storefronts. Unusual multi-pane windows would be installed in the smaller openings running down 23rd Street. The application also proposes canopies over the storefront windows and door. A zoning permit indicates that the storefront windows were altered in 1951. A photograph indicates that the southernmost four windows openings on 23rd had not yet been infilled in 1959. Unfortunately, the 1959 photograph does not reveal the design of the windows. The window designs should be simplified. Canvas awnings that fit within the openings would be more appropriate than the proposed canopies.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 308 N LAWRENCE ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bart Schindler

Applicant: Bart Schindler

History: 1785

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 1 to recommend approval of the application, provided that the addition is not visible from the public right-of-way and the rear dormer is retained in its shed-roof form, with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz dissented.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a third floor to the two-story rear ell and connect that addition to the attic story of the front portion of the house. The connector would replace a portion of the rear roof slope, but would leave the rear dormer and remainder of the rear roof slope intact. The rear portion of the building is not visible from any street. This intact row of early buildings is very significant.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 200 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Install signage and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bellevue Associates

Applicant: A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres, LTD

History: 1902; Bellevue Stratford Hotel; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the following parts of the application, with the staff to review details:

- the proposed awnings, with the understanding that, in addition to the palm tree logo, the words "Palm Restaurant" would be placed on the apron;
- two vinyl window appliques; and,
- one blade sign that reflects either the design submitted in the application or the revised design presented at the meeting, with a preference for the revised design.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of all other proposed signage, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new signage for the Palm Restaurant, located in the first-floor space of The Bellevue. Existing awnings would be replaced above all Broad and Chancellor Street windows. Two illuminated blade signs and a back-lit sign would also be installed at the Broad Street façade. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on the property.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 231-37 RACE ST

Proposal: Paint mural on wall at rear of parking lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Brandywine Construction and Management, Inc.

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett, Tackett and Company, Inc.

History: 1827; new façade, c. 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint a mural on the side of an exposed one-story party wall of a property fronting on N. 3rd Street, which is overlooking a parking lot accessed from Race Street. The proposed mural would depict the skyline of Center City Philadelphia in lavender and grey.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 APRIL 2017

Emily Cooperman, Chair

ADDRESS: 23 W PENN ST

Name of Resource: Germantown Boys' Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Germantown Boys' Club

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Penn Knox Neighborhood Association

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 23 W. Penn Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 23 W. Penn Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that Germantown Boys' Club is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criteria A and J for its association with the Boys' Parlors Association, which became the Germantown Boys' Club, and which provided a community center to serve the growing working-class community of Germantown. The nomination further argues that the building is significant under Criterion D, as an example of the Colonial Revival style as articulated in institutional buildings of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Lastly, the nomination claims that the building satisfies Criterion E, owing to its designer, architect Mantle Fielding, Jr. The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 23 W. Penn Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H, and J. The Committee rejected the nomination's claims regarding Criterion A and added Criterion H, even though it is not addressed in the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Long recused. Fred Purnell, director of Housing and Community Development, took her place at the table. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architectural historian Oscar Beisert and Penn Knox Neighborhood Association Chairwoman Sue Patterson represented the nomination. Attorney Jerald Goodman represented the property owner.

Ms. Patterson commented that the community values its historic structures as central to the character and economic vitality of the neighborhood, and understands that preservation and development can coexist without sacrificing one for the other. She noted that there are many neighbors in attendance who wish to testify. She stated that they understand that the current facility has been outgrown, and support the construction of a new facility somewhere in Germantown, but believe it can be accomplished without the needless demolition that has been proposed. She stated that the community also supports a new ice hockey rink, but feels that it does not necessarily have to be on the same site as the new facility. She stated that she is pleased to see that so many people signed both petitions, demonstrating that there is a desire to see this new resource in the community. Ms. Patterson provided Commissioner Thomas with a list of speakers who support the preservation of the extant building.

Commissioner Thomas asked that all speakers direct their comments to the nomination and try to not be repetitive. He cautioned that he will have to cut people off who are not addressing the appropriate topic.

Mr. Beisert commented that this is not the first time that Penn Knox has tried to protect this resource. It was part of a historic district nomination that the Commission did not consider.

Mr. Goodman provided opening remarks. He stated that we are here to preserve an important part of the history of Germantown. While the nominators believe doing that is done by preserving an obsolete building, they are wrong. We are here to preserve the Boys and Girls Club's activity in serving this community for over 100 years at this site. It can no longer do so with this building. In effect, designation of this building will imperil the future ability of the Boys and Girls Club to continue to serve the Germantown community at this location. There are multiple reasons why this nomination should be denied. First, the nomination fails to satisfy the Criteria for Designation. As such, the nomination on its face is deficient and should be denied. Second, the condition of this building is in fact relevant. The nomination misrepresents the condition of the building and characterizes it as fair, based on an exterior view. Without having the benefit of inspecting the interior of the building, the condition is actually very poor. A rear portion of the building is collapsing. The building is laid out in a way that is completely obsolete and unusable. There is significant water infiltration into building. The mechanical and electrical systems are inadequate. The building cannot be adaptively reused by the Boys and Girls Club. Third, the designation of the building will impose an extreme hardship on the Boys and Girls Club. The Boys and Girls Club is a non-profit entity. By designating the building, it will be saddled with a financial burden of maintaining an obsolete structure for which it has no future use. Lastly, this designation is not in the public interest. Designation of this building will have an enormous negative societal impact. It will effectively deny thousands of children in the Germantown area from having a new state-of-the-art recreational facility. This nomination was filed to stop the construction of the new facility. The sudden interest in this building which was long neglected is really an attempt to stop the construction of a new facility. That is not in the public interest. This Commission has the authority to permit the demolition of a building when it is in the public interest and when its retention imposes an economic hardship on the owner of the building. Commissioner Thomas interjected that what was just described are the grounds for

a hardship hearing, but this is a designation hearing. Mr. Goodman responded that he understands, but these are factors that are relevant. Historic preservation laws were adopted to promote the public interest by preserving the historical assets. Those restrictions on the right of private property ownership are accepted, and are only permissible when they serve the public benefit. In this case, the opposite is true. Preserving this building imperils the institution and therefore will harm the overall benefit of the community. It is the Commission's obligation to decide if there is a compelling public interest in designating. The US Supreme Court has noted that the designation of a property requires careful analysis of the impact. In this case, the Commission needs to determine what the impact will be. Mr. Goodman submitted that there will be a severe impact, not only on the property owner, but the community at large. Designating this building will not promote a significant social benefit. The nomination should be denied. Mr. Goodman introduced George Thomas, architectural historian. Commissioner Thomas commented that the Commission can accept that a nomination is valid, but then also decide whether or not to designate. The main focus initially is to understand if the nomination makes the case for the satisfaction of the cited Criteria for Designation.

Mr. Thomas stated that this is a complicated and difficult situation. The elephant in the room is that there are two Germantowns. The nomination was reviewed by the staff who felt that it did not meet the Criteria in any way, and did not address the issues in any way. The Commission is voting on this nomination. This Club has been planning and developing its ideas for this site since the fall of 2013. This Club has invested three-and-a-half years of work, with the intention of being under construction this past spring. The architectural description is offensive in its ignorance. The wrong term is used for the brick pattern, the direction labels on the photographs are wrong, and the nomination misrepresents the condition of the building as fair when it is poor. The period of significance is listed as ending in 1909, but this club has 108 years of subsequent history. The nomination omits the historical narrative of the change that happened in Germantown that is at the heart of the two Germantowns that are represented here today. These conditions and issues are readily available by looking at the files at the Germantown Historical Society. Articles from 1938 describe a declining condition of the building and the need to rebuild it. In 1985, a major report details the deficiencies of building. All of these issues remain to present day. In 1985, it was realized that the building did not and could not meet the needs of modern children. The gymnasium on the third floor has a hammer beam ceiling that starts at seven feet, which is not a particularly effective site for playing basketball. The 1985 report called for a new pool and gymnasium. After that report was published, the Americans with Disabilities Act was enacted. This building meets none of the accessibility criteria. These issues were readily accessible and should have begun to raise the key questions as to whether this building warrants designation. Another question is whether this building is such an important example of a Colonial Revival that it should be designated. The Colonial Revival style is common. The nomination makes no attempt to discuss if this is a good example of the style. On those grounds, the nomination should not succeed. The nomination tries to make the case that Mantle Fielding is a remarkable architect. He was not included in the Kings Views page of architects. He was not a major listed figure in various historic discussions. Mantle Fielding is at most a minor architect. Regarding Criterion H, an aerial view shows that this is not a unique location or on a major avenue. It is simply a building in the fabric. Criterion H should not be applied. The building is part of a major institutional district, with all institutions occupying major buildings on major properties. The most egregious issue is that the historic narrative ends in 1909. This is of concern, because it means that the nominator did not feel it was worth telling the complete narrative. The narrative of Germantown is that beginning in the early twentieth century, Germantown began to change from a small community to one that viewed itself under siege as African Americans moved into the area. In the course of the century since 1909, all of those institutions that served the various groups were split into white groups and black groups.

That was the core essence of this community. The nomination does not tell you that. The other piece is that there is an enormous narrative that can be constructed based on comparable institutions. It is all part of a history that ought to be understood. The core is that there is a bigger narrative that has been omitted and in the process of leaving it out, it does not give the Commission the adequate information to decide whether or not to designate the building.

Mr. Goodman introduced Matt Heckendorn. Mr. Heckendorn stated that there is a wide spectrum of obstacles associated with any rehabilitation or adaptive reuse of this structure. There are combustible materials throughout, the majority of facility is not equipped with sprinklers, and there are issues associated with accessibility and the split-level condition of the building. Ms. Cooperman asked if his testimony will address the merits of the nomination, noting that the adaptive reuse of the building is not before the Commission. Commissioner Thomas commented that the Commission has designated buildings that have suffered fires, or are vacant. The condition of the building is not a criterion for designation, but the earlier testimony regarding history does address the criteria. Many of the issues raised by Mr. Heckendorn are code issues and do not pertain to historic designation. He noted that the Commission has the information from Mr. Heckendorn in its packets, but what he is discussing does not have to do with the merits of the nomination, but rather the bigger issue of designation. Mr. Goodman responded that it is the Commission's duty to consider the impact of the designation, and the point in presenting this testimony is that designation will create a severe impact on this building and also the community. Mr. Heckendorn is trying to describe why the building cannot be reused, which is one argument that the nominators have advanced. Commissioner Thomas responded that it is an appropriate topic for the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that the discussion is sounding like a hardship hearing. He asked everyone to address the Criteria for Designation and the historical significance. Commissioner Thomas commented that the question of condition relates to the general question of designation, but first the Criteria need to be considered. Mr. Goodman responded that condition relates to whether or not designation is in the public interest. Mr. Heckendorn asked if he could discuss issues related to adaptive reuse for club purposes. Commissioner Thomas responded that it has nothing to do with designation. He stated that the Commission needs to first determine if the nomination successfully argues for any of the Criteria for Designation. If it does not succeed, then all other discussion is unnecessary. If the Commission finds that the nomination demonstrates that one or more Criteria are met, then it can consider condition and feasibility for reuse as it decides whether or not to designate.

