

**THE MINUTES OF THE 734TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2023, 9:00 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		Left at 1:27 pm
Erin Kindt (Department of Public Property)	X		Left at 10:39 am
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)	X		Left at 12:46 pm
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		Left at 1:17 pm
Matthew Treat (Department of Planning and Development)	X		

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I
Maggy White, Esq., Law Dept

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Abina Sade
Alexander Fidrych

Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
Amy Lambert
Amy Lu
Angelina Lam
Autumn Harris
Ava Talerico
Axel Paredes
Betty Mon
Brianna Camacho
Carolyn Klepser
Charlene Mires
Commissioner Cheryl Bettigole, Philadelphia Department of Public Health
Chris Carickhoff
Christy Camposeco
Clem Hepburn
Cristina Mancini
Dan Macey
Darryl Blackwell
David Brownlee
David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Deborah Gary, Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Artifacts
Dennis Carlisle
Doug Seiler, Seiler+Drury Architecture
Douglas Jordan
Evan Battallio
Gabe Canuso, D3 Developers
Greg Voshell
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Israt Jahan
Jay Farrell
Jeff Stortz
Joe Pyle, Scattergood Foundation
John Malis
John Stortz
Justin Spivey
Kathy Fisher
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Kim King
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City Philadelphia
Leah Silverstein
Lecie Solomon
Manal Hssain
Mari Carrasquillo
Mary Horstmann
Maxwell Homans
Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Mesha Hester
Metrica Brown
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Michael Ramos

Michael Toledano
Mike Schade, AOS Architects
Monica Gibson
Nancy Pontone
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Nicole Mirabal
Pam Bracey
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Sam Stortz
Sara Enes, Philadelphia Department of Public Health
Seth Cohen, VSBA
Shokhrukh Davronov
Stepham Alston
Stuart Lacheen
Suzanne Ponsen, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Thomas Bond
Tom Stortz
Tony Bracali
Tyreek Leon
Wen Lin

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 733RD STATED MEETING, 8 SEPTEMBER 2023

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:00

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 733rd Stated Meeting, held 8 September 2023. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 733rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 September 2023. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 733rd Stated Meeting of the PHC					
MOTION: Adopt minutes					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

ADDRESS: 775 S CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD

Name of Resource: Piers 38 and 40 South

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Pier 38-40 LLC

Nominator: Keeping Society

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Southwark Municipal Piers 38 and 40, located at 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, as historic and list the property on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the piers, constructed between 1914 and 1915, satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the piers represent the establishment and enlargement of the Port of Philadelphia as a municipal program to spur commercial activity through the creation of a

system of municipal piers along the Delaware River waterfront. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the piers represent an era of civic architecture inspired by the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago and possess distinguishing characteristics of the Beaux Arts style of architecture. Under Criterion H, the nomination states that the massive piers form an established and familiar visual feature of the Southwark neighborhood, the City of Philadelphia, and the Delaware River. The staff notes that the nomination would benefit from some editing and fact checking. The staff corrected some obvious errors, for example revising the name of Mayor Blankenburg's director of the Department of Public Works, who was Morris Cooke, not Frederick Winslow Taylor, on page 34. Other errors remain; for example, the statement on page 26 that the Benjamin Franklin Parkway was planned as early as 1906 and the groundbreaking took place in 1917 is incorrect. Planning, in fact, began in the nineteenth century and the official groundbreaking, the demolition of some houses in the boulevard's path, occurred in 1907.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, and J.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard to the March 2024 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 775 S CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD MOTION: Continue to March 2024 CHD meeting MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2023

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:09:15

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 3733 Lancaster Avenue. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda					
MOTION: Adopt Architectural Committee recommendation					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD

Proposal: Construct health center building

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: Thomas Scattergood Foundation

Applicant: Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr LP

History: 1813

Individual Designation: unknown

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval to construct a new municipal health center on the grounds of the historic Friends Hospital in the Frankford section of Philadelphia. Established by the Quakers in 1813 as the first private psychiatric hospital in the United States, the Friends Hospital complex is composed of numerous historic and modern buildings set on 99 acres. The date that the Historical Commission designated Friends Hospital is unknown. No documentation of a designation at a Historical Commission meeting exists. It appears that the hospital was added to the Register in the early 1970s in response to the proposed Pulaski Expressway, a highway that would have cut across the hospital grounds and connected the Betsy Ross Bridge to Route 309. In addition to its local designation, Friends Hospital is a National Historic Landmark.

The new health center building would be located along the main entrance drive from Roosevelt Boulevard to the hospital complex. It would be two stories in height and clad in three types of brick with a cast-stone base. The windows would be aluminum. A painted metal screen would block views of the mechanical equipment on the roof. The service area at the rear of the building would be enclosed with a brick-clad wall and have a metal gate. A material samples page in the drawing set identifies the materials.

