THE MINUTES OF THE 640TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 11 DECEMBER 2015
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR

PRESENT
Sam Sherman, Chair
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Celeste Morello
Kate Robinson
Rob Nydick
Margaret Rzepski
Thom Beattie
Don Gould, Olde Richmond Civic Association
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Jack Southwell
Beth Chekemian
Emily Cooperman, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Aaron Wunsch
Kathy Dowdell, AIA Philadelphia
Carolyn Adams, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Randy Williams, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Marla Marko
Mike Marko
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Frank Niepold, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Joe Bergan
Andrew Fearon
Kim DeStratis, Friday Architects
J.M. Duffin
Marc Collazzo, Office of Pennsylvania Representative John Taylor

DRAFT

Phillip Stoltzfus
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Daniel Mulholland, Olde Richmond Civic Association
Oscar Beisert
Ori Feibush, OCF
Sean McMonagle, Office of Councilman Mark Squilla

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners DiPietro, Hawkins, Leonard, Mattioni, McDade, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 639TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 639th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 November 2015. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 17 DECEMBER 2015
Dominique Hawkins, Chair

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2044 LOCUST ST
Project: Remove rear bay, construct rear addition, renovate front facade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Beth Chekemian
Applicant: Frank Mallas, Friday Architects/Planners, Inc.
History: 1860; altered 1912 by Baker & Dallett, 1934 by Grant Simon
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and add to a rowhouse at 2044 Locust Street.

The application proposes to renovate the front façade including replacing the windows. Most of the proposed work can be reviewed for approval by the staff. However, the application proposes new windows in subframes, which would reduce the sizes of the historic openings. Also, the proposed casements would include center posts, which would not replicate the historic French casements. The applicant should work with the staff to identify windows and other rehabilitation work that satisfies preservation standards.

The rear of the building faces Latimer Street, a narrow, dead-end alley. The rears of Locust Street buildings stand along the north side of Latimer. Small rowhouses face the south side of this end of the block. Maps show that the main block was originally three stories and the rear ell two. The house was significantly modified in the early twentieth century, probably in 1912, perhaps by the architectural firm of Baker & Dallett. The main block was increased in height to four stories and the rear ell to three. The front façade was reconstructed in a Colonial Revival

style. At that time, the rear bay at the first, second, and third floors and a side yard infill addition were likely constructed. In 1934, architect Grant Simon converted the building to offices for Dr. Thomas M. McMillan Jr., adding a fourth story to the rear ell and rear bay. It appears that the rear bay was poorly reclad in metal at some point.

The application proposes to remove the four-story rear bay and construct an addition to the rear of the building. The addition would include a deck. A non-historic rear garden wall at the street would be removed to allow for parking. The application offers two alternative designs. In the first alternate design, the rear bay and side yard additions would be removed and an addition spanning the full width of the property would be constructed. In the second alternate design, the rear bay would be removed and an addition the width of the existing rear ell would be constructed.

The Historical Commission approved similar projects for rear additions at 2018 Locust in 2003 and at 2041 Locust in 2013.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Leonard Reuter, architect Kim DeStratis, contractor Jack Southwell, and owner Beth Chekemian represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the application is comprised of two sections, work to the front façade and work to the rear. On the front façade, the windows should, but do not, to match the historic windows. The Committee recommended denial of the windows, which do not replicate the historic windows. She recommended that the applicants withdraw those windows and work with staff to identify an appropriate window that can be approved by the staff. The second section of the application involves removing the rear bay and constructing an addition. She explained that this section of the building faces a small street that is bounded by building rears on the north side and building fronts on the south side. She acknowledged that many of the rears of the buildings on the north side have been significantly altered. She remarked that the Committee determined that, although not original, the bay and other alterations at the rear have significance. She noted that the bay has been reclad, but the shape and design of the bay survives as documented in the Sanborn Atlas and should be preserved.