Mr. Goodman introduced Councilwoman Cindy Bass. Ms. Bass thanked the Commission for having this meeting, but noted that this is a much larger conversation than just about a building. She stated that she sees her role of a Councilperson as a preservationist as well. Not just the preservation of a structure like this, but the preservation of neighborhoods, communities, and the people who live in those neighborhoods. In that role, these kinds of conversations have happened before, but this time there is a level of hostility that has put neighbor against neighbor. It has divided an already-divided Germantown. There are disparities that exist within Germantown. After we hopefully come to an agreement, this is something that we will need to work on, she stated. Ms. Bass described other efforts that her office has undertaken to preserve Germantown, including putting money and resources into the Germantown YWCA, Maplewood Mall, and Town Hall. She stated that she does not want to tear down a structure, but is also convinced that the preservation of a building is only as good and necessary as the people that it serves. Where we cannot realistically save a building and serve the people, her duty as Councilperson is to the people of the district. She commented that she is not in favor of destroying the fabric of Germantown, but the people of Germantown are a part of that fabric. In

some extraordinary cases, a decision must be made that can solve the needs of the people first, and the design of the facility can and will support the community at that location. This argument around historic preservation is new. This is not the first argument around the demolition of this building. In the beginning, there was a concern about the population that would use the facility, and a desire to not have them attend this facility. There was a second argument in terms of locating the facility elsewhere. Finally the last argument that has us here today is about historic designation. Ms. Bass expressed concern that this was a strategy to get an outcome for this particular site. This is a conversation that has evolved from one that was not acceptable to one that could sort of pass. She asked the Commission to see that it is not in the best interest of the total population of Germantown, and asked that it deny the designation.

Mr. Goodman introduced Lisabeth Marziello, CEO of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Philadelphia. Ms. Marziello stated that over 7,100 kids live within a one-half mile radius of this club. Today the structure of the building can only serve 50-75 kids a day owing to the unusable space. Over the years, the needs have changed, and it is very crucial that twenty-first century programming is provided. This building does not do that. There are multiple floors, a fragmented stairwell in the middle of the structure, and it is not conducive to twenty-first century programming. Instead the facility needs a single-story open floor plan. The Penn Knox petition states "Save the Boys and Girls Club." People signed it thinking they were saving the Boys and Girls Club. Yet, by signing that petition, they are not saving the Boys and Girls Club; rather, they are chloroforming the Boys and Girls Club. They are eliminating long-term life-saving programs for the kids in this community. People say that the Boys and Girls Club "saved my life." Those are strong but true words. One of those people is my CEO husband, Joe. It saved his life, and that is why we do the work we do today, because it personally saved by husband's life. The soul of the organization is not the shell of the building. It is the people inside that touch lives and make a difference. This Commission is not making a decision on a building. It is making a decision on thousands of lives today. Ms. Marziello submitted additional letters for the record, and commented that over 50 corporations have sent letters, and 40 members of the House of Representatives. She read from and submitted for the record a recognition of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Pennsylvania from the House of Representatives.

Mr. Goodman introduced the Reverend Alyn Waller, Senior Pastor at Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church. Mr. Waller stated that Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church has been supportive of the Boys and Girls Club since its inception. He asked to speak to context rather than content, choosing to support ministry over museum. The reality is this Commission has already experienced the spirit with which this is being presented. At the beginning of the meeting, there was a ruckus about emptying the room because of the safety of the room. We all know that was foolish. It is that same spirit that is driving this agenda. The reality is there is a split Germantown. There is a white and a black Germantown. If we worked together, we could probably solve our common problem, which is not this Club, nor these children, but is a larger issue that Philadelphia has given up on Germantown. This building needs to be torn down so that an adequate facility can be constructed so the children will have an opportunity. The current building will not allow us to do that in an adequate way, but tearing it down and building a new facility will. Designation as a historical building will make it cost-ineffective to do anything good for the children who are already dealing with difficult realities. Mr. Waller stated that he is speaking on behalf of those who want the building to be torn down to allow for something better, and he is here because of the children and the community and the majority of people in this room are not going to stand by while old racist mentalities seek to stop us from doing what is right for these children. He concluded that he can say that because he is not a politician, but rather a pastor who wants the best for the community.

Mr. Goodman concluded that the reason the testimony focused so much on what the Club does is because it is important to understand that designating this building, while it may save the structure, will imperil the institution. It will jeopardize the opportunity of the Boys and Girls Club to continue to serve the community from this location. That is the real motivation behind this nomination. This nomination was put in place to stop the project and delay the project and designation will further delay the project. There will be more hearings on this if it gets designated. This will not be the last the Commission will hear of this building because designation, while it may serve a small subset of the community, does not provide benefit to the community at large, and it needs to be viewed in that context.

Sue Patterson asked to respond. Ms. Patterson opined that it is the Boys and Girls Club's responsibility that they have let the building decay. She noted that of the current building only occupies approximately 10,000 square feet, leaving approximately 70,000 square feet of land on which to construct a new facility. She also noted that the property is zoned residential, and that, despite the owners' intimation that everything is ready to go, the owners do not have a zoning approval yet. She explained that the zoning approval will involve going to the community, and having the project go through the normal, legal, iterative process that zoning requires. She argued that another elephant in the room is that the community has not been shown any plans of the new structure. She stated that, two years ago, the neighborhood was shown a plan of a building that described the programming of each space, but which was not oriented or include any streets. She argued that that is where many of the questions, including what the orientation of the building and how it fits the site, came from. She stated that the problem now is that the only available rendering of the proposed facility does not accurately depict the surrounding. It does not show any homes existing, says Penn Street is a two-way street, and shows the building extending all the way to Germantown Avenue, across a parcel that the Boys and Girls Club does not own. Mr. Thomas interjected that Ms. Patterson should direct her testimony at the merits of the nomination's claims regarding significance, not the potential development. Ms. Patterson concluded that there have been no plans or meetings with the 10 Registered Community Organizations in two years.

Mr. Thomas responded that he personally understands the larger issues, noting that he grew up in the area and walked to the YMCA, and has very warm feelings for the neighborhood. He provided an example of the designation of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, noting that when the district was nominated, the 1400 block of Spruce Street was excluded because plans for the Kimmel Center were already underway. At that time, he explained, the Historical Commission questioned why it would go through the process of designating the properties just to have the owners apply to demolish them through financial hardship or public interest. He opined that that saved a lot of time. Mr. Thomas explained that there will be time to discuss more of the issues, but that he first wants to address the nomination.

Oscar Beisert, one of the authors of the nomination, displayed a PowerPoint presentation. His first slide included a map showing the evolution of the site, with Germantown Avenue on the right. He noted that Germantown Avenue is one of only two National Historic Landmark historic districts in Philadelphia. The city has a number of National Register Historic Districts, he explained, but only two of them, Germantown Avenue and Elfreth's Alley, are National Historic Landmarks, the highest distinction in historic preservation. Elfreth's Alley is entirely protected. On Germantown Avenue, however, only 76 properties of the larger 500 properties are designated. Mr. Beisert noted that the area is and has been considered of exceptional historic significance since the founding of the National Park Service. He noted that, although this building sits just off the Avenue and is not in the National Landmark District, it would no doubt be considered contributing as well. Last year, he noted, six or seven buildings listed as

contributing to the district were demolished. He asked rhetorically whether that would ever happen on Elfreth's Alley, responding to himself that it would not, because those resources are protected.

Addressing questions regarding the period of significance, Mr. Beisert argued that it is common in the historic preservation world to select a specific period of significance. In this case, he explained, he selected the period of construction and founding of the Club as the period of significance, because he felt that was one of the most significant periods in the building's history. He noted that he is involved in many preservation issues, and objected to the contention that he is doing this with some sort of racial motivation. He asserted that he still feels sick that the church where Marian Anderson learned to sing was demolished for three townhouses. He noted that he submitted a nomination for that church, too late, unfortunately, but that he also submitted a nomination with the minority parishioners for First African Baptist, and the church was saved and is being repurposed. He noted that First African Baptist was able to sell the building and to move on. He stated that he picked this boundary and period of significance in part because he heard that the pool was in terrible condition. He noted that the State Historic Preservation Officer recently issued a ruling that the area within the red boundary in the displayed image could be listed on the National Register because of its exceptional significance for social history. Mr. Beisert stated that he intentionally picked the period of 1898 to 1909 so that it covered just a portion of the site so that there would be fewer restrictions, because he does not want to block any development from happening on the site. He stated that he would be happy to sign a petition saying that the Germantown Boys and Girls Club deserves a new facility; of course they do; he argued, however, that there is plenty of room on this site for both the historic building and a new one. He opined that there are many other already vacant lots in Germantown where a new facility could be located. He suggested that, if the Boys and Girls Club wanted to construct a new facility to serve the kids in Germantown, they should have done a study to show where the kids live, and pick a site that is central to those children. He opined that, if an organization is spending \$20 million, it should undertake basic planning and have multiple meetings with the community. That has not happened, he stated. He expressed frustration that the Boys and Girls Club has only had one meeting with the community, and now are calling the community members racists. Mr. Fiol-Silva interjected. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that the issue is so fraught with concerns on both sides and recommended that both sides not get into the plethora of complex issues at this meeting. He opined that the Historical Commission is charged with reviewing the nomination based on the Criteria laid out in the nomination, and that it is not appropriate to consider the other issues. He stated that this is not a financial hardship hearing, and that condition is not relevant at this point in the discussion. Mr. Beisert answered that he is responding to claims that were made that he feels are untrue. Mr. Thomas replied that the Commission is not here to discuss zoning or other issues, and that there are other more appropriate venues for those debates.

Mr. Beisert returned to his PowerPoint presentation. He reiterated that the boundary and the period of significance are solely for the portion of the building as completed in 1909. He noted that, of course, the nomination could be amended to include many other aspects of the building's significance, but reiterated that this period was selected specifically. He argued that the building's position on the property is ideal because it is at the corner of the lot, not in the middle, where it would completely impede upon the redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Beisert displayed a drawing that he said he saw early on that, for himself as a preservationist and resident of Germantown, seemed like a great compromise if the new building has to be on this site.

Mr. Beisert asked to briefly discuss the Colonial Revival style. He noted that he went to the State Historic Preservation Office's website on that style and picked out features that they say demonstrate Colonial Revival. He displayed photographs from that website, noting that there are many similarities between the characteristic style and the Boys and Girls Club building. He stated that the contention that this building somehow does not satisfy the Colonial Revival is absurd.

Regarding architect Mantel Fielding, Mr. Beisert quoted Ms. Cooperman's comment at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting that, "if one were to erase all of Fielding's buildings from the northwest section of the city, one would understand his impact on this portion of the city." He clarified that that meant that if one erased everything that Fielding designed, Germantown would not look the way that it does. Mr. Beisert quipped that perhaps the reason that Dr. Thomas does not like Mantel Fielding is because Fielding was a preservationist. Mr. Beisert noted that one of the extremely progressive things that Fielding did as an architect was convert the barn at Wyck into his residence. He changed it, but did not demolish it.

Mr. Beisert reiterated that the intent of this nomination is not to cripple the Boys and Girls Club. He stated that he would not be involved with the nomination if it was, as he is not opposed to development. He noted that he has withdrawn nominations for developers when they came to an agreement about keeping the historic building. He explained that he does not want to see Philadelphia erased. Germantown is filled with institutions. If the School for the Deaf decides it does not want to be in a building from the 1700s, would the Academy be demolished? If the Friends School decides it does not want its original buildings, would those buildings be lost? The original campus for the School of the Deaf on Broad Street, Mr. Beisert noted, has been reused by another institution, and now the school is reusing the Germantown Academy. Mr. Beisert noted that, while some historic fabric on that campus was lost, many of the buildings were retained and restored alongside new construction. Mr. Beisert argued that the reuse of the Germantown Boys and Girls Club building does not need to be a white-glove restoration and that they could gut the whole building if they wanted to. He asserted that Philadelphia has always been a city of reusing things; that at the root of almost any institution in the city is an eighteenth-century house, or a nineteenth-century building, or something that is emblematic of the architectural history of Philadelphia. It is a pride is shown in the built environment.

On his next slide, Mr. Beisert displayed a letter from Ken Weinstein, a local developer who is also involved in social justice. He noted that Mr. Weinstein supports the designation and thinks that the building could be renovated for the Boys and Girls Club, or put to a new use if the Boys and Girls Club did not want to reuse the building.