The Historical Commission granted in-concept approval of the massing, size, scale, and location of the new health center building, pursuant to Standard 9, at its July 2023 meeting. The massing, size, scale, and location of the building as currently proposed are identical to that approved in concept in July 2023.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct health center

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o As already determined by the Historical Commission, the massing, size, scale, and location of the new construction proposed in the application satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The architectural features of the proposed building satisfy Standard 9.
 - o The proposed building will be differentiated from yet compatible with the property.
 - o The proposed building is designed to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends final approval of the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:09:50

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Washington and Mr. McCoubrey recused from the review of the application.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Nathan Farris, architects Mike Schade and Seth Cohen, and Commissioner Cheryl Bettigole of the Philadelphia Department of Public Health represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farris introduced the members of the application team. He reminded the Commissioners that they had approved the design of the building in concept in July 2023. He stated that his team has returned to present the detailed design and explain how it fits into the Friends Hospital campus. He explained that the Scattergood Foundation, the owner of Friends Hospital, has been working with Atkin Olshin Shade Architects as its in-house campus architect for many years now, and that firm has been advising the Scattergood Foundation throughout this project and design. Mike Shade of the firm will explain how the new building fits into the larger campus. Seth Cohen of VSBA Architects will provide a full presentation on the proposed building. But first, Commissioner Cheryl Bettigole of the Department of Public Health will address you.
- Commissioner Bettigole thanked the Historical Commission for its efforts and stated she and her colleagues at the Department of Public Health have worked closely with VSBA Architects to develop plans for this health center to ensure that it meets the needs of the City's health center program, and she is thrilled to be so close to being able to move forward with a facility that will change the longstanding lack of access to health care in the Lower Northeast. She commented that generations of Philadelphians will benefit from this health center.
- Mr. Schade introduced himself and his architectural firm. He stated that his firm undertook a study of the history of the Friends Hospital campus and then developed a master plan for the site. He stated that his firm has been working at the site for a decade. As part of the work, Mr. Schade has collaborated with VSBA Architects to integrate the new health center building into the site. He stated that he has concluded that the new building will be a welcome addition that will fit elegantly into the campus.
- Mr. Cohen presented the design of the new building to the Historical Commission. He displayed numerous photographs and other images of the site and proposed building. He discussed the site improvements including the restoration of trees along the entry driveway and the addition of turn lanes at the exit of the driveway to Roosevelt Boulevard. He explained how the entry gates would be widened. He noted that they are reusing the existing footprint of the parking lot and expanding it slightly to accommodate the new programmatic needs. He also noted that they are providing

- appropriate stormwater management. He discussed the lighting on the exterior of the building and lighting that will be added to the campus. He pointed out that added landscaping will soften the views of the building and ensure that it is compatible with the setting. He explained how visitors to the health center will arrive at the building by transit, car, and foot. He reported on the accommodations for drop-off and parking. In response to a question from Mr. Thomas, he promised that they will absolutely provide adequate bicycle parking on site, and it will be in close proximity to the both the building entrance as well as the parking. Mr. Cohen described the building elevations, noted the materials and their colors, and elaborated on the rooftop screen for the mechanical equipment. He stated that he had made several revisions in response to comments from the Architectural Committee. He described the wall around the service area at the back of the building.
- o Mr. Thomas asked if the dumpsters and other back-of-house equipment will be blocked from view.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that the service area is surrounded by an eight-foot-tall brick wall that matches the building. The area is also screened with landscaping.
 - Mr. Cohen noted that the Architectural Committee had complained about the flatness of the exterior walls of the building. He showed a section drawing of the wall and explained that it is not flat like the Committee asserted. He pointed out the cast stone base, projecting sills, windows, coping, and other features. He stated that the facades have a rigorous, consistent undulating pattern of masonry that creates a nice subtle articulation. He noted that that was how they addressed the long, relatively flat facade. Mr. Cohen discussed the rooftop screen and stated that the gap between it and the roof had been reduced as the Architectural Committee had suggested. He explained that the entrance is located at a large porch, referencing the Quaker origins of the site. The porch is welcoming and inviting. He showed views of the building in its surroundings and noted that it is a background building in the landscape.
 - o Mr. Thomas asked if the rooftop screen is set back from the edges of the building.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that it is set back so far that it will likely not be seen. He showed a roof plan.
 - o Mr. Thomas agreed that it would be inconspicuous or invisible.
 - Ms. Cooperman asked about moving the entrance piers to widen the entrance drive. She asked if the metalwork would be retained and reused.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that the metalwork would be retained and reinstalled.
 - Ms. Cooperman asked if the applicants had investigated the history of the landscape and engaged an arborist. A landscape architect is also working on the project.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that they had hired an arborist who was undertaking a survey of the trees. He stated that they do not know what species of trees they will use to restore the allée of trees, but they will match the existing and historic trees as closely as possible.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, stated that his organization is working with some members of the community to oppose the health center project. He objected to the demolition of the Lawnside building. He asserted that the health center will not be a background building. It will be a very large building on the grounds of America's oldest psychiatric hospital. He stated that the health center will be located on a very dangerous road that is underserved by transit. He contended