Mr. Reuter stated that they will not apply for the work to the front façade separately, but would be willing to work with the staff on the details. He asserted that the owner will not improve the front façade unless the proposed rear alterations are approved. He stated that the rear faces Latimer Street, which is an alley that dead ends at the back of the St. Patrick's Church. It is not a thoroughfare; no one but the residents uses this alley. Although the alley is on the City Plan, it is too narrow to meet the current requirements of an open street. It is an alley. Mr. Reuter displayed photographs of the north side of the alley and claimed that the buildings facing it have been much altered. He asserted that the rears of these buildings have the character of secondary façades, with trash collection and some parking pads. He claimed that, even on the south side, there are some rears of houses, one of which has been modified with Historical Commission approval. He explained that, because the alley is an open street, it is possible to build to the rear property line without a zoning variance. He explained that the house in question is one of the smaller houses on Locust Street and these owners have a growing family and would like more space. Although the bay seems to date to 1912, it is not original and has been significantly modified. In 1934, it was expanded for a doctor's office. Mr. Reuter opined that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards & Guidelines allow for additions on secondary facades. He asked if the bay can be considered a character-defining feature simply because it is 100 years old. He asserted that it is not a character-defining feature because it is at the rear, is not original, and has been modified several times. He opined that it was probably re-clad in the

1970s. He said that the rear yard was excavated for a basement entrance in the 1970s. He claimed that the Commission has approved at least two significant rear alterations on this block. He claimed that almost every rear on the block has been altered at one point or another.

Ms. Hawkins said that the Committee did not discuss the excavation of the rear yard during its review. She contended that no evidence had been presented to dispute the dating of the bay as documented in the Sanborn map. She reiterated that it would still have significance even if re-clad. Mr. Reuter countered that the question is whether the bay is a character-defining feature. He claimed that it is not. He asserted that changes to secondary facades can be approved in compliance with the Standards. Mr. Reuter contended that the applicants will not restore the front unless they are given permission to alter the rear. He said that the cost of the work to the front would exceed $40,000. He stated that the contractor, who is currently working on the interior, can testify regarding the bay. Mr. Southwell testified that the bay is in poor shape and would need to be partially reconstructed. In his opinion, the cladding might date to the 1960s or 1970s.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged that most of the other rears on this block have been altered over time. He stated that, in general, the Commission has been primarily concerned with front facades. When Society Hill was redeveloped, the fronts of the rowhouses were restored, but the rears were altered or reconstructed in new forms. He stated that the Commission sometimes protects unique aspects of buildings, even if they are not visible from the street. Mr. Thomas stated that he is familiar with the block. The majority of the block is rears that have been altered. This building is set back into a slot and does not hold the street line. He said that construction that holds the street line can be considered beneficial. He said that there are many metal bays and not everyone is special. If this one had been by Wilson Eyre, it might be more important. This bay is not significant. He stated that he is conflicted with regard to this application, but can make an argument that the application satisfies the Standards. He noted that this project would certainly benefit the property. He stated that one would hardly even notice the proposed addition because all of the other buildings are already built out to the property line. If this bay were very unique or valuable, he would oppose the application. However, the bay is not significant; there are thousands of similar pressed metal bays in the city. The proposed design would, in fact, fit in with the character of the alley.

Mr. Baron claimed that the bay is the work of two important architects, Baker & Dallett, who constructed it in 1912, and Grant Simon, the architect for the Fidelity Building, who added to it in 1934. He noted that it is part of a Colonial Revival alteration to the building, which carries through from the front to the rear façade. Mr. Baron also objected to the removal of the non-historic concrete-masonry-unit garden wall and a flowering tree. He asserted that this project includes a proposal for parking that would obstruct the public right-of-way. Mr. Reuter countered that the architects' connections to this bay are tenuous. It is not a significant architectural element. Mr. Farnham disputed Mr. Baron's assertion that Baker & Dallett constructed the bay. He stated that they may have, but it is merely an attribution.

Messrs. Thomas and Schaaf asked about the plans showing the parking area. They asked if the plan is to park the car in the public right-of-way. Mr. Reuter stated that the Streets Department will determine if a car can be legally parked in that location. Mr. Schaaf stated that the Commission needs to know whether a car can be legally parked in that location. Mr. Reuter replied that only the Streets Department can make that determination. He stated that his client will not park illegally. Mr. Thomas asked for the distance between the rear of the building and the property line. The architect could not provide this information. Mr. Schaaf said that, judging from the other distances on the plan, it would appear to be 7'-6" from the rear of the wall to the curb. The architect pointed out that she had provided two alternate plans, H 1.1, the more

desired option, and H 1.2 is an alternate that would preserve the side wall of the rear ell. Mr. Thomas said that he advocated for the approval of the addition with the assumption that it would respect the rear property line. Mr. Reuter said that they would set aside the parking at this time if the Commission would approve the addition. He noted that the parking would be dealt with later. Mr. Sherman asked how many square feet would be added with this addition. The architect did not know the answer, but Mr. Reuter estimated that it would add 300 square feet.