Addressing Criterion J, Mr. Beisert explained that the historical significance of the building is probably the most important aspect of the building. He noted that additional witnesses would testify to that. He explained that the building has been used to serve youth from its inception, and likened it to Mayor Kenney's recent efforts to restore and reuse many community recreation centers around the city. He noted that the creation of the Boys Club was a similar to modern youth centers, as it was established to provide boys a place to go outside of their usual setting and to have games and activities. He noted that contributions from members of the community over time enabled the construction of this facility. Mr. Beisert presented a photograph of Grace Kelly's father with other boys at the club, noting that Kelly was the son of immigrants who came here and prospered. He concluded that this is a hugely significant building, and that that is laid out in the nomination. He stated that everyone knows the significance of this club, and expressed distaste for needing to reiterate that over and over again.

James Duffin, a researcher for the nomination, stated that he speaks as someone who has worked with Germantown history and understands and enjoys it, and can never seem to get away from it. He reminisced that, as a teenager, he would go to the Germantown Historical Society by riding the 23 Trolley, back when trolleys ran on Germantown Avenue. He noted that the most salient point of the nomination, and which the additional material the Commission received draws out a little more, is that the building represents an important moment not only in the history of Germantown but in Philadelphia and the nation. As the supplemental materials state, the Germantown Boys Club is one of the oldest non-sectarian Boys Clubs in the nation, and the oldest for Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, and the oldest surviving building. The Boys Club came about in a period of phenomenal growth in Germantown in which the neighborhood grew by 107% between 1890 and 1910, while the population of Philadelphia only grew by 48%. The response to the immense boom in population put strain on the social services and materials that were available to youth in Germantown. There were no public playgrounds in Philadelphia until the mid-1890s, Mr. Duffin explained. The playground movement started out as a volunteer civic organization, not something undertaken by the City. The first playgrounds were in Center City. The first playground to come to Germantown was what is now called the Waterview Recreation Center, which opened around 1906. The Philadelphia public schools ran playgrounds in summers beginning around the 1895, but in the first years, none of those playgrounds were in Germantown, they were all in other parts of the city. This created a huge need for what was called at the time the “street boy population,” which periodicals renamed “underprivileged youth” in the 1920s. These children needed some sort of place to have structured activity and play. Germantown Boys Club was founded to deal with that need, and its growth was quite phenomenal. Mr. Duffin opined that it is important to put that growth into perspective, especially in relation to comments in Dr. Thomas’s report that were misleading about other Germantown institutions. He noted that the Germantown Boys Club had five different homes during its first 10 years before it built this building in 1898. The first location was a room above a store, then it was in the back of a market house, and the last three locations were cobbled together in houses. The Germantown Y, which Mr. Duffin noted that Dr. Thomas wrongly claimed started out in a purpose-built building, actually started out small, like the Boys Club, in rented rooms on Germantown Avenue below Queen Lane. In 1872, it purchased a hand-me-down building on Price Street, and it took 20 years to build its own building. The YWCA started out in a rented building at 5225 Germantown Avenue, which was demolished only three years later and they had to move to another house on Market Square. It was not until 1915 that it had its own purpose-built building. Mr. Duffin noted that, looking at these buildings’ organizational history in relation to the Boys Club, one can see how special the Boys Club was from the beginning, because it was able to build and pay for its own building just 10 years after it was founded. Mr. Duffin noted that the material he sent the Commission also demonstrates that, by 1909, the Germantown Boys Club was considered a leader in the Boys Club movement in Philadelphia, and in America more broadly; had one of the largest memberships of Boys Clubs in America; and was part of a movement that was just beginning to deal with the problem of youth and to help them during hours when their parents were working. Mr. Duffin noted that one other misleading statement by Dr. Thomas was that the Wissahickon Boys Club, the boys club founded for African American boys, was able to start out in a purpose-built building on W. Coulter Street. Mr. Duffin clarified that the building was actually built in 1885 as a free daycare for children in Pulaskitown, who were primarily Quakers, and it was turned over to the Wissahickon Boys Club sometime around 1905. In addition to serving the community of underprivileged white boys, the Boys Club also provided a space for the community in off-hours when the Boys Club was not in operation. From its inception, two organizations utilized the space in addition to the Boys Club; one was a women’s sewing club that provided sewing for poor people in Germantown, and the other was the African American Union Mission. The Union Mission continued to use this space fairly actively until 1920. In addition, the Boys Club space

was used for other events and by other groups. In 1915, the *Chicago Defender* reported that well-known suffragist and poet Alice Dunbar Nelson spoke at the Germantown Boys Club about women's suffrage and the inclusion of African Americans in that suffrage on a tour she made across Pennsylvania. Mr. Duffin opined that the material that has been presented makes a fairly clear case that this was a significant organization both in Philadelphia and nationally during the period of significance presented. He noted that more could have been said on the significance, but because the period of significance was restricted to 1909 to help the Boys and Girls Club have more freedom in how they use the property, the presentation focused on the history up until that time period. Mr. Duffin also noted two points about Mantel Fielding. First, his conversion of the barn at Wyck was nationally publicized. Secondly, his absence from *King's Views* of architects does not mean much because architects had to pay a fee to be included in the publication; inclusion in *King's* meant that you paid, not that you were important. He noted that he read diary entries of a Germantown banker who was approached by King and originally refused to pay to be put in the book, but eventually conceded and had his house published in the book. Mr. Duffin concluded that it is important to remember that publications such as those cannot be used as the sole source of determining whether someone was prominent.

Aaron Wunsch, professor of historic preservation at the University of Pennsylvania, asserted that he has been involved in a fair number of preservation cases over the years in Philadelphia, and is struck by one thing in this case: never before has he seen an institution so steadfastly opposed to sitting down with its neighbors to talk. He opined that what has happened instead is ugly and unnecessary. It involves pulling every political string and the slinging of every ounce of available mud. He stated that the consistent suggestion that the nominators have ulterior racist motives is offensive. It is offensive to Councilwoman Bass's constituents, black and white. Penn Knox neighbors, Germantowners, and Philadelphians deserve better. There is no question that 23 W. Penn Street is historically significant. There is no question that the Boys and Girls Club has outgrown it. The question is, can everyone have a civilized and open discussion about what comes next. Designation, he argued, is the starting point of that conversation.

Ms. Patterson introduced Justin Spivey, a structural engineer that Penn Knox hired to review the Boys and Girls Club's engineer's report. Ms. Patterson noted that her organization offered Mr. Spivey's services to the Boys and Girls Club, as historic structures are his specialty. Mr. Thomas asked which Criteria for Designation Mr. Spivey would be addressing. Mr. Beisert responded that Mr. Spivey would be addressing condition. Mr. Thomas responded that condition is not relevant at this point in the discussion. Mr. Beisert quipped that it is on the nomination form; the nominators are claiming that it is in fair condition, but the owners are claiming it is in poor condition. Mr. Goodman objected, noting that the Boys and Girls Club was not permitted to provide testimony to the condition. Mr. Thomas responded that, while an assessment of condition is indicated on the nomination form, the Commission's job at the moment is to consider which Criteria for Designation the nomination demonstrates that the property meets. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that, in a matter of fairness, the Commission should give Mr. Spivey a few minutes. Mr. Mattioni disagreed, noting that the Commission was on Step One in a multi-step process. Others noted that the chair did not allow Mr. Heckendorn to address the building's condition on behalf of the owner. Ms. Patterson asked if the Commission would prefer to hear from the neighbors at this point. Mr. Thomas responded affirmatively, noting that the neighbors should present new information only, as it relates to the merits of the nomination. Mr. Spivey interjected, asking to briefly explain his role. He referred to a letter he submitted to the Commission, noting that he was retained to read the Civic Visions report prepared by Dr. Thomas and the Heckendorn Shiles report as well, and to explain to the Penn Knox Neighborhood Association whether there was anything in those two documents that impacted the eligibility of the property to the Philadelphia Register. Mr. Spivey explained that he does not

believe that there is any argument against designation, because condition is not a necessary factor in designation.

Ms. Patterson referred the Commission to the list of Registered Community Organizations present, and asked Allison Weiss, Pam Bracey, Eleanor Alter, Joe McCarthy, Ted Stone, and Yvonne Haskins to address the Commission. Mr. Thomas noted that it is important to know whether they are in favor of designation. Ms. Patterson responded that they are. Mr. Thomas asked why they are in favor. Ms. Patterson responded that they are in favor of it for the building's historical significance to the neighborhood.

Pamela Bracey, a member of SOLO Germantown neighborhood association, noted that she believes the Commission has a copy of SOLO's letter. She explained that her only additional comment is that she feels as though Germantown is losing the fabric of its historic buildings, and she would like to see that addressed. She noted that she does not want to lose any more buildings to teardowns, but is not going to get into all of the other ugliness. She commented that visitors do come to Germantown, even though the Visitor's Center does not always send people there. Visitors want to come see Germantown's unique architecture, locate the buildings they have seen in written history, and discover some of the people about whom they have read stories.

Allison Weiss, also of SOLO Germantown, added that the Germantown Boys and Girls Club building reflects and contributes to the historic nature of the community, which dates back to 1683. The building is a half-block walk to the Germantown Avenue Historic District. The building has been a fixture of the neighborhood since 1898. Many buildings in Germantown have succumbed to age, neglect, ignorance of their importance, or lack of historic designation. She opined that if people do not recognize and protect the history of Germantown, it will be lost, and with it, the city's identity. The building deserves the recognition and protection provided by listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Yvonne Haskins, an attorney, commented that her family owns property in Pulaskitown. This building is an icon for the neighborhood, she said. Her grandson was born in a building only half a mile away, and she wants him to see this building. She stated that she is appalled that Germantown is being described as a divided community, because she believes that everyone in Germantown treasures its history. That is the greatest asset, and something that Germantowners are beginning to understand. On a personal note, she added that the Wissahickon Boys Club, which dates almost as far back as the Germantown Boys Club, also should be preserved. Her husband worked as a young man in the 1950s at the Wissahickon Boys Club, and she has heard many stories about people who came through the Wissahickon Boys Club, so she knows what happened to the boys who came through the Germantown Boys Club. She noted that she has been reading about Pulaskitown, and would like to share one piece she read, and that is that at the beginning of the twentieth century, when there was a huge population growth in Germantown, Pulaskitown was socially integrated. She described the recent effort to save the old Germantown YWCA, a building that was also on the chopping block. She noted that during that process, she learned the history of the white women in the 1940s who invited the black women from the nearby black YWCA to come swim in their pool with them, an act that was unheard of at that time elsewhere. She concluded that she has owned property in Germantown for 30 years, and is proud of the people and neighbors and history, and intends to do even better in preserving the history of the neighborhood.

Joe McCarthy, representing a nearby RCO to Penn Knox, noted that he is directly affected by nomination. He stated his support for designation, and perceives the building as an asset to the

club, not a liability. He commented that the Boys and Girls Club teaches good sportsmanship, and this building will also allow them to teach good stewardship, that this is how we live in Germantown. This is how we live in a historic building. Mr. McCarthy opined that the building itself could be a teaching tool.

Emily Dooley of Germantown United CDC noted that the Commission has on record the letter supplied by the Board of Directors. She is the Commercial Corridor manager for the organization, and a resident of Germantown. Germantown United's mission is to support and facilitate the revitalization of Germantown's business corridors through a sustainable, creative and community-driven approach to economic development. As stated in the letter, Germantown United CDC supports the nomination. Ms. Dooley explains that she understands that this project could provide a significant economic improvement in Germantown, and welcomes both the preservation of the building and the proposed services for the betterment of the community. She expressed hope that, moving forward, there can be collaboration between the owner, community organizations and other stakeholders to promote a community-endorsed project.