- that patients of the health center will be forced to turn left when exiting the site. He stated that the Architectural Committee twice recommended denial of this design. He asked if there were other sites for this facility in the Northeast. He complained that no one had done any outreach to the community. He concluded that this project represents an enormous mistake and public policy blunder. It is a public safety mistake and a traffic engineering mistake.
- Cristina Mancini introduced herself as the lay leader of Saint Mark's Church, Frankford. She stated that her primary objection to this proposal is the lack of stakeholder outreach and civic engagement.
 - o Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Mancini to address the design of the building with regard to historic preservation standards. He noted that the Historical Commission had met its obligation with regard to public notice for its meetings at which this application is being reviewed. He stated that traffic, transit, public safety, and other similar issues are important but outside the Historical Commission's purview. He asked Ms. Mancini to concentrate her remarks on the Historical Commission's review of the architectural design of the building.
 - o Ms. Mancini stated that the proposed building is not situated in the right place. She stated that Roosevelt Boulevard is a dangerous stretch of highway. She stated that the proposal is in conflict with the Phila 2035 Comprehensive City Plan.
 - Oscar Beisert opposed the application. He stated that there are other sites at Friends Hospital for this building. He objected to the demolition of Lawnside, which he called a charming Gothic cottage that has been standing since before the Civil War. He stated that the proposed building is not a background building; it is a front yard building.
 - Allison Weiss of SoLo Germantown stated that she agrees with Messrs. Steinke and Beisert.
 - David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he agrees with Messrs. Steinke and Beisert.
 - Brianna Camacho stated that she understands the concerns but noted that change is often good. She suggested that the architects consider the lighting closely because the campus will be dark at night with all of the trees.
 - o Mr. Cohen assured the members of the public that they are carefully considering traffic, congestion, safety, and lighting.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission granted in-concept approval of the massing, size, scale, and location of the new health center building, pursuant to Standard 9, at its July 2023 meeting. The massing, size, scale, and location of the building as currently proposed are identical to that approved in concept in July 2023.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- As already determined by the Historical Commission, the massing, size, scale, and location of the new construction proposed in the application satisfy Standard 9.
- The architectural features of the proposed building satisfy Standard 9.
- The proposed building will be differentiated from yet compatible with the property and therefore satisfies Standard 9.
- The proposed building is designed to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment and therefore satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which was adopted by a vote of 9 to 1.

ITEM: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Carney SECONDED BY: Lech					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair				X	
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey				X	
Michel		X			
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	9	1		2	

ADDRESS: 241-43 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT G

Proposal: Construct rooftop pergola

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steven Gelbart

Applicant: Douglas Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1856; Lewis Building; Stephen D. Button, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a rooftop pergola on the building at 241 Chestnut Street. The Historical Commission approved the roof deck and pilot house in 2021.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rooftop pergola.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The rooftop pergola as currently proposed would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The application photographs show the visibility of the building's roof

area from Chestnut Street and Independence National Historical Park; therefore, the application fails to satisfy this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:14:24

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Doug Seiler represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert stated that the Historical Commission's staff's the review of the details of the pergola should be carefully considered.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The pergola is being proposed to allow for shade on the approved roof deck, which is currently under construction.
- The owner previously used freestanding umbrellas for shade and the intent of the fixed pergola is to have a less cluttered appearance where the roof deck area is visible from the public right-of-way.
- The pergola design, with a modest footprint and slim metal structure, is intended to be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The final color should be selected to minimize visibility. A gray or tan shade would reduce the visibility of the structure.
- The rooftop pergola as proposed would be minimally visible and unobtrusive from the public right-of-way, thereby satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details including the color of the pergola, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 241-43 Chestnut St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	12				

ADDRESS: 6190 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stuart Lacheen

Applicant: Betty Mon-Mon & Assoc. for Christopher Carickhoff, Studio C Architecture, LLC

History: 1870, first-floor commercial addition in 1938.

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to build a third-floor addition on the rear ell of a contributing building in the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District. The historic portion of the building was constructed circa 1870, and, while a first-floor commercial addition was built in the twentieth century, the historic structure remains prominent, especially the third-floor mansard roof. The proposed addition would encroach on the rear mansard and necessitate the demolition of the rear dormers.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct third-floor addition on rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed addition would cut into and obscure the mansard roof and demolish the rear dormers.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition would cut into and obscure the mansard roof and demolish the rear dormers.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The demolition of portions of the rear mansard would not be reversible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:32:50