Ms. Hawkins said that she thought it was important for the Commission to consider the drawings as presented. She said that those drawings show a car extending out into the street and an addition of about 300 square feet. Mr. Schaaf asked if any drawing shows the rear property line. Ms. DeStratis referred him to one of the drawings with a site plan. He asked if they had commissioned a survey. She said that they had not.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Turner dissented.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 2 DECEMBER 2015

Richardson Dilworth III, Chair

8330 MILLMAN STREET, VANNA VENTURI HOUSE - CONTINUANCE REQUESTED

Nominator: Kathleen Abplanalp and Emily Cooperman, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Owner: Estate of Thomas and Agatha Hughes
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the property at 8330 Millman Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 8330 Millman Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. World-renowned architect Robert Venturi designed and built the house for his mother, Vanna Venturi, in the late 1950s and early 1960s. It is widely considered one of the world's most important architectural landmarks of the twentieth century. The subject of numerous books, articles, and essays, the house marks a pivotal shift in architectural theory and design, signifying the end of Modernism and the start of Post-Modernism. The Historical Commission designated Venturi's Guild House on Spring Garden Street, which occupies a similarly prominent position in the canon of architectural history, in 2004.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination for 8330 Millman Street and a request from the property owner to table the matter to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee on Historic Designation did consider the merits of the nomination and make a recommendation that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. He noted that the claim of historic significance has not been disputed by the property owner, and in fact, this building is recognized as one of the great architectural monuments of the twentieth century; there is no disputing that it is an exceptionally important building. Mr. Farnham directed the Commission's attention to the letter before them from the property owner's attorney, requesting that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination to allow the owner an opportunity to consider the impact of designation, and

primarily the impact of designation on a potential easement and the value of that easement. He noted that it is a very special property that is likely to change hands soon. The current owner would like an opportunity to consider the implications of designation as the property is being marketed for resale. Mr. Farnham explained that the building was designed by world-famous architect Robert Venturi for his mother, and the current owner's parents were the second owners of the house and were always excellent stewards of the property, using the architectural firm of Venturi Scott Brown to advise them on any work to the house. The house, he continued, is in pristine condition and is not under any threat. Mr. Farnham noted that the request is to continue the nomination to the fall of 2016.

Mr. Sherman asked if the nominator was present. Emily Cooper, a member of the Board of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society (CHHS) who helped prepare the nomination, addressed the Commission. She noted that the nomination derives from a long-term effort to preserve this monument for the future. Owing to the imminent change of ownership, she continued, the CHHS felt that undertaking a nomination at this juncture was prudent. Lori Salganicoff, the executive director of the CHHS, noted that the AIA Pennsylvania recently gave the Vanna Venturi House its 50 Year Timeless Award. She stated that it is surprising that there are no preservation protections on this icon. She continued that when the CHHS received a grant from the Preservation Alliance in summer 2015 to work on updating the Chestnut Hill National Register nomination to include the nearly 90 mid-century buildings as Contributing, they also agreed to work on at least one Philadelphia Register nomination. She noted that, at that time, she attempted to get in touch with the owner of the Vanna Venturi House, but was unable to do so, and moved forward with the nomination. The nomination, she noted, has also been submitted to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, which currently classifies the building in the National Register district as "intrusion by reason of age." The building, she noted, was considered for inclusion on the National Register 15 or 16 years ago by PHMC in an earlier effort to recognize the building, but was rejected because Robert Venturi was still practicing. Ms. Cooperman noted that that decision was based on National Park Service policy. One of the reasons the CHHS submitted the nomination to the National Register previously, Ms. Salganicoff noted, is because they had worked with Thomas Hughes, the father of the current owner, to craft an easement that would have protected both the interior and exterior of the building. When the National Register nomination was rejected, the easement effort was stopped. Ms. Salganicoff commented that, through the letter and subsequent conversations with the current owner's attorney, they became aware that an easement might again be considered. She noted that the Historical Commission would retain jurisdiction during the tabling period, but if the Commission chose to designate the property at this time, the value of the easement would be greatly diminished. She noted that a preservation easement can be granted to a property essentially for the value of the property that the owner gives up with the easement, and, if the building is designated, then there is no benefit that can be recognized by the IRS. Therefore, she asked the Commission to approve the request for the continuance. She noted her organization would not support a withdrawal of the nomination.