Ted Stone, a resident of Wister Woods in Germantown, a block captain, 12th Ward Committeeperson, and member of the Playground Advisory Council, noted that he will do whatever else he can do to make community a better place. Mr. Stone asked to speak to the significance of the building to the community. Mr. Stone noted that, in the late 1980s, he coached basketball teams for the community out of the club. Yes, they had to climb steps and yes, the overhead was low, but that gave him the opportunity to work on the ground skills instead of the three-pointers. There is good and bad in everything, he explained. Twenty years or more later, the kids he coached still call him "coach" and they still remember their experiences at the building, which represents camaraderie in the community. For people who walk by and who have participated in events at the club, the building is a symbol. A symbol represents two things: ownership and direction. When someone can relate to a building and think, "I was there, I was part of it," that builds a camaraderie and sense of ownership in the community and strengthens the community, Mr. Stone explained. The building also serves to provide direction for the children. Whenever a child walks by it or sees it, it reminds that child of his or her commitment to the community, to the rules and regulations she learned when she was playing sports at the club. Mr. Stone commented that, when one teaches sports, one does not just teach how to shoot, one teaches kids civics and how to work with each other. This building is a symbol of that civic pride in the community, a symbol of accomplishment, a symbol to remember, "my team won the championship that year." When Germantowners refer to their accomplishments together, Germantown Boys and Girls Club always stands out, Mr. Stone explained. Now some of those young men are coaching teams, and when they pass this building, it reinforces the camaraderie and love that everyone had together in the community. Mr. Stone opined that the significance of this building, even if it was just left there and nothing else happens to it, is that it still plays a major role in the community. He opined that there are better ways of handling this situation and noted that he does not understand the racial divide that is being spoken about. He joked that the introduction of a hockey rink in Germantown is the real integration. There is no such thing as hockey in the black community. Mr. Stone thanked the Boys and Girls Club, Penn Knox neighbors, and the Commission, noting that he speaks for the child, the small folks on the street.

Mr. Goodman objected to the pro-designation community member comments, noting that club provided a number of letters of support for their position as well. He stated that the Germantown Boys and Girls Club could have people come up and reiterate what those letters said, but chose not to do that; he offered to do so if things continue this way. He opined that none of the comments being made are relevant to the actual nomination. None of the commentators are

addressing the merits of the nomination with regard to the historical significance as defined in the nomination. Mr. Thomas responded that he had asked about significance, and is hearing that from the members of the community. Mr. Goodman stated that the Germantown Boys and Girls Club would like an opportunity to speak to that sort of significance as well. He pointed out that none of the recent speakers addressed the Criteria in any way. Mr. Thomas responded that he asked people not to speak to the condition, so he would try to keep the discussion to the Criteria.

Eleanor Alter, a member of the Penn Area Neighborhood Association, stated her support for keeping the building intact. She noted that she likes old buildings and has lived in 1860s Victorian house for 49 years. She stated that she would be sad to see anything of historic significance disappear. She stated that Penn Area supports keeping the building intact.

An unidentified woman spoke in support of designating Germantown Boys and Girls Club as historic and in support of keeping the building in the neighborhood. She opined that perhaps the building could be modernized and made accessible, but the structure itself fits in the neighborhood. She noted that the block, and also across both sides of Germantown Avenue, contains incredible historic buildings. She noted that she used to live across the street on the east side of Penn Street, where she restored three houses, two of which are historic and were not in wonderful condition. Mr. Thomas interjected and asked her to please focus her comments to the nomination. She reminisced about going to the Germantown Boys and Girls Club as a child in the 1940s with her older sister. She mused that there was also a dentist there, and that she did enjoy that, but that the building was used for other purposes. Mr. Thomas attempted to summarize her thoughts, clarifying that she appreciates the historic architecture of this building in particular. She agreed, noting that she is not opposed to a new building, and would actually like to see it built in her own part of the neighborhood, which is the Tulpehocken Station neighborhood. She noted that she lives on the street where the Wyck barn was converted into a home. She concluded that Germantown is so blessed with older structures and should not be so eager to tear them down.

Tina Leikoff, a 25-year resident of W. Coulter Street, stated that anyone familiar with the Germantown Boys and Girls Club knows that the building and field are a strong visual feature and landmark. She opined that the building plays an important role in establishing the historic context of the neighborhood for its many social and physical roles it plays in the community. She noted that an important part of civic engagement in Philadelphia is that this process and every other zoning process is a public process, and the people that own property surrounding a parcel and who look at it every day are the ones who have standing. She explained that she worked for the National Park Service for 20 years, and the Park Service trains people to look at buildings and understand their importance. She noted that, owing to its presence as a strong visual feature, plus the social and cultural significance of the building and the green field, she supports the designation. She noted that she and her husband submitted a letter of support. She opined that the green field is critical, because from her house she is able to see kids enter the building, pour out into the field, and return to the building for other projects. The building is open. She reiterated her support for the public process, and suggested that the new program of attracting 7,000 people would really overwhelm the one-way street. Mr. Thomas interjected that the Commission understands issues of traffic, but that that is not germane to the nomination. Mr. Farnham clarified that the green fields are not included within the proposed boundary for designation; only 23, not 25, W. Penn Street is proposed for designation.

Ms. Patterson asked all the neighbors in support of the nomination to stand and be recognized. She asked if anyone else has something to add.

Connie Winters, a Germantown resident, stated that she has a background in city planning, and runs a company called Historic Germantown Properties, which operates historic properties in Germantown, two of which were tax credit projects. She stated that she hired George Thomas to write the National Register nominations for those properties, and wanted to state that the two buildings she owns are not nearly as significant to the neighborhood as the Germantown Boys and Girls Club. She read her written comments regarding context.

Mr. Thomas opined that the Criteria for Designation should be presented so that the members of the public could see them and understand them. Ms. Turner clarified that the staff presentation currently had the Criteria on display. Mr. Thomas read the Criteria for which the building was nominated, and noted that those are the Criteria by which the Commission is evaluating the nomination.

Ms. Winters continued, noting that she hoped that anyone who thought about voting against designation would have taken the time to walk through the Penn Knox historic district. She opined that walking through the neighborhood would make it clear why there is an outcry for the future plans for this site, and the lack of involvement with the community in the planning process. She argued that the Penn Knox neighborhood is a well-maintained neighborhood of houses that contribute to the City's tax base. The 20 homes on the south side of Penn Street contribute a total of \$38,000 in real estate to the City coffers. A significant number of residents are new to the neighborhood, and bought there in part because of the quiet, historic ambiance. She stated that 53% of the tax base in Germantown is tax-exempt. Mr. Thomas interjected that Ms. Winters should stick to the Criteria for Designation. Ms. Winters continued that Penn Knox is a walkable community and asserted that a historic built environment is central to both community and place. This particular building is a community landmark and a placeholder on a quiet street.

Mr. Gupta asked the chair for an opportunity for the Commissioners to discuss the matter before proceeding with additional testimony. Commissioner Thomas responded that that would be a good idea. Mr. Goodman asked for clarification before the Commission took a break. Mr. Goodman noted that much of the testimony just heard was not related to the nomination. With respect to people who support the nomination, he noted that the Germantown Boys and Girls Club also submitted hundreds of letters from people who are opposed to the nomination. He noted that, in courtesy to the Commission, the Germantown Boys and Girls Club did not ask all of its supporters to attend the meeting and reiterate what they wrote in their letters. Ms. Marziello commented that much of the testimony heard today described a love for the Germantown Boys and Girls Club, but that love, she suggested, is for the people who comprise the institution, not the building. The building did not change people's lives; people changed people's lives. She noted that she was advised not to share something, but stated that she will not be silenced. She claimed that the staff of the Germantown Boys and Girls Club has been harassed, has suffered from racial slurs, and the office has been telephoned with the caller saying "rat rat rat rat rat." The African American staff has been abused and is asking the management what the Germantown Boys and Girls Club can do to keep them safe. Ms. Marziello claimed that people in the room today have committed these abuses. She reiterated that she had not wanted to bring up this issue, but felt compelled to because she heard people say that there were no racial dimensions to this issue. She also commented that Ken Weinstein, who some claimed is in favor of designation, had walked through the building and embraced the Germantown Boys and Girls Club's initiative. She noted that he owns a significant amount of the neighboring land and offered to buy the building, but she rejected his offer, saying that it is not for sale and never will be. She noted that she never heard from him again. She opined that this

is not about the preservation of this building; it is in the 11th hour that people are calling it historic. She noted that donations keep the Germantown Boys and Girls Club going, and opined that none of the neighborhood people who support designation have donated to the organization. Some in the audience objected to her claims.

Mr. Gupta commented that, in his opinion, the building does meet enough Criteria for Designation. He noted that, if he had to vote for it, he would, but the Commission has a level of discretion; just because a building meets Criteria does not mean that the Commission necessarily designates it. Mr. Gupta opined that there is such a level of inflamed passion on both sides of the issue, and he understands that; he has redeveloped historic buildings in Northwest Philadelphia on Germantown Avenue and has ruled out others, like Germantown Town Hall, because it was simply too difficult. He noted that his son goes to the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, which is a wonderful example of what is possible in the spirit of compromise. The campus has beautiful, well-maintained historic buildings, right behind which is a beautiful, modern facility. Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, he noted, had the land to maintain and create new facilities. Mr. Gupta addressed a question to Councilwoman Bass. He noted that he understands she has the very difficult position of weeding through thorny community issues, and that, at the end of the day, sometimes she has to take a position and that she has presented her position here today. He noted that, objectively, there seems like there is room for a compromise, and he would hesitate to vote for the designation until he felt like there was a collaborative discussion between the stakeholders, the community groups, the Germantown Boys and Girls Club, near neighbors, etc. He opined that those groups should meet, discuss, and seek a compromise in good faith. Mr. Gupta asked Ms. Bass if she felt there was any room for compromise. Mr. Fiol-Silva interjected, stating that he used to work for a Mayor and Council and that he knows that it is difficult to put a Councilperson on the spot. He joked that he is the new kid on the block at the Commission, and he thinks the Councilwoman should have some time to let the question sink in. He noted that he came to the same thought as Mr. Gupta in a different way entirely. He went through the Criteria. He opined that the building does not have national significance. Ms. Cooperman responded that Criterion A also says that a building can be significant at the city-level. Mr. Fiol-Silva continued that he does not think that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of a style and that it is a shame that the architect does not rate. He opined that the design of the building is not that unique or significant, but to him what is very powerful is hearing how significant the Boys Club is to the history of the organization and how significant the building is to the people who used it and are familiar with it. He opined that the discussion today is a proxy war for many other issues, but that this building clearly is a symbol for ownership and direction and that this building teaches civics and how to work together. "The history of this place is building community in place." If this building is demolished and new building built, or if the existing building stays and the new facility is constructed elsewhere, it totally destroys what this building is about, which is creating community. He opined that demolition would be a "lose-lose" situation for everyone. If there is not a compromise, everyone loses. He opined that the Commission should not put anyone on the spot and should give everyone time to let things sink in. He opined that this is something that would benefit from being taken up at the next Commission meeting. Mr. Gupta responded that he was not trying to put the Councilwoman on the spot, but noted that she is in the position of being in the middle of a variety of community interests, and that is why he posed the question to her, and to others. He asked, "Do people think that there is still the opportunity for discussion?" He noted that, although he dislikes kicking the can, but argued that, if there is room for discussion and compromise, he would recommend tabling the discussion. Mr. Fiol-Silva reiterated that the building clearly exemplifies the cultural heritage of the community in the city, and questioned whether the Commission should vote. Mr. Mattioni responded that there is another possibility. He noted that the Commission does not usually consider nominations a two-

step process, it usually conflates the two steps, but today, from the presentations the Commission has heard, conflating the two steps would be a grievous error. He noted that the first step would be determining whether the nomination has established that the property meets at least one of the Criteria for Designation, and then the second step of the process would be whether the Commission, in the exercise of its discretion, believes that the building should be designated. He noted that the Commission could take Step One and withhold Step Two, or could simply table the entire review. He agreed with the observations of Mr. Gupta and Mr. Fiol-Silva, and noted that this is the first time in his nine years as a Commissioner that he has ever seen so many people so dedicated on all sides. He opined that the Commission should do something to let the interested parties “bury the hatchet in something other than each other.” He addressed the audience, noting that, if everyone is sincere in the belief that they want to do something that is right for the community, they should take a good step back, and do just that. Right now, the heated opposition to one another will never achieve that level of success, he concluded.