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Chris Carickhoff and property owner Stuart Lacheen represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance voiced his support for approval of the revised application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The existing kitchen grease hood on the first floor may need to be relocated to comply with the building code.
- The rear-most window on the second and third floors should be shifted slightly forward from the rear edge toward the existing building.
- The revised proposal, which relocates the proposed overhang to the rear of the property and includes a mansard on the addition, is sensitive to the historic structure's scale and style.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- By retaining one of the rear dormers and working in balance with the historic structure's scale and style, the application satisfies Standards 2 and 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details including the location of the grease hood, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 6190 Ridge Ave MOTION: Approval of revised application MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	12				

ADDRESS: 3733 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Henry Pemberton

Applicant: Wen Lin, Lui Consulting and Construction LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on a contributing property in the Powelton Village Historic District. The addition will approximately double the length of the building while leaving a minimum setback at the rear of the property of approximately 25 feet. The building was constructed in 1875 and is three stories tall with a flat roof. The rear of the building is not visible from any public rights-of-way, but is visible to neighbors, including those along the private Pearl Court. The addition may be slightly visible from viewpoints between twin buildings along Baring Street. The application also includes landscape plans for the rear yard as well as proposed cladding materials for the addition.

An application which proposed a similar scope was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its July 2023 meeting, at which time the Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. The Historical Commission reviewed the application at its August 2023 meeting and voted to deny the application but provided recommendations to the applicant to reduce the length of the addition, enlarge the windows on the addition, use compatible materials, and include a landscape plan. The applicant has submitted this revised application and is responsive to the Commission's recommendations.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed new addition does meet Standard 9. It is too differentiated from the historic main block and is generally compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the historic building.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - o The new addition does meet the Roofs Guidelines because it will not be conspicuous from the public rights-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 6 SEPTEMBER 2023**ADDRESS: 1611 WALNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Hollinger Building

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: 1611 PPW LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate 1611 Walnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Hollinger Building, built in 1923, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the Hollinger Building, with its Neoclassical façade, reflects an era in American architecture when this architectural style was commonly applied to commercial buildings serving the financial industry. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion E due to it being an important representative commercial building designed by Charles E. Oelschlager, an architect whose work significantly influenced the City of Philadelphia and the larger surrounding region. Under Criterion J the nomination maintains that the Hollinger Building is representative of and related to the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Walnut Street's redevelopment and transformation from residential to commercial which occurred between 1900 and 1930. The nomination argues the Hollinger Building also represents the economic and historical heritage of the community through the business tenants that have leased its commercial space, from the pre-1940s bankers and brokers, to Bachrach, Inc., a legacy in American photography and

portraiture. The period of significance spans from 1923 when the building was constructed, to 1968, Bachrach's 100th anniversary and last year of renting the commercial space.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that 1611 Walnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation C, E, and J. The staff also recommends adding language to the Physical Description section clarifying that the storefront has been significantly altered since original construction and the division between the first level and mezzanine level is the only character defining feature that remains.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1611 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and J, with the understanding that the significantly altered glazed storefront excluding the historic masonry surround is not a character-defining feature, but the division between the first level and mezzanine level is a character-defining feature.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:47:50

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, asked about the nomination of 700-34 Race Street. He stated he was disappointed that the review was continued.
 - o Mr. Mattioni stated that Mr. Steinke was out of order because he was commenting on a matter that was not before the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. Thomas agreed.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The storefront has been altered throughout the years and the glazed storefront elements are not character-defining features.
- The pilasters, which surround the storefront, are contributing or historic elements.
- The property owner submitted a letter to the Historical Commission requesting confirmation through the review process that parts of the existing storefront are non-historic.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property satisfies Criterion C, owing to its Neoclassical façade which reflects an era in American architecture when this architectural style was commonly applied to commercial buildings serving the financial industry.
- The property satisfies Criterion E because it is a representative commercial building designed by Charles E. Oelschlager, an architect whose work significantly influenced the City of Philadelphia and the larger surrounding region.
- The property satisfies Criterion J and is representative of the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Walnut Street's redevelopment and transformation from residential to commercial which occurred between 1900 and 1930.

ACTION: Mr. Lech moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1611 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and J, with the understanding that the significantly altered glazed storefront excluding the historic masonry surround is not a character-defining feature, but the division between the first level and mezzanine level is a character-defining feature, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1611 WALNUT ST					
MOTION: Designate; Criteria C, E, and J, with storefront clarification					
MOVED BY: Lech					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	12				

ADDRESS: 150 AND 160 W WASHINGTON LN

Name of Resource: Cranford

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owners: 150: G13 Residences, LLC; 160: Sapphire Corp.

Nominator: The Keeping Society

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate two properties, 150 and 160 W. Washington Lane, as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property at 150 W. Washington Lane includes a Colonial Revival brick house constructed in 1893 and expanded in 1909. The property at 160 W. Washington Lane is an undeveloped parcel surrounded by a stone retaining wall. The nomination argues that the properties are significant under Criteria A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the properties are significant for their association with Charles F. Jenkins, a prominent Quaker businessman, historian, and publisher, who impacted the cultural and social development of the Germantown community and larger Philadelphia area. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the properties represent a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival style.