Mr. Thomas opined that the request makes sense. He noted that nothing inappropriate will happen to the property during the tabling period, and that, along with the tax benefits that would flow to the new owner, there would be the added benefit of additional protections on the building. Mr. Thomas asked if the easement would be held by the CHHS. Ms. Salganicoff responded that that is up to the owner, but that CHHS would love to have the easement. She noted that the owner should seek an easement with an organization that is capable of monitoring it, and that the CHHS is one of those organizations. Ms. Salganicoff noted that CHHS is the nation's first land trust.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance noted that a grant from the Preservation Alliance partially made this nomination possible, and seconded the support of the continuance request to pursue a preservation easement. He commented that it is his hope that, whatever the outcome, this property receives the protection that it deserves, and that is done so in a way that benefits present and future owners, the neighborhood of Chestnut Hill, and the City of Philadelphia.

Some Commission members expressed their confusion regarding the length the requested continuance. Mr. Farnham responded that it is his understanding that the various parties are requesting a continuance to the fall of 2016. Mr. Sherman, Ms. Merriman, and Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant should check in every 90 days with the Commission to make sure that the easement discussions and the nomination are moving forward. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission does not want to delay the designation of the property any longer than it has to.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to table the nomination of 8330 Millman Street for 90 days to the March 2016 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

101 W GRAVERS LANE - CONTINUANCE REQUESTED
Nominator: Jennifer Robinson, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Owner: 101 Gravers LLC
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Laverty moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination for 101 W. Gravers Lane and to remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation when the discussions between the various parties are complete. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 101 W. Gravers Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, H, I and J. The nomination argues that the single-family residence, with the main block constructed by stonemason Lewis Headman in 1867 and 1868, is a well-preserved example of a vernacular interpretation of an architect-designed dwelling. The nomination further argues that the building is significant for being a visual landmark in Chestnut Hill, owing to its location on a corner lot, and that the site may be likely to yield information important in history, as the house sits approximately on the site of the former Union Chapel.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the request to table or continue the nomination for 101 W. Gravers Lane to the Commission.

Mr. Farnham noted that the request was made prior to the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, and as such, the Committee did not review the nomination on its merits. He stated that the Committee recommended that the nomination be remanded back to the Committee for review at a later date. Mr. Farnham noted that, like the previous continuance request, this request is open-ended, and that there are on-going discussions regarding preservation easements for the property. In the meantime, he continued, it will remain under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission.

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

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to table the nomination of 101 W. Gravers Lane for 60 days, to the February 2016 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

209-25 N. 18TH STREET, PAINTINGS (OBJECTS) IN CATHEDRAL OF STS. PETER & PAUL

Nominator: Celeste Morello
Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the reviews of the nominations for 209-25 N. 18th Street and 900 S. 20th Street and to remand them back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate five oil-on-canvas paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street as historic objects and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the paintings, executed by artist/decorator Constantino Brumidi, satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. The nomination argues that the paintings are significant works of art by an important designer, Constantino Brumidi, whose artistic production has significantly influenced the cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, and that the oil paintings exemplify the heritage of Philadelphia's Catholic community.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Leonard recused. Mr. Farnham presented the continuance requests for 209-25 N. 18th Street and 900 S. 20th Street to the Commission. Celeste Morello represented the nominations.