Councilwoman Bass commented that she is always on the hot seat, and that that comes with the territory. She noted that, although someone said the community is not divided, that is clearly not true, as the tension is palpable in the room. She explained that she hears from both sides and talks to everyone to make an informed decision. She noted that she had told someone in support of the designation the night before that she was disappointed that they could not come to a compromise, and that person said: “Oh, we can compromise. They can build it on another site.” Ms. Bass opined that she does not see building the new facility on a different site as a compromise. She noted that there needs to be an honest conversation about this particular site. She opined that the Germantown Boys and Girls Club has offered some compromise in that they reduced the footprint of what they originally proposed. She stated that, if there needs to be additional conversation to make sure that people get information, then they should get it. The idea that the compromise or the process of working together is: “Take your project somewhere else” is completely unreasonable, given that the Boys and Girls Club owns the property. Mr. Gupta inquired whether there might be a compromise whereby the Germantown Boys and Girls Club is able to stay on the site because they have been there for so long, in the heart of Germantown and construct a state of the art facility while maintaining the historic building as part of the campus. Ms. Bass responded that she believed that, if that was possible within a reasonable expense, the Boys and Girls Club select that option. However, it appears that it is not possible. She opined that no one is interested in division and hostility among neighbors. She opined that, if it was possible to retain the existing building and still build the new facility, the option would already be on the table, but the reality of the situation calls for something different.

Ms. Patterson interjected that she reached out to what she called the Design Advocacy Guild and that they have agreed to do just this sort of mediation.

Commissioner Thomas stated that it seems to him that there is a tremendous amount of pride in Germantown in general and in this building, as well as in the Germantown Boys and Girls Club itself. As an architect and someone who has done community development work in all parts of Philadelphia, he noted that he has encountered many instances where there is a building that does not work or is falling apart, and his firm has managed to combine that building with new construction to create something feasible. He provided an example of a fire station in Chestnut Hill where the historic building does not work because fire trucks in 2017 do not fit in the 1898 doors. The initial feeling, he noted, was that the whole building needed to be knocked down, but they worked out a compromise where the historic building is being kept and repurposed, and on adjacent land, there will be a new, sensitively-designed, one-story addition to accommodate modern equipment. He noted that that case was driven by a life-safety issue, where every

second counts, so the station needed to stay at their centralized location. He explained that, from his own experience looking at this site, it would seem to him that a design could be accomplished on the space being shown that would protect the cultural resource and enhance it. He reminisced that, as a child in the Philadelphia school system, he would always wonder, why do all the rich kids go to school in historic buildings? Why is William Penn Charter or this academy or that in an old building? He noted that his feeling as a child growing up in a small Philadelphia row house: "Gee, we kind of get left out in terms of having things that we can really appreciate." He noted that, if the Commission were to say that the building meets the Criteria, but not take the designation step yet, then that would allow for a process to examine whether there a design that could be worked out that could accommodate all the pride that people feel in the existing building but also get a twenty-first century facility. He noted that there is not time to create a design today at this meeting, but that if everyone is comfortable that the building meets at least one of the Criteria, the Commission could wait to designate the property until that community process has occurred. Mr. Thomas opined that there is no rush. Mr. Goodman responded that there is a rush, and that they have already looked at ways to retain the building. He noted that he called a witness to speak to that issue, but the witness was prevented from providing any testimony. Mr. Goodman opined that the cost to retain the existing building is exorbitant. Commissioner Thomas responded that his personal belief is that the Commission could evaluate whether the building meets any of the Criteria, and then work with the owners to look at the public purpose and help the owners forge a solution that benefits everyone. He noted that the Commissioners could contribute many ideas.

Joseph Marziello of the Germantown Boys and Girls Club agreed that the community needs to work together, but stated that as long as the power exists outside of the community to influence it, the community would not work together. He argued that the Commission should shut the nomination down today and say that it is not their business, but is the business of the community. He opined that if the Commission kicks the can, everyone will be back next month, and the community will not have worked together. He asserted that there are many people who want to work together, but have not because everyone keeps running outside of the community to commissions such as this one and to zoning. He opined that, as long as both sides think there is the opportunity to influence the Commission, they will not have sincere conversations with one another. He reiterated that the Commission should shut it down today. He opined that everyone needs to be honest about the truth of the goodness of the community, but also the history of the ugliness of racism and present reality of it. He opined that, as long as the Commission is in the picture, the minority of bad people in the community will manipulate the system, and there will not be a positive outcome. He asked that the Commission vote against designation and send the project back to the community so that the stakeholders can work together and with their Councilperson. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission has the responsibility to take some sort of action, and that what the Commission might be looking at is taking some sort of a vote on the merits of the nomination, but not the designation. He noted that the Commission can table the nomination and allow the community time to work towards a compromise. Mr. Fiol-Silva and a woman from the community spoke at the same time. Mr. Goodman asked that, if the Commission planned to table the review, it table both parts, and give the community and the Germantown Boys and Girls Club the opportunity to speak together.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the nomination should not be continued indefinitely. Mr. Goodman agreed. Commissioner Thomas noted that the Commission would like not to simply continue the review, but to have some sort of solution or consensus. Mr. Gupta recommended a 60-day continuance for the designation, but noted that he does not know if there is any disagreement over the merits of the nomination. Commissioner Thomas noted that, if the Commission was going to table the nomination entirely, then they could address that question at

the later date. Mr. Thomas noted that if they were going to get everyone's opinion, then essentially they are taking a vote on the nomination. Mr. Marziello spoke from the audience, arguing that, if the nomination was tabled, then they could lose their funding. He asserted that the organization is teetering and could end up being shut down. Ms. Turner responded that if the nomination is tabled, she would recommend 30 days, not 60 days. Mr. Goodman agreed.

Mr. Fiol-Silva inquired about the impact of whether the building is designated today or in 30 days, noting that the applicants could come right back with their arguments for why the building's reuse is infeasible as part of a financial hardship review. Commissioner Thomas and Ms. Cooperman clarified that there is a separate financial hardship process that requires review by a different advisory Committee before being presented to the Commission. Mr. Fiol-Silva noted that, sooner or later, there will be a reckoning as to whether the Germantown Boys and Girls Club can live with this building or not. He reiterated his opinion that the organization work with the community to create a "win-win" situation. Mr. Goodman noted that, in addition to the financial hardship process, the Commission is permitted to allow demolition when it is necessary in the public interest. Mr. Beisert shouted from the audience that that is not a compromise.

Ms. Cooperman noted that she does not know how the Commission can continue to encourage the parties to speak to and work with one another if the Commission declines to designate and relinquishes jurisdiction over the property. Commissioner Thomas noted that if the Commission tables the designation, then it would remain under the Commission's jurisdiction.

An unidentified member of the audience asked who would facilitate the various parties working together.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports the nomination and the designation of the building. He acknowledged that most of the reasons for the Alliance's support of the nomination have already been stated by other members of the public. He noted that the issues surrounding the building go well beyond architecture and serving children, and well beyond the purview of the Historical Commission. However, he noted, there is an organization within the City designed to deal with this kind of tension. He suggested that Commission table the nomination and allow the Germantown Boys and Girls Club and other stakeholders consult with the City's Human Relations Commission. He noted that the Human Relations Commission might decide that it does not want to hear the case, but it also might indicate that they need a certain period of time, and Mr. Steinke suggested that the Historical Commission grant a continuance for whatever period of time was necessary to work through that process. He noted that he had worked with the Human Relations Commission recently over charges of racism in the LGBT community. He noted that the Human Relations Commission has been able to simmer tensions considerably in that community and to put in place measures to resolve those tensions. Mr. Thomas responded that he appreciates Mr. Steinke's recommendation to the community, but clarified that it falls outside of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction to make a recommendation that such a process be undertaken.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Commission could continue the nomination for a certain period of time, but if it seemed like progress was being made but more time was needed, an additional continuance request could be granted.

MOTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination to the June 2017 Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion.

Mr. Farnham suggested that it seems that this issue may warrant a special meeting, which the Historical Commission has the authority to call. He noted that it would be a public meeting in which the property owner, public, and Commissioners would participate in the same way, but that would allow the Commission to free up this complex issue from the many prosaic issues that the Commission faces every month and would also allow the Commission to find a room that can adequately house everyone. Ms. Cooperman asked how that would happen. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission continue the review to the next Commission meeting or to a special meeting to be held within a certain time period.

Mr. Gupta added that Mr. Steinke's thoughts were insightful, and recommended having an objective technical person or organization, the Planning Commission or the Community Design Collaborative, for example, involved in that discussion. Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that the issue of adaptive reuse and expansion is complex. Councilwoman Bass added that her office stands ready to convene the appropriate parties to discuss the issue. She noted that it needs to be a small but organized group with equal representation on both sides. She opined that it would be preferable for them to be able to hammer things out at the community level rather than having to return to the Historical Commission and waste everyone's time.

Ms. Patterson asked the Commission to recognize what she called the Design Advocacy Guild representative in the room. Kiki Bolender clarified that Ms. Patterson sent her materials, which she reviewed, but that the Design Advocacy Group has not agreed to support any group in this fight. She noted that Design Advocacy Group is a group of architects, preservationists, and planners. She opined that the citywide voice has been shut out of the conversation because of the heightened passions. Ms. Bolender noted that the Design Advocacy Group has submitted written testimony and inquired whether the Commission thought that was sufficient, or whether she should speak to its content, or whether that would inflame passions, in which case she would not speak. Ms. Cooperman responded that a third-party analysis would be helpful since there are obviously such intense feelings by parties closely involved. Ms. Haskins asked for an assurance from the Germantown Boys and Girls Club that they will provide the community supporters of the designation with the information they have been seeking, namely the report that indicates that it is not possible to reuse the building. Ms. Cooperman responded that it is beyond the purview of the Commission to compel the property owner to provide such a report. Mr. Mattioni noted that, if the groups appear before the Human Relations Commission, that commission might require such a document.

An unidentified man in the audience asked that, in advance of the next meeting, the Commission provide ground rules as to how many witnesses from each side can speak. He opined that the number of people allowed to comment from each side seemed imbalanced at this meeting. Commissioner Thomas responded that the Commission typically would provide some ground rules at the beginning of the meeting, but perhaps next time they could hold more closely to those rules. Commissioner Thomas noted that it is impossible for the Commission to predict what will be said and exactly how the meeting will run. The unidentified man responded that he wanted to ensure that the next meeting would not be a rehashing of this meeting. Mr. Mattioni and Mr. Thomas responded that that would not happen; the Commission has already heard considerable testimony.

Mr. Beisert spoke out of order, commenting that he is in favor of a compromise, and agreed with Councilwoman Bass that leaving the site is not a compromise. Demolishing the existing building and constructing a new one is also not a compromise, he noted. If the groups are going to work together moving forward, then those two points need to be taken into consideration. Mr. Mattioni responded that Mr. Beisert is trying to prejudice the proceedings before they even get started.