The nomination, which was submitted under a combined address of 150-160 W. Washington Lane but updated by the staff, does not appear to accurately reflect the history of the parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane, instead conflating it with that of 150 W. Washington Lane and identifying it as a side yard and garden.

The undeveloped parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane was part of Edward Cope property that fronted on W. Tulpehocken Street and extended along Greene Street to W. Washington Lane until Cope's death in 1911. At that time, the parcel was conveyed to Cope's daughter, Maria C. Jenkins and her husband Charles F. Jenkins, who had purchased a portion of the property that would become 150 W. Washington Lane from Cope and a portion from David H. Livezey in 1893 and constructed the house in question at 150 W. Washington Lane. Charles and Maria Jenkins sold the property with the house at 150 W. Washington Lane to Elizabeth and E. Naudain Simons in 1917, and the undeveloped parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane to the same in 1919. While the Jenkins family may have used the parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane as a garden prior to the death of Edward Cope in 1911, the nomination does not provide evidence to support this claim. The only historic reference to a garden at the Jenkins property is a 1902 photograph of a sundial, whose location is not identified in the nomination. The nomination does not discuss the stone retaining wall that runs the length of the 160 W. Washington Lane parcel. It is likely a remnant of the Edward Cope property. The stone wall abuts a Colonial Revival brick retaining wall along 150 W. Washington Lane, and corresponds to historic maps, none of which are provided in the nomination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D but does not demonstrate that the property at 160 W. Washington Lane satisfies any criteria.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 150 and 160 W. Washington Lane satisfy Criteria for Designation A and D.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:58:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Kim King represented the property owner of 160 W. Washington Lane. No one represented the owner of 150 W. Washington Lane.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lecie Solomon, a near neighbor, commented in support of the designation of both properties.
- Allison Weiss, representing So/Lo Germantown Civic Association, commented in support of the designation of both properties.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property at 150 W. Washington Lane includes a Colonial Revival brick house constructed in 1893 and expanded in 1909 and is delineated by a brick retaining wall.
- Charles F. Jenkins was a person significant in the history of Philadelphia as a prominent Quaker businessman, historian, and editor and publisher of the *Farm Journal*.
- The property at 160 W. Washington Lane is an undeveloped parcel surrounded by a stone retaining wall constructed in the mid-nineteenth century and associated with

Edward Cope and his demolished house at 161 W. Tulpehocken Street. Remnants of the retaining wall run along W. Washington Lane to Greene Street, along the 6200 block of Green Street, and up the 100 block of W. Tulpehocken Street.

- The lot at 160 W. Washington Lane was owned by Charles F. Jenkins and Maria Cope Jenkins, daughter of Edward Cope, from 1911 to 1917 and possibly used as a garden.
- No garden features associated with Charles F. Jenkins remain in the lot at 160 W. Washington Lane.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 W. Washington Lane is significant under Criterion A for its association with Charles F. Jenkins.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 W. Washington Lane embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The nomination does not make an argument for the significance of 160 W. Washington Lane and fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; and to find that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 160 W. Washington Lane satisfies any Criteria for Designation. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 2.

ITEM: 150 and 160 W WASHINGTON LN					
MOTION: Designate 150; Criteria A and D. Decline to designate 160.					
MOVED BY: Carney					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman		X			
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel		X			
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	9	2			1

ADDRESS: 1621 JEFFERSON ST

Name of Resource: Dr. Oscar James Cooper House

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Union Housing Development

Nominator: Preservation Alliance

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1621 Jefferson Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The semi-detached rowhouse with a side ell, constructed in 1890, was the home and medical office of Dr. Oscar James Cooper from 1930-1972. The nomination contends that Dr. Cooper's legacy as founder of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, charter member of the Pyramid Club, and long-time physician makes the property eligible for designation under Criteria for Designation A and J. It argues that Dr. Cooper was "a person significant in the past" and that his medical office, which served many in the predominantly African American neighborhood "exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1621 Jefferson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1621 Jefferson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:28:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation.
- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented in support of the designation.
- Deborah Gary, representing the Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets, commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Committee on Historic Designation was very supportive of the nomination and thanked the property owners for their restoration and stewardship of the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Dr. Cooper was "a person significant in the past." Therefore, the property is worthy of designation under Criterion A.
- Owing to the impact of Dr. Cooper's leadership in social organizations as well as his long practice of medicine in the neighborhood, the property meets Criterion J for designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1621 Jefferson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1621 JEFFERSON ST MOTION: Designate; Criteria A and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 307 S CHADWICK ST