Ms. Morello noted that, at the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, she presented to Michael Phillips, attorney for the Archdiocese, a list of Roman Catholic churches listed on the Philadelphia Register. She noted that some of these churches were designed by Edwin Forrest Durang, the architect of St. Charles Borromeo Church, which is proposed for designation. Regarding the paintings, she commented that Mr. Phillips had objected to the nomination for potential violations of the First Amendment. Ms. Morello noted that the Archdiocese had not objected to the two previous nominations she submitted, one for moveable art at Old St. Joseph's in Society Hill, and the second for frescoes at St. Augustine's Church; the latter was made a feature in the Augustinian's magazine, she noted. As such, she opined, it seems there is support among the Archdiocese, who sent out a press release in which they took full credit for her work. Ms. Morello took the press release and other recent literature as tacit approval of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over artwork. In addition to the letter she submitted, she continued, the five paintings seem to be the only original objects in the interior in the Cathedral Basilica that date to the 1864 dedication, and as such are integral to the building, even though they can be removed. In the art world, she noted, it is impressive that the paintings were done by Constantino Brumidi, who also executed paintings in the interior of the the United States Capitol.

Mr. Farnham asked Ms. Morello if she still supported the continuance request, as she had at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Ms. Morello responded that she does support the request, and understands that there may be some discussion of the theological implications, specifically of the Roman Catholic doctrine on sacred art. She noted that she told the attorney for the Archdiocese that he is welcome to see her sources from which she cited the information, and everything she has is open to him to clarify the issue with the Archdiocese.

Attorney Michael Phillips, representative of the Archdiocese, noted that the request for a continuance with respect to the paintings is twofold. He noted that the Archdiocese has significant First Amendment concerns with respect to its personal property and sacred religious works of art that can only be construed as having being designated as historic by a municipality, and the implications for the separation of church and state. The request for a continuance, he noted, is in order to analyze the complex legal issues and be prepared to discuss them fully at the subsequent meeting. In addition, the Archdiocese would like time to consider the merits of the nomination of the paintings as well as the nomination of St. Charles Borromeo Church. He continued that the parishes are active, functioning parishes, and there is no danger whatsoever to the paintings or the church.

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

> **ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to accept the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation, and continue the consideration of the nominations for 209-25 N. 18th Street and 900 S. 20th Street to the next meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation in March 2016. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

900 S. 20TH STREET, ST. CHARLES BORROMEO CHURCH

Nominator: Celeste Morello
Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the reviews of the nominations for 209-25 N. 18th Street and 900 S. 20th Street and to remand them back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate St. Charles Borromeo Church and rectory at 900 S. 20th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. The nomination argues that hybrid Romanesque/Baroque St. Charles Borromeo Roman Catholic Church is architecturally significant as part of the national culture of the post-Civil War era when combinations of "revival" styles emerged in American architecture. Its rectory is a fine example of the Second Empire architectural style. The nomination further contends that the church is significant owing to its architect, Edwin Forrest Durang, one of the foremost American ecclesiastical architects.

DISCUSSION: See discussion and action for 209-25 N. 18th Street.

1105-09 FRANKFORD AVENUE

Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc.
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination for 1105-09 Frankford Avenue and remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends

DRAFT

that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed as two separate buildings in the late nineteenth century, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Thomas recused, owing to his firm's involvement with the property at 1115-27 Frankford Avenue. Mr. Farnham presented the continuance requests for the nominations for 1105-09, 1111-13, and 1115-27 Frankford Avenue to the Commission.

Mr. Farnham noted that there are two owners of the three properties. The properties at 1105-09 and 1111-13 Frankford Avenue are both owned by Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc. The property at 1115-27 Frankford Avenue is owned by Driscoll Construction Co. Both property owners have requested that the Commission table the nominations and remand them to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its meeting in March 2016. Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee on Historic Designation did not review the merits of the nominations. The Commissioners discussed the continuance requests and determined that they had merit.

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

> **ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to table the nominations for 1105-09, 1111-13, and 1115-27 Frankford Avenue and remand them to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its next meeting in March 2016. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1111-13 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc.
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination for 1111-13 Frankford Avenue and remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1111-13 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1899, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: See discussion and action for 1105-09 Frankford Avenue.

1115-27 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Driscoll Construction Co.
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination for 1115-27 Frankford Avenue and remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1115-27 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1902, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: See discussion and action for 1105-09 Frankford Avenue.

631 ADDISON STREET
Applicant: Jeffery M. King
Owner: Robert Nydick III and Katherine Mary Robinson
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that the Historical Commission reclassify 631 Addison Street from contributing to non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, pursuant to Sections 14-203(78) and 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance, because the building does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the property at 631 Addison Street from its current classification of contributing to non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The inventory for the district dates this building to 1950, but newly discovered documents irrefutably date it to 1970 or later. Although the building shares some stylistic affinities like the windows and roofline with Redevelopment Era houses classified as contributing to the district, its stucco cladding and setback from the sidewalk differentiate it from those buildings, which are all brick and built to the sidewalk.