Mr. Marziello spoke out of turn from the audience, arguing that he is just a poor club kid, and, if there is going to be a compromise, then the people demanding the compromise have to help raise money.

Mr. Fiol-Silva clarified that the motion on the table is that the Commission reconvene to discuss whether the building is to be designated. He noted that he is in favor of the community coming to some sort of agreement as quickly as possible, but noted that those issues are outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. He suggested a 45-day maximum for the continuance. Mr. Farnham clarified that, if the staff is unable to make the arrangements for a special meeting within 45 days, the matter will be included on the regularly-scheduled Commission agenda next month.

Mr. Mattioni addressed the audience, noting that many people spoke today, and it is not necessary for all of those people to reiterate their comments at the next meeting. The minutes from the meeting and a recording of the meeting will be available. Mr. Thomas noted that the minutes are also posted online. Ms. Bolender asked if written testimony is included in the minutes. Commissioner Thomas responded that it does not. Mr. Farnham clarified that all of the materials that were submitted to the Historical Commission in writing will remain in the record, and anything distributed to the Commission at the meeting will be noted in the minutes along with the spoken testimony. Commissioner Thomas reiterated that there are numerous letters that the Commissioners received that were not referenced during the meeting, but which will remain in the permanent record kept by the Historical Commission.

A woman from the audience spoke out of turn, noting that she would not be able to attend the next meeting. She stated that she loves Germantown, and that when she was young and raising her child, she went to the Germantown Boys and Girls Club. They were poor and he needed a place for after-school care. She noted that when she walked in the building, what struck her was the hominess of the place. She was young and did not consider old buildings. Commissioner Thomas interjected that the Commission needed to continue its meeting. She concluded by thanking the neighborhood and advocating to save Germantown and to save the Boys and Girls Club.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Mattioni amended their motion, moving to continue the review of the nomination for 23 W. Penn Street to a Special Meeting of the Historical Commission to be held within 45 days of today's date. The motion passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 7345 AND 7347 OXFORD AVE

Name of Resource: Horace Castor House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Anthony Bradley

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 7345 and 7347 Oxford Avenue satisfy Criteria for designation A, D, and E.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 7345 and 7347 Oxford Avenue as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the properties are significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. The nomination contends that the properties represent the Queen Anne, Shingle, and Colonial

Revival styles, as conceptualized by owner and architect Horace Castor. The nomination suggests that Castor, who designed the twin structure as a young architect, received significant assistance from his father-in-law, Ferdinand Hormann, a successful Philadelphia businessman who founded the Jefferson Flint Glass Works in Frankford. The nomination further contends that Castor, a founding partner of the prolific Philadelphia firm Stearns & Castor, contributed innumerable institutional, industrial, and residential buildings to Philadelphia's built environment and that the Oxford Avenue house represents one of his earliest designs.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee on Historic Designation was very appreciative of the staff's efforts in bringing to light this particular building and that the Committee was very much in favor of a designation.

Mr. Thomas asked for comments and questions. Ms. Keller noted that the property owner, who is not in attendance, opposes designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 7345 and 7347 Oxford Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 3500-10 LANCASTER AVE

Name of Resource: West Philadelphia Friends Meeting House and School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority

Nominator: George Poulin and Amy Lambert, University City Historical Society

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3500-10 Lancaster Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3500-10 Lancaster Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property, constructed in 1901 for the Hicksite West Philadelphia Meeting, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property is a local landmark prominently sited at the eastern terminus of Lancaster Avenue. It further contends that the property is significant as a physical reminder of the religious and cultural importance and influence of the Quakers in the region during the nineteenth century, and specifically in the growing suburb of West Philadelphia. The nomination also argues that the property is significant as an expression of both Beaux-Arts and Colonial Revival architecture.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner. Elizabeth Stegner of the University City Historical Society spoke in support of the nomination, noting the authors of the nomination were unable to attend the meeting.

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

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3500-10 Lancaster Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1006-08 W LEHIGH AVE

Name of Resource: Excelsior Trust Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1006-16 W Lehigh Avenue LLC

Nominator: Harrison Rutherford Haas

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 1006-08 W Lehigh Avenue satisfied Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1006-08 W. Lehigh Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Excelsior Trust Company building, constructed in 1925, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of Beaux Arts Classicism, a style often used for grand public buildings. Under Criterion E, the nomination asserts that the building is significant as a surviving example of the commercial work of Horace Trumbauer, one of the city's best known and well regarded architects. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the bank's selection of Trumbauer to design an elegant, monumental building signaled a commitment to Lehigh Avenue as a major commercial thoroughfare in the rapidly developing North Philadelphia neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner. No one represented the nominator.

The Commissioners discussed the nomination and agreed that the property satisfied the cited Criteria for Designation.

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

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1006-08 W. Lehigh Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 862-72 N 41ST ST

Name of Resource: Rorke Mansion

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Friends Rehabilitation Program, Inc.

Nominator: Harrison R. Haas

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 862-72 N. 41st Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 862-72 N. 41st Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property, constructed in 1899, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, E, and H. Under Criteria A and E, the nomination argues that the house is significant for its association with prominent contractor and Republican Party heavyweight Allen B. Rorke and his son Franklin M. Rorke, who constructed some of the city's most important buildings in the late nineteenth century. The nomination further asserts that the corner property is significant under Criterion H as a neighborhood landmark.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner. No one represented the nominator.

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

Mr. Thomas noted that, having lived nearby for many years, this property does stand out as a landmark in the community. He expressed displeasure that the building had been vandalized a few years ago, but noted that the essential elements of the building survive. Ms. Cooperman noted that the Committee on Historic Designation concluded that this is a strong nomination.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 862-72 N. 41st Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and H, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 600-08 N 40TH ST

Name of Resource: West Philadelphia Title & Trust Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Sam Kim Chen and Melinda Chen

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 600-06 N 40th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 600-08 N. 40th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the West Philadelphia Title & Trust Company building, constructed in 1897, exemplifies the cultural, economic, social and historical development of West Philadelphia as it transitioned from an area of upper-class country retreat to a vibrant streetcar suburb over the

course of the second half of the nineteenth century. The nomination argues that the grand, eclectic design by local architect Walter Smedley satisfies Criterion D for embodying distinguishing characteristics of the Renaissance Revival and Beaux Arts styles. Under Criterion H, the nomination contends that the magnificent bank building is striking for its unique position which architecturally forms a prominent intersection that has hosted important community events, including Martin Luther King Jr.'s "Freedom Now" rally.

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

Mr. Thomas noted that this property is especially significant for its location at the intersection of 40th Street and Haverford and Lancaster Avenues. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

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

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 600-08 N. 40th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

228 RICHMOND ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Carlos Lopez

Nominator: Andrew Fearon & Oscar Beisert

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

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 228 Richmond Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame half-gambrel house is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Carlos Lopez represented the property. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert stated that the building is a rare surviving house type of what was at one time a common house type and, though quaint, is an important building. He commented that he and the owner had reached a compromise and that he would nominate a small district that includes the few remaining buildings along the waterfront that were not obliterated by the construction of I-95. The owner, he continued, asked that his property not be individually designated. Mr. Beisert asked to continue the review of the nomination for 228 Richmond Street until the district nomination is submitted. He added that he has held several meetings with the neighbors and the district nomination is in progress.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Beisert to clarify whether he is requesting a continuance. Mr. Beisert answered that he is requesting a long continuance, because it could take time to designate the district. Mr. Thomas noted that the Commission would typically grant a 90-day continuance. Mr. Beisert responded that there has been progress on the district nomination, even though it may not seem like it.

Ms. Cooperman asked to hear from the property owner. Mr. Lopez remarked that he is very conflicted about the designation of his property. He explained that he loves his house and would like to keep it and not develop the property, but he opposes all the restrictions placed on a homeowner once a property is designated. He noted that there are many similar houses in the neighborhood, some covered with stucco. Currently, he added, 1117 E. Oxford Avenue is up for sheriff's sale. He asserted that, although the same type of house as his own, the Oxford Avenue building is more original. He claimed that if it were not for the restrictions imposed by designation, he would not mind if his property were designated.

Ms. Cooperman asked whether Mr. Lopez objects to the continuance. Mr. Lopez answered that he does not object.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to table the review of the nomination for 228 Richmond Street for 90 days to the Historical Commission's meeting on 11 August 2017. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 401-11 S BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Gershman Y, Young Men's & Young Women's Hebrew Association

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: University of the Arts

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 401-11 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 401-11 S. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination asserts that the impressive Georgian Revival building was the first center built jointly by formerly independent chapters of the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations and that numerous prominent figures were involved in the planning and construction of the building. The nomination further argues that the property, designed by architects Frank E. Hahn and S. Brian Baylinson in consultation with Paul Phillippe Cret, reflects more than nine decades of Jewish social, cultural, and educational heritage.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney Michael Sklaroff represented the property owner. Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Mr. Sklaroff thanked the Commission for granting a 30-day continuance at the last meeting and stated that he does not oppose the designation of the property for inclusion in the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He asserted that, not only is the building protected, but that he concurs on its designation. Regarding the nomination, he added, there are serious issues. Mr.

Sklaroff noted that he submitted papers prior to the meeting and requested that they be distributed to the Commissioners. He contended that the staff of the Commission and presumably the Commission itself has the power under Regulation 5.8.a to correct errors in a nomination. He contended that there are two important errors in the nomination. The first he identified as a mischaracterization of the construction. On page 2 of the nomination, he continued, the building is described as reinforced concrete. It is not, he asserted. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the building consists of a steel structure with masonry cladding. He then described the second error, also identified in his papers, in which he claimed the building's condition, listed as "good" on the nomination form, should be listed as "poor." He argued that part of the building, the chimney, was a ruin at the time the nomination was submitted and has since been reasonably removed because of its condition. In support of his position and his request that the nomination be corrected, he noted that he submitted a report by Fred Baumert of the engineering firm Keast & Hood. Mr. Sklaroff commented that Mr. Baumert would testify in support of his conclusion that the nomination contains an error in the building description. He explained that he has photographs of the facility's exterior, which he believes discloses the serious issues. As discussed at the last meeting, he continued, there are serious structural problems, and the structural problems are part of the history of the building and should be taken into account in the nomination. Condition matters, he claimed. He then referred to a remark by Mr. Mattioni at the 13 April 2017 meeting, in which Mr. Mattioni stated: "If the nomination does contain the type of errors that the owner's representative suggests, which would have an impact on any future application for alterations, it would be important to correct the record so a proper description of the building exists." Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the error in describing the structural system has been confirmed in the engineer's report, and he further clarified that he is largely present to contest the two errors. He stated that he supports designation, because the property quite clearly satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, since the building served as a very important site of Jewish culture in the City of Philadelphia, and of culture itself. Significant people, he continued, who were part of world culture, such as Miriam Makeba, Albert Einstein, e. e. cummings, and others, came to the Gershman Y to speak to the community in general. He argued that it is important that they came to Philadelphia and equally important to reflect Philadelphia's outreach to the culture and the world. He reiterated that there is a strong case made for Criteria A and J.