Name of Resource: Frank Weise House and Studio

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: GHI-1 LLC

Nominator: Historical Commission staff

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 307 S. Chadwick Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The building at 307 S. Chadwick Street was constructed as a stable circa 1895. Beginning in 1966, it was altered by owner and architect Frank Weise into his studio and residence based on a design from 1960. The design reflects a period when architects were questioning the limits of Modernism. Although Postmodernism was not formally named for almost two decades, Weise's house and studio embodied the spirit of Postmodern architecture. The design incorporated traditional forms from the past without losing its sense of place in the mid-twentieth century. Satisfying Criteria C and D, the Weise house and studio reflect the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style. Through his work as an architect, planner, and community organizer, Frank Weise significantly influenced the historical, cultural, and cultural development of Philadelphia in the second half of the twentieth century; therefore, the house and studio satisfy Criterion E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 307 S. Chadwick Street, the Frank Weise House and Studio, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 307 S. Chadwick Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:36:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Andrea Hemmann represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Frank Weise was a key architect in what is known as the Philadelphia School and influential in the redevelopment of Philadelphia during the latter half of the twentieth century.
- The nomination is an important record of the development of home and studio building and is significant in the body of Frank Weise's architectural work.
- Building permits recently obtained by the Historical Commission's staff require a revision of the proposed Period of Significance to 1959 to 2003.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion C and D, as an early example of Postmodernism in Philadelphia, reflecting the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion E, as architect Frank Weise significantly influenced the historical, cultural, and cultural development of Philadelphia through his work as an architect, planner, and community organizer in the second half of the twentieth century.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 307 S. Chadwick Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, with the understanding that the nomination will be supplemented with documentation provided by the architect's family and that the Period of Significance will be revised to 1959 to 2003, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 307 S. Chadwick St MOTION: Designate; Criteria C, D, and E MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 4837 AND 4839 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resources: 4837 and 4839 Germantown Ave

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: 4837: Greg Pronko; 4839: Nicole Dowell

Nominator: SoLo/Germantown Civic Association

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

OVERVIEW: These nominations propose to designate the properties at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Jon Kirby and James Kinnier & Sons erected the residential rowhouses in the Second-Empire style in 1870 and 1871. The nominations contend that the rowhouses reflect the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, the Second Empire style, satisfying Criteria C and D.

In November 2022, the Historical Commission designated the property at 4841 Germantown Avenue based on architectural style, under Criteria C and D. At that time, the Commission recommended nominating the buildings at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the properties at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation C and D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation C and D.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:42:05

PRESENTERS:

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

- Allison Weiss and Oscar Beisert represented the nominations.
- Greg Pronko represented the property owner of 4837 Germantown Avenue. No one represented the property owner of 4839 Germantown Avenue.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation.
- Pamela Bracey, Germantown resident, commented in support of the designation.
- Nancy Pontone, representing the East Falls Historical Society, commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The buildings at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue were constructed at the same time as the building at 4841 Germantown Avenue. The designation of all three properties will ensure the protection of the rowhouses, which were originally designed and constructed together during 1870 and 1871.
- The nominations are similar to the nomination adopted for 4841 Germantown Avenue's designation in 2022.
- Their design and construction reflect a key period in the history and development of Germantown Avenue.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nominations demonstrate that the buildings at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue reflect the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, the Second Empire style, satisfying Criteria C and D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4837 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 4837 GERMANTOWN AVE MOTION: Designate; Criteria C and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4839 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Sanchez seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 4839 GERMANTOWN AVE MOTION: Designate; Criteria C and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Sanchez					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				1

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 208-12 VINE ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Charles Stortz

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1780; John Stortz and Son Store; Building at 210 Vine St, c. 1870. Rear building added at 207 New St, 1948. Older buildings cut down at 211 New St, 1941, and 209 New St, 1943.

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish completely a complex of interconnected buildings at 208-12 Vine Street, on the south side of Vine west of 2nd Street in the Old City Historic District. The application claims that the buildings cannot be reasonably adaptively reused and therefore requests that the Historical Commission approve the demolition pursuant to the financial hardship exception in the historic preservation ordinance.

The complex consists of three buildings facing Vine Street (208, 210, and 212) and three buildings facing New Street (207, 209, 211), all of which are internally connected. The buildings at 208 and 212 Vine Street were constructed about 1780. The building at 210 Vine Street was constructed about 1870. The one-story garage building at 207 New Street was constructed in 1948. The one-story buildings at 211 and 209 New St were created by cutting down and altering older buildings in 1941 and 1943 respectively.

The Historical Commission individually designated the property at an undocumented date prior to the adoption of the current preservation ordinance in 1984, hence the 31 December 1984 individual designation date. The Historical Commission classified five components of the property separately in the inventory for the Old City Historic District when it designated the district on 12 December 2003. It classified the structures at 208, 210, and 212 Vine Street and at 209-11 New Street as contributing and the structure at 209 New Street as non-contributing.

Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance expressly prohibits the Historical Commission from approving demolitions of historic buildings unless it determines that:

- the demolition is necessary in the public interest; and/or,
- the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

In the first instance, the ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to approve demolitions for public policy reasons, when the public interest advanced by the demolition greatly outweighs the public interest in the preservation of the building. In the second instance, the ordinance authorizes the Commission to approve demolitions when preservation regulation of the property denies all economically viable use of it and thereby inflicts a financial hardship on the owner. This application asks the Historical Commission to approve the demolition because the complex of buildings cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

The application includes:

1. Affidavit of Thomas S. Bond, Real Estate Broker
2. Appraisal Report
3. Condition Assessment Reports from O'Donnell & Naccarato

- A. Supplemental Condition Assessment, 2/27/2023
- B. Supplemental Field Invest Report, 1/12/2018
- C. Visual Condition Assessment, 11/3/2017
- 4. Construction Cost Estimates, Becker & Frondorf
- 5. Conceptual Approval Submission, 2014
- 6. Developer Letters
- 7. Photographs of Property
- 8. Photographs of Surrounding Neighborhood
- 9. Aerials and Maps
- 10. Zoning File for 244-58 N 2nd Street
- 11. Articles on John Stortz & Son Inc

The application details efforts to market the property for adaptive reuse since 2014. In 2014, the Historical Commission approved an application in concept to rehabilitate the buildings on Vine Street and construct a large addition on the buildings on New Street for residential use. Several developers sequentially entered into sales agreements for the property and evaluated residential conversions during their due diligence periods. In the end, all the developers who considered purchasing the property determined that adaptive reuse was infeasible and abandoned the projects.

The application includes several assessments of the condition of the property by a structural engineer. It also includes construction cost estimates for four scenarios: to stabilize the buildings; to stabilize the buildings and convert the space to a “vanilla box,” presumably unfinished but code-compliant interior space; stabilization and residential fit-out in the existing buildings; and stabilization and residential fit-out in the existing buildings plus the addition approved in concept in 2014. The application includes letters from two real estate developers asserting that they have reviewed the in-concept redevelopment scheme, conditions assessments, construction cost estimates, and other materials and have concluded that the property cannot be developed in a way that provides a reasonable return on investment.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish all structures.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - o The complete demolition of the structures fails to satisfy Standards 2 and 5.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City’s historic preservation ordinance: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission’s opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the*

property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

- o The application seeks to prove that the buildings at 208-12 Vine Street cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted.
- *Section 14-1005(5)(b)(.7) of the historic preservation ordinance: The Historical Commission may further require the owner to conduct, at the owner's expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.*
- *Section 9.2.b of the Rules and Regulations: As provided by Section 141005(5)(b)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code, the Commission may also require the owner to conduct, at the owner's expense, evaluations and studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternative uses consistent with preservation. If the Commission requires an owner to conduct additional evaluations and studies, these shall, at a minimum, include:*
 1. *identification of reasonable uses or reuses for the property within the context of the property and its location;*
 2. *rehabilitation cost estimates for the identified reasonable uses or reuses, including the basis for the cost estimates;*
 3. *a ten-year pro forma of projected revenues and expenses for the reasonable uses or reuses that takes into consideration the utilization of tax incentives and other incentive programs;*
 4. *estimates of the current value of the property based upon the ten-year projection of income and expenses and the sale of the property at the end of that period, and*
 5. *estimates of the required equity investment including a calculation of the Internal Rate of Return based on the actual cash equity required to be invested by the owner.*
 - o The application identifies and provides cost estimates for a reuse and then offers the opinions of experts contending that the reuse is not viable, but it does not provide a 10-year pro forma that documents all the assumptions regarding hard and soft costs, incentives, expenses, and revenues and then estimates the net present value of the development project. Such a pro forma should be provided because it would allow all assumptions to be interrogated. For example, a pro forma would allow the assumptions to be tested with sensitivity analyses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission require the submission of a 10-year pro forma that will allow the assumptions behind expenses, revenues, and incentives for the residential rehabilitation project to be tested and confirmed.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Financial Hardship voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the matter to allow for the submission of additional materials and to remand the matter to the Committee on Financial Hardship for additional review.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:52:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips, property owner John Stortz, financial consultant Autumn Harris, and realtor Thomas Bond represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips introduced his client and consultant. He stated that his construction cost estimator was unable to attend. He stated that they do not deny the historic significance of these buildings both to the City of Philadelphia and to the Stortz family. He stated that the owner had marketed the property for 10 years. Several reputable developers put the property under agreement and analyzed redeveloping it. In the end, all potential developers rejected the property as infeasible for redevelopment. He introduced the various sections of the application, which was submitted by affidavit. He explained that they analyzed four redevelopment schemes to see if they would be financially feasible. The schemes included an eight-unit plan for residences in the historic buildings as well as 24, 49, and 57-unit schemes. He remarked that they were only legally obligated to consider the eight-unit scheme in the historic buildings but analyzed the others to be thorough and to counter claims made by the Preservation Alliance at earlier meetings. He stated that none of the schemes produced a reasonable rate of return. All would lose money. He stated that Mr. Stortz, the owner, would be willing to save features of the building like the pressed metal parapet. He also stated that Mr. Stortz would be willing to donate artifacts related to the 175-year-old manufacturing business to a museum or other repository.
- Mr. Stortz introduced himself and provided some background on his family's company, which has occupied the buildings since before the Civil War.
- Ms. Harris, who prepared the financial analyses of the four schemes, introduced herself and provided some background on her 20-year career in financing commercial real estate. She presented pro formas describing the finances of the four potential scenarios, 8 units, 24 units, 49 units and 57 units. She discussed the income generated by and the expenses incurred by the schemes. She explained how she derived her projected rents and minimum cap rate. She stated that she was aggressive with the numbers to really test her conclusions. She showed slides of all of her numbers documenting her analyses. She concluded that none of the four schemes would be financially feasible. None would produce a reasonable rate of return.
- Mr. Bond, the owner's realtor, addressed the Historical Commission. He stated that he has been marketing the property for a decade. Several prominent developers have looked at the property, brought it under contract, done their due diligence, and decided that they cannot feasibly adaptively reuse it. The historic designation prevents the property from being sold.
- Mr. Thomas suggested that, if the Historical Commission determined that there was no feasible reuse for the historic buildings, then it should not approve any demolition unless and until a developer was ready to construct a new building on the site.
 - o Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, to comment on the assertion.
 - o Mr. Reuter stated that, if the Historical Commission finds that there is no feasible reuse for the property, it must relax its regulation to allow for the property to regain some value, likely through the demolition of the buildings. However, it may include reasonable conditions on any approval of demolition. He added that any new construction will be subject to the Historical Commission's review regardless of how any demolition is conditioned.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that all of the reuse schemes that were considered propose residential conversion. She asked if a use besides residential use might produce a profitable redevelopment project.