Section 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance stipulates that "Any designation of a building, structure, site, object, or district as historic may be amended or rescinded in the same manner as is specified for designation." Section 5.14.a.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations explains that "Amendment presupposes that the historic resource under consideration," in this case the historic district, "continues to meet the criteria for entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places." The regulation then observes that "Amendment includes … the revision of a district classification," but offers no guidance or criteria for reclassification. Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance defines a contributing building

as “A building … within a historic district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Historical Commission’s designation.”

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the reclassification request to the Historical Commission. Owners Robert Nydick and Katherine Robinson represented the application.

The Commissioners discussed the reclassification request and determined that granting the request was merited.

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

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and approve the reclassification of the property at 631 Addison Street from Contributing to Non-Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District inventory. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1839-43 ELLSWORTH STREET, HARRISON DAY NURSERY
Nominator: Kim Broadbent, Staff of Philadelphia Historical Commission
Owner: Lincoln Day Nursery
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1839-43 Ellsworth Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1839-43 Ellsworth Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. The nomination argues that the purpose-built daycare center, constructed in 1899 for the Harrison Day Nursery, is significant as an example of a late Furness, Evans and Co. design, commissioned by William West Frazier, a close friend of Frank Furness. The nomination further argues that the building is significant for its association with the Harrison Day Nursery and Lincoln Day Nursery, two agencies that merged to provide desegregated child care at this location in 1923.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission as the preparer of the nomination.

The Commissioners discussed the nomination and determined that the property satisfies the cited Criteria and designation is merited. The Commissioners commended Ms. Broadbent on the preparation of the excellent nomination.

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

> **ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the property at 1839-43 Ellsworth Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5710 WISSAHICKON AVENUE, FRANCIS R. STRAWBRIDGE HOUSE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Eastview Realty Association
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5710 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5710 Wissahickon Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. The nomination argues that the house, constructed in 1905-06 for Francis R. Strawbridge, is significant as an intact example of a Brockie & Hastings interpretation of the Colonial Revival style, as well as for being a fine example of the Georgian tradition of architecture in Philadelphia, and in Germantown specifically. The nomination further contends that the house is significant for its association with its first owner, Francis R. Strawbridge, the son of Justus C. Strawbridge, co-founder of the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, as well as his son G. Stockton Strawbridge.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert noted that he met with members of the Strawbridge family to prepare the nomination, and that it is one of the last houses of the family left in the neighborhood. Architecturally, he noted, it is a great example of the Colonial Revival style.

Mr. Farnham reminded that Commission that they had continued the review of this nomination from the Committee on Historic Designation meeting in September 2015 to its meeting in December at the request of the property owner. Therefore, the property owner, who is represented by an attorney, is aware of the nomination and the Commission's consideration of it today.

The Commissioners discussed the nomination and determined that the property satisfies the cited Criteria and designation is merited.

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

> **ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the property at 5710 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D and E, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DRAFT

1003 FRANKFORD AVENUE, FREDERICK RAPP HOUSE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Fulwider II Corp A PA Corp
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1003 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. Mr. Mooney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1003 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

The nomination argues that the house, constructed between 1785 and 1787, is significant as an example of "an average to slightly above-average house type of the late eighteenth century in the Fishtown section of the larger Kensington neighborhood, within the larger post-Revolution context of Philadelphia." The nomination claims that the Rapp House is the oldest known dwelling in Fishtown and the larger Kensington neighborhood. The nomination further contends that the house is significant for its association with its first owner, Frederick Rapp, a doctor and German soldier.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee on Historic Designation's archaeologist, Doug Mooney, had suggested that this site might contain archaeological artifacts of great significance, but such a determination would rest upon whether or not the rear ell of the building has a basement or not. Mr. Farnham stated that Mr. Mooney asked that the staff to explore this matter and report back, so the nomination may be amended at some point in the future to include Criterion I, but that that Criterion is not included in the current nomination. The Commission discussed the nomination and agreed that it successfully demonstrated that the property satisfies the Criteria recommended by the Committee.