Mr. Sklaroff addressed the other criteria contained within the nomination, stating that the language of Criterion C is as indirect as possible. He then read aloud the definition of Criterion C and commented that the building dates to 1923. He suggested that the words contained within the definition of the criterion could not be put together to make a coherent sentence. He noted its reference to a distinctive architecture style and reiterated the building's 1923 construction date, adding that the building demonstrates a Federal-Revival style, which, he claimed, is not of that era. It is a throwback to another era, he asserted. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the design of the 1920s was more exciting than the design of the German Y and gave several examples including 1616 Walnut Street and the N. W. Ayer building. Other buildings, he continued, were unique and were not tied to the past. With respect to Criterion D, he remarked, the building is not significant in its own right. He further argued that regarding Criterion E, which he cited, the architects were very competent but do not rise to the level required. He contended that the building is not the work of Paul Cret and offered the following analogy: "This is like the vermouth that is mentioned over the gin. It doesn't make it a martini." He concluded that he has made his position clear, and he then asked Mr. Baumert of Keast & Hood, who he described as a very well-qualified structural engineer, to describe the building's condition.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baumert if he has been inside the building. Mr. Baumert responded that he has been inside several times. Mr. Sklaroff then asked whether Mr. Baumert has examined

the building from the perspective of a structural engineer, and Mr. Baumert confirmed that he had. Mr. Sklaroff asked whether Mr. Baumert had an opinion on the building's condition, and Mr. Baumert answered that he did. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baumert to describe the building's exterior. Mr. Baumert stated that the building's condition was characterized as poor in his report because of the extent of damage that has occurred in the past and has continued to occur due to the forces of nature. Mr. Sklaroff asked how the determination was made. Mr. Baumert replied that the visual examination was informed by many viewpoints and angles over a period of several years. Mr. Sklaroff inquired, with regard to the building's structure, whether it is steel with masonry or reinforced concrete and asked whether Mr. Baumert is sure in his conclusion that the building is structural steel with masonry. Mr. Baumert answered that he is absolutely certain and explained that the drawings related to the building's construction are available online through the Philadelphia Architects and Buildings website and other sources. He stated that he has been through the interior of the building numerous times and has seen firsthand the structural steel frame. Mr. Sklaroff asked whether the structure is relevant to the building's current condition. Mr. Baumert answered that it absolutely is, adding that the way a steel frame building reacts to water and forces such as wind and earthquakes differs greatly from the way a reinforced concrete building reacts. Mr. Sklaroff stated that at the 13 April 2017 Historical Commission meeting, he used the term "Regents Street Disease" and asked Mr. Baumert to explain how that concept is relevant to this structure. Mr. Baumert responded that the building was built in a period when the design philosophy of the construction industry was moving away from eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century forms of construction, which consisted of masonry-bearing structures on the exterior and general wood-frame construction on the interior. Throughout the world, he continued, there was a movement toward using steel frames, or in some cases concrete frames. He commented that an envelope in this region, for historic reasons, was typically masonry and explained that the understanding of the interaction between steel frame and masonry was not well understood until later. In particular, he added, the term "Regents Street Disease" is a phrase that was developed by the British in reference to instances in which masonry cladding against a steel frame held moisture and accelerated the deterioration of the steel where it had contact with the masonry. He suggested that examples of beams and lintels, and even anchors, becoming corroded because of trapped moisture are common. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baumert whether, to his knowledge, there is any reference in the nomination to this condition, in part because this was identified not as a steel frame building but as reinforced concrete. Mr. Baumert affirmed, adding that if one assumes the building consists of concrete frame construction, then one would not look for this evidence, though it would be clear for someone who has experience conducting these evaluations.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that part of the Gershman Y's history included a very large, impressive swimming pool and that anyone recounting the building's history would mention the pool at the basement level. Mr. Baumert agreed, adding that the cultural aspects of the nomination talks about it being a community center. He commented that the athletic facilities were an important aspect to the organization and that the swimming pool contributed to the cultural aspect. Mr. Sklaroff noted that it operated for decades. He then asked Mr. Baumert to discuss the chemistry and physics of a large swimming pool contained within the basement of a steel-frame, masonry-clad structure. Mr. Baumert stated that records indicate that the pool was in operation from the time the building opened until the 1980s, which he approximated to be 60 years. Public pools, he explained, are treated with chemicals to reduce the incidence of bacteria and mold growth for the safety of people using the pool. Typically, he continued, chlorine is used, which can create hydrochloric acid when it comes into contact with water. Mr. Baumert further described the scientific aspects of the pool by stating that "water is a continuing cycle of creation of hydrogen and OH atoms that join and separate." He noted that this forms the basis for evaporation and electrolysis. The chlorides, he elaborated, attach themselves to open surfaces and, when

rehydrated, can form hydrochloric acid. He noted examples of concrete with reinforcing bars where the reinforcing has become corroded through this process, and concrete has spalled and ripped apart the steel. At the Gershman Y, Mr. Baumert contended, the process was active for 60 years and continues to this day in a passive way, because chlorides are still present throughout the building, though most predominantly in the lower level. He asserted that the pool deck has partially collapsed from the deterioration process and that the whole section of the basement has been barricaded due to safety concerns. He suggested that evidence of the chlorides exist elsewhere in the building. At the first floor, he claimed, deterioration is visible in various places owing to the process described.

Mr. Sklaroff asked that the Commission view photographs that present the conditions under discussion. The first slide, he noted, is a chimney in the condition at the time the nomination was submitted. Mr. Baumert added that the chimney had been in poor condition for a while and that the deterioration accelerated in the last few years. He stated that he believed part of the reason for the visible crack would have been propagation from the 2011 earthquake that affected the area. He maintained that other buildings in the city consisting of tall, slender forms were also damaged. The chimney of the Gershman Y, Mr. Baumert explained, serviced the incinerator that once operated, though its use was discontinued in the 1980s, owing to environmental concerns. He suggested that one consequence of discontinuing use of the incinerator was that the chimney had become very prone to degradation from water, because when in use, the chimney was kept hot, so rain, snow, and general moisture were almost immediately expelled into the atmosphere. Once an incinerator was shut down, he explained, water gets absorbed into those masonry elements. Mr. Baumert remarked that this chimney in particular was not built of brick but terra cotta, a very absorptive material. Because of the accessibility difficulties, he continued, the joints were not maintained after the incinerator ceased. Mr. Sklaroff asked whether a fair statement would be that the architects and engineers who built the building, which was put in service in 1923, made choices of material that reflected a notion that this building was not built to last. Mr. Baumert replied that he would phrase the question differently, and commented that there were decisions made during construction to substitute materials that would be inherently less durable, so a long-term view may not have driven those decisions. Mr. Sklaroff directed the discussion back to the chimney, which he stressed was terra cotta and not brick, and asked whether it had been recently removed. Mr. Baumert confirmed that it was removed and that he had advised the university that the chimney was a danger to the neighborhood and building occupants. He noted that he had it reviewed by a third party that supported his determination. He clarified that the owner followed the City's process to obtain approvals for the chimney's removal so it would no longer present a hazard. Ms. Cooperman stated that it seems that the chimney is no longer part of the building and questioned why it is being discussed at such length. Mr. Sklaroff replied that the chimney is under discussion because it existed when the property was nominated. If the chimney had been removed, he added, that would have been part of the history of the building at the time of nomination. He confirmed that the chimney had been lawfully removed after obtaining approval from the Department of Licenses and Inspections and the Historical Commission.

Mr. Baumert continued with his presentation of condition photographs and showed an image that he described as the underside of the cornice close to the entrance. He remarked that the image highlights how the terra cotta that forms the ornamentation at this part of the front façade is deteriorating. He elaborated that the feature is splitting due to "Regents Street Disease," adding that the steel is expanding and pressing against the much weaker terra cotta, causing it to break apart. Additionally, he continued, the terra cotta is being held in place by some pieces of wire, which have corroded and lost their integrity. Mr. Sklaroff interjected that, knowing the history of the building, which is available online, and understanding the history of 1920s

construction, this would inform a conclusion about the current and ongoing condition of the building. Mr. Baumert confirmed Mr. Sklaroff's statement and then directed the Commission to another photograph taken from across Broad Street that showed the same area of the building. He stated that the image underscores a widespread issue, not only in Philadelphia, but throughout the region that, in the 1920s, it became very popular to substitute terra cotta ornamentation for carved stone ornamentation, because terra cotta cost less and was easier to install. Now, he continued, property owners are suffering the consequences from a brittle material that lacks durability. Mr. Baumert claimed that terra cotta designs all over the region are falling apart. He maintained that part of the reason for Philadelphia's façade ordinance is to address concerns about similar situations where pieces of ornamentation start to unravel on buildings throughout the city. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that throughout the city similar facades are not only in poor condition but unsafe.

Mr. Baumert turned to another slide of an ornamental balcony directly over the Gershman Y's front entrance on Broad Street. He asserted that the original drawings indicated that the material was to be carved stone and that during the bid process, bidders were asked to change their bids to install these features in terra cotta. What is seen now, he added, is a representation that was intended to be a stone pillar but is in fact terra cotta. He noted damage to the corners of ornamental pilasters caused by ice and water damage.

Showing a close-up image of the stone base, Mr. Baumert stated that the feature was installed as stone and the panels exist at the sidewalk level and extend to approximately shoulder height. Mr. Sklaroff asked what the image suggests about the interior condition and how it affects the structure. Mr. Baumert answered that the stones are displaced out of plane and that represents two different but related phenomena. The first, he continued, is that each of the stones would have been anchored in place with a relatively thin steel anchor set into the top of the stone, which would then be tied back into the masonry. He explained that water enters the joints between stones and corrodes the anchors. The anchors, he elaborated, break and the stones start to shift freely. He added that, referring back to Regents Street Disease, the oxidation or rusting of the steel structure behind causes the steel to push on parts of the building's façade, which is visible at the stone panels where the stone is being pushed off the face of the building by the underlying structure.

Mr. Baumert then showed a detail of a steel grate covering a window and commented that the grate's anchorage has expanded through the rusting process and has fractured the stone into small pieces. He contended that the condition is clearly visible from the street and claimed that the information should have been included as evidence in the nomination to indicate that there are aspects of the building that are being pushed apart from internal rusting and decay of materials.

Mr. Baumert showed an image of where the pool deck was located and stated that the supporting members became so corroded they collapsed. He asserted that it is currently unsafe to walk over that area of the pool. Mr. Baumert described a second image as showing the cavity space below the pool deck adjacent to the pool basin. A final image showed an overview of the pool area, which Mr. Baumert stated had not been in use for approximately 30 years owing to the dangers to people in that part of the building.

Mr. Sklaroff concluded that he supports the designation and believes the cultural aspects of the site are persuasive and important to the history of the City of Philadelphia. He again requested that the nomination be corrected under Regulation 5.8.a, because he argued that it is incorrect in two important aspects. He first noted that the structure is not reinforced concrete. He then

argued that the second correction is related to a misunderstanding of the structure. Mr. Sklaroff claimed the building condition is poor due to the basic construction of the building, which he contended is part of the building's history. He added that the effect of those decisions over the years, both to use steel frame and masonry and to have a pool in use for six decades, resulted in the spread of vapor containing hydrochloric acid throughout portions of the building. He reiterated that he supports designation but that the nomination should be corrected under the Rules & Regulations. He further requested that the nomination proceed on the basis of Criteria for Designation A and J. He also asked that the Commission take into account the property rights of the ownership, in this case a nonprofit university.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Sklaroff to clarify what he is requesting of the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff stated that he is requesting a correction in the two aspects he identified and for the nomination to proceed, but only on the basis of Criteria for Designation A and J. He claimed that when applying rigor in reviewing Criteria C, D, and E, the Commission would not find those criteria persuasive. Mr. Thomas stated that his understanding is that, whether the Commission designates based on one Criterion or all ten Criteria for Designation, the treatment by the Historical Commission is the same. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the criteria the property is designated under are important for the property owner.