- o Mr. Phillips stated that the surrounding neighborhood is almost entirely residential, and his consultants determined that residential was the highest and best use.
- o Mr. Bond agreed that residential is the only plausible reuse for this site.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if historic tax credits were factored into the financial analysis.
 - o Ms. Harris responded that the sizes of the four schemes are too small to benefit from the historic tax credit program. She also noted that the tax credit are only applicable to the work within the historic buildings, the eight units, which is much too small a project to support all of the work that comes with obtaining the credits.
- Mr. Lech thanked the owner for the tremendous effort and expense put into the application. He stated that the fact that the property has been on the market for nearly 10 years and has not been able to be developed or sold is very telling. He stated that he believes that the applicants have proved their case.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert wondered if one or both of the two older houses on Vine Street could be saved.
 - o Mr. Phillips stated that they retained an engineer to analyze the stabilization of the front buildings. They concluded that stabilizing them would be prohibitively expensive.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the supplemented application should be referred back to the Committee on Financial Hardship. He also stated that the Historical Commission needs to think about the impact of the current high interest rate environment and high construction costs as opposed to a few years ago. He noted that the applicant is assuming a construction cost of \$550 per square foot. He claimed that the current open-shop rate that most developers pay is less than half that, about \$210 per square foot. He stated that he firmly believes that there is another alternative. He suggested that the owner should simply list the property for sale, as is, and it will sell if the price reflects its current condition.
 - o Messrs. Phillips and Bond disagreed with Mr. Steinke about the potential for a sale and about his suggested construction costs. Mr. Phillips stated that the construction cost estimates were developed by Becker & Frondorf, one of the most prestigious cost estimation firms in the area. Mr. Bond noted that no developer was interested in buying the property when interest rates were at all-time lows.
 - o Mr. Farnham objected to Mr. Steinke's suggestion to refer this application back to the Committee on Financial Hardship. He stated that, unlike the other advisory committees, the Committee on Financial Hardship is comprised entirely of Commissioners and all of those Commissioners are in attendance today. No additional expertise would be brought to bear if the matter were referred to the Committee.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites recommended retaining the front facades of the buildings on Vine Street.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property at 208-12 Vine Street was marketed for sale to developers for nearly 10 years, yet no buyers were identified.

- The financial analyses demonstrate that an eight-unit plan for residences in the historic buildings on Vine Street as well as 24, 49, and 57-unit residential schemes for the historic buildings with new rear additions do not produce reasonable rates of return. The four redevelopment schemes are financially infeasible.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application demonstrates that the buildings at 208-12 Vine Street cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted. The sale of the property is impracticable, commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find that the application demonstrates that the buildings at 208-12 Vine Street cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted and to approve the complete demolition of them, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, provided no demolition is undertaken until a zoning permit and financing for new construction have been obtained. Mr. Treat seconded the motion, which was adopted by a vote of 8 to 0.

ITEM: 208-12 VINE ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Treat					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman					X
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	8				4

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:19:50

ACTION: At 1:38 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: Adjourn					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman					X
Kindt (DPD)					X
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	8				4

PLEASE NOTE:

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

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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

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