Mr. Mattioni suggested that, based on the testimony heard at the meeting, the building is in the process of self-destruction. Mr. Sklaroff replied that it is. Mr. Mattioni asked whether there is any practical way of saving the structure or whether one must sit and watch it continue to deteriorate. He also asked whether the answer is significant in terms of designation. Mr. Sklaroff responded that, as a lay person, the condition continues to worsen on an ongoing basis. That is clear, he claimed, and part of the history. Mr. Sklaroff then suggested that, were the property owner to determine the extent of the damage, it would be required in the future to remove historic fabric and return to the Commission or staff before commencing work. He asserted that there are physical issues. Mr. Sklaroff claimed that, when the owner needs to apply for alterations to the building, it is important to know the building's condition at the time of designation. In addition, he continued, it is relevant to understand that this is not a 1923 building in good condition and designed by Paul Cret, who was a substantial, known, important architect in the history of Philadelphia and whose work at Rittenhouse Square and elsewhere. Instead, if the property owner has adaptive reuse plans, Mr. Sklaroff argued, it is important for them to know this is not a Paul Cret building in good condition. He reiterated that he is requesting that the nomination be corrected and reformed to accurately represent the condition and history.

Mr. Steinke and Mr. Grossi introduced themselves as the nominators and stated that the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia nominated the building in July 2016. Mr. Steinke noted that the Committee on Historic Designation recommended designation in December 2016. After 220 days of continuances, he is pleased to learn that the University of the Arts, who owns the building, does not oppose designation. He called it great news. In some senses, he continued, the meeting could end there, but he asked to address a few of the assertions that were made by the owner's representative, including the insistence that Criteria for Designation C, D, and E should be eliminated, should the building be designated. He asked Mr. Grossi to make a brief presentation.

Mr. Grossi began his presentation by noting that Mr. Sklaroff conceded that the building meets Criteria for Designation A and J. To reinforce those points, he continued, the building meets Criterion A because it serves as an expression of Jewish society and culture in early twentieth-century Philadelphia. He asserted that its prominence and visibility on South Broad Street, the city's principal north-south corridor, are intentional. The building, he continued, was designed

within the nationally revered and, at the time, highly popular Colonial Revival style, which he stated was a suggestion of both the U.S. cultural assimilation and Jewish prominence and continuity in American life. He then noted that the building holds association with a number of prominent Philadelphians, including Albert Greenfield, the Gimbels, the Lits, Snellenberg, and others.

Regarding Criteria for Designation C and D, Mr. Grossi remarked that he feels strongly that the building demonstrates those criteria, as did the Committee on Historic Designation, primarily because the building serves as a textbook Colonial Revival specimen, or, more specifically, Georgian Revival. He noted that the building features all the key design ornament, including a symmetrical brick façade, corner quoins, a combination of round- and flat-arched windows, stone impost blocks, lintels and keystones, classical pediments, and balustraded parapets. The building, he continued, is further in context with other contemporary Jewish institutional buildings of the time, notably the Federation of Jewish Charities, also a Hahn design, Mount Sinai Hospital, demolished recently, and the Jewish Education Center No. 1 in South Philadelphia, which has been altered almost beyond recognition. Mr. Grossi asserted that the building further reflects the local and national rise in popularity of Colonial Revival, particularly in the wake of Philadelphia's own 1876 Centennial Expo and the 1926 Sesquicentennial.

Regarding Criterion for Designation E, Mr. Grossi contended that the nomination does not suggest that the building is principally the work of Paul Cret. He maintained that the nomination very clearly presents the building as the work of Frank Hahn and S. Brian Baylinson and was completed at the time of their partnership. He argued that the two are notable local architects. Hahn buildings, he summarized, include the Royal Theatre, Jewish Education Center No. 2, and the previously mentioned Federation of Jewish Charities. Mr. Grossi opined that the Federation is not designated but that the other two buildings are listed on the Philadelphia Register. He then identified notable Baylinson projects as including the Warwick Hotel and the Overseas Motor Works at 1501 Fairmount Avenue, another previous Alliance nomination.

Mr. Grossi argued that Criterion for Designation J serves as one of the most interesting aspects of the nomination. He explained that the building has continually served the broader Jewish community of Philadelphia and beyond for nearly a century through concerts, lectures, screenings, and recreational activities. The YM and YWHA Arts Council, he continued, was a prominent and early supporter of modern arts and poetry in Philadelphia, primarily during the years of 1958 and 1980. He elaborated that the Arts Council hosted or showcased the work of nationally revered figures such as Andy Warhol, Jasper Johns, Roy Lichtenstein, e. e. cummings, and many others. Mr. Grossi noted that the property's period of significance extends to the present in the nomination, because the building remains a key contributor to the institutional fabric of South Broad Street and the contemporary Avenue of the Arts, both through the long-term programming of the Y itself and the more recent contributions of the University of the Arts. For those reasons, he concluded, the building very strongly demonstrates the five selected criteria. He reiterated that the Alliance is pleased to hear the owner has no objection to designation and argued in favor of including Criteria C, D, and E.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the observation concerning the Colonial Revival and the fact that the Sesquicentennial influenced building design was very relevant. He noted that the influence is visible in the façade reviews he conducts for Chestnut and Walnut Streets, including commercial buildings of the 1920s such as Liberty Travel and Florsheim Shoes, which were early 1920s buildings. He used the example of the Provident Bank building at the southeast corner of 17th and Chestnut Streets, opining that it stands as a Colonial Revival skyscraper from the same period and further reflects an environment characterized by a distinctive architectural style,

which defines Criterion C. Admittedly, he added, 1616 Walnut Street is a fabulous example of where design was heading, but the past also influenced design at the same time during the same decade.

Ms. Cooperman agreed and stressed the fact that revival historicism and revivalism was modern at the time of the Gershman Y's construction. She clarified that modern design was not limited to the work displayed at the PSFS building and 1616 Walnut Street and noted that the Gershman Y was modern when constructed. She supported Mr. Grossi statements by adding that it was very important for Jewish institutions to guard themselves in this cloak of respectability of the American tradition. The Colonial Revival dress that this building puts on, she continued, is one that creates a sense of status for the institution at this prominent corner. She seconded Mr. Grossi's comments about the importance of Hahn and Baylinson.

Mr. Thomas opined that Ms. Cooperman and the Committee on Historic Designation seem to feel strongly that the nomination satisfies all the criteria it presents. Ms. Cooperman affirmed. Mr. Thomas addressed Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Baumert and stated his appreciation for the additional information provided by Keast & Hood. He added that, should the Commission designate the property, that information would be reflected in the record.

Mr. Mattioni stated that Mr. Steinke and Mr. Grossi have spoken to the Criteria for Designation but have not addressed the comments regarding the condition of the building itself. Mr. Steinke responded that they first wanted to hear comments on the information that was presented. On the issues of condition and the type of structure, he continued, a nomination is based on a nominator's best inference about these issues. He noted that the Alliance does not own the building and stressed that the nomination covers only the façade, not the interiors or the swimming pool. Those issues, he maintained, were neither subject to the Alliance's review nor relevant for designation purposes. He argued that the condition assessment is a check box on the nomination cover sheet, which suggests that it is a windshield review, not intended to be an exhaustive and rigorous analysis of the building's condition. In terms of the type of construction, he added, the determination is based on a good faith assessment from the outside. Mr. Steinke commented that he wrote a letter to the Commission, addressed to Mr. Farnham and Commissioner Thomas, on April 17 and had asked that it be distributed to the Commission members. The letter, he stated, indicates that the owner's representative wishes to amend the record so that those two issues to reflect the realities of the building today. Mr. Steinke noted that he had no objection to that request, but that he left it up to the Commission. He stated that he still does. Mr. Grossi added that he had identified the original building permit for the building, and the original permit specifies both steel and concrete construction. Based on an initial assessment, he continued, there are aspects of the building, particularly in the rear, that would suggest reinforced concrete. He concluded that on a cursory assessment he felt that the structural system identified was appropriate, though he noted he had no objection to correcting the information for the record. Mr. Steinke stated that neither factor is germane to the historical merits with respect to the criteria that the Commission sets forth in making their decision.

Tom Chapman, an attorney representing Dranoff Properties, commented that Dranoff Properties has owned and developed numerous properties on South Broad Street, including Symphony House, located on the opposite side of Broad Street from the subject property. He named several other properties owned or being developed by Dranoff Properties that are in close proximity to 401-11 S. Broad Street and noted that the company views the Gershman Y building as a significant architectural and cultural landmark in the city and along the Avenue of the Arts. On behalf of Dranoff Properties, Mr. Chapman offered his support for the property's inclusion in the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and noted that he supports the nomination.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that he would hope the Commission in its designation will correct the nomination. He added that the power under the city's preservation ordinance that is given to private citizens and institutions to nominate properties and to create this power over private property is awesome. He claimed that the Criteria for Designation are so broad that any property in the city could satisfy Criterion C. He argued that the rowhouse he grew up in at 4515 Conshohocken Avenue is emblematic of an era, as any rowhouse is emblematic of an era because of the way the city grew. In this case, he continued, he is not objecting to designation, but is requesting that the nomination be corrected. The windshield view of the building, he added, does not take into account the building's history or its condition, which is obvious from outside the building. He contended that the property owner has property rights that are broad under the Pennsylvania Constitution. He again asked the Commission, in its designation, to correct the nomination in two respects: that the condition be identified as poor and that the structure be corrected to indicate that it is structural steel with masonry cladding rather than reinforced concrete. Mr. Sklaroff argued that the correction is relevant not only to the building's history but to the owner.

Ms. Cooperman stated her understanding of the issues presented with certain building details. As someone who regularly surveys building, she asserted that, in the field, she would assess the building as being in fair condition. Poor condition, she contended, would be falling down, and this building is clearly not falling down. She observed that windows still exist in all the openings and, while there is some deterioration of certain elements, there is not major structural failure visible on the exterior. She reiterated that she understands the condition issues raised by Mr. Baumert but argued that, as someone well-versed in building survey, she would characterize the building's condition as fair rather than poor.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 401-11 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; and to correct the nomination to reflect the fact that the building is not a reinforced concrete structure but is a steel frame structure with exterior masonry cladding, and to characterize the building as being in fair condition. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomas encouraged Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Baumert to submit the information they have gathered for the Historical Commission's property file, adding that specific information would be helpful in the file. Mr. Sklaroff responded that, presumably, his request is in the file. Mr. Farnham confirmed that a copy of the request is in the property file. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the report identifies the building as being in poor condition, and added that he hopes the staff would have more resources. When a nomination like this is submitted, he argued that the staff is required to review it and correct it. His request, he added, was that the nomination be corrected at the staff level. He asserted that he understands the resolution did not go in his favor, but that he would have been happy to invite the staff to make a site visit to see whether they agree with Mr. Baumert, who is a structural engineer and whose expertise is well-established. He noted that he does not agree that the building is in fair condition. Mr. Thomas countered that the Commission does not disagree with Mr. Baumert or the facts that were presented, which is why they would best lie in the Historical Commission's property file. Mr. Sklaroff responded that providing an accurate assessment is incumbent on nominators, who claim they have expertise to do the analysis and understand the history and structure, because once they nominate, it is a path that continues. He stated that he appeared before the Committee on Historic Designation, though he did not present fully, so the fact that the Committee passed on their recommendation

is not really in any way persuasive. The Committee has the responsibility to understand the building and the structure and not rely on a windshield view of an important site in the City of Philadelphia.

CLG COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

ADDRESS: 2201 BRYN MAWR AVE

Name of Resource: Penn Wynn House

Property Owner: Penn Wynn, Inc.

Nominator: Powers & Co., Inc.

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

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2201 Bryn Mawr Avenue, known as the Penn Wynn House. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the nomination, the Penn Wynn House, located in Philadelphia's Wynnefield neighborhood, was constructed in 1961 in the Modern style. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion C, in the area of architecture, as a significant local example of a novel mid-century building type: a post-war, luxury, high-rise, suburban, apartment building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission. The Commission commented that the Penn Wynn House satisfies National Register Criterion C, in the area of architecture, as demonstrated by the National Register nomination.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 2:41 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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