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

> **ACTION:** Ms. Turner moved to find that at the property at 1003 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1101-03 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Shifco Holdings LLC
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1101-03 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for A, C, and J, but not Criterion H. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1101-03 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the building, constructed in two phases, the first in 1851 and the second in 1856, is significant in

the development of Kensington as part of several industrial enterprises: the Martin Landenberger Hosiery Mill Complex (1851-1920), the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of a "distinctive industrial pile of a mid-nineteenth century urban mill and/or industrial building," and claims that it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

The Commission discussed the nomination and agreed that it successfully demonstrated that the property satisfies the Criteria recommended by the Committee.

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

> **ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the property 1101-03 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2640-42 AND 2644-58 E HUNTINGDON STREET
Nominator: Andrew Fearon, Kensington and Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC
Owner: 2640 E Huntingdon LLC
COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Mr. Laverty seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 1. Mr. Dilworth dissented.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A former church stands on the site. The church building is composed of two separate but connected structures, an 1848 chapel and an 1892 addition. The nomination proposes designating the 1848 section as historically significant, but not the 1892 section.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. The nomination argues that the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Messiah, constructed about 1848, is significant as a work of the prominent Philadelphia architect John Notman. The nomination further contends that the chapel is significant as an early example of the Gothic Revival style.

The building has been altered many times and is in very poor condition. The belfry has been lost. Most, if not all, original windows and doors have been lost and most window openings have been infilled. An addition with a roll-down gate was constructed in front of the entrance to the church. Other alterations include a fire escape and an exhaust fan. The roof is in very poor condition and the gable ends appear to be bowing significantly where water has infiltrated at the intersections of the gables and roofs. The masonry facades appear to have shifted and cracked at points. In late November, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited the building as imminently dangerous and ordered its immediate demolition. The demolition had not

commenced at the time of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, but commenced before the meeting of the Historical Commission. Prior to the submission of the nomination, a developer began to plan for the redevelopment of the site, which would include demolition of the existing structures and construction of new structures. When reviewing building permit applications, the Historical Commission may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the review of a nomination. The plans in place may constitute substantial design development.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Nominator Andrew Fearon represented the nomination.

Mr. Farnham noted that, approximately two weeks ago, just before Thanksgiving, the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) cited the building as Imminently Dangerous (ID) and ordered its immediate demolition. That demolition, he noted, had not commenced at the time of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting, but has subsequently commenced. Mr. Farnham read the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation that the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Mr. Farnham noted that there was significant discussion about the integrity of the building at the Committee meeting and it was decided at that time that the building retained sufficient integrity to satisfy the Criteria for Designation. However, he said, it is a fluid situation, as the building is currently being demolished.

Ms. Merriman stated that the Historical Commission's record on buildings declared Imminently Dangerous is clear, the Historical Commission does not designate them, and lets the determination of the L&I inspector stand.

> **MOTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to reject the nomination for the property at 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street and to refuse to designate it. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion.

Mr. Thomas commented that, in some cases, something less than a complete demolition is necessary to make an imminently dangerous building safe; portions of buildings are sometimes left standing after the dangers have been abated. He noted that, if this is such a case, a nomination could be resubmitted for the remaining portion of the building. He explained that, for example, he was involved in a case several years ago in which buildings were declared imminently dangerous, but the structural problems were limited to the rear ells. The rear ells were demolished to abate the dangerous conditions, but the fronts of the buildings were repaired.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham if he knew which portion of the property was declared ID. Mr. Farnham responded that the building was cited for walls that were bulging and unsafe, and a roof structure that was unsafe. Violations were issued to both tax parcels. He noted that the staff contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections as soon as they learned of the declaration and asked for information, and that the staff was sent photographs that showed an interior roof rafter broken and dislodged. The property maintenance code, he continued, was amended last summer and now stipulates that L&I can order the demolition of an imminently dangerous building that cannot be cannot feasibly or safely repaired and can order the repair or demolition of a building that can be cannot feasibly or safely repaired. He stated that it is his understanding that L&I determined that this building cannot be safely repaired and must be demolished. He stated that he has requested that L&I confirm that understanding, but has not yet heard back.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the 1892 companion building would be demolished as well. Mr. Farnham responded that L&I issued violations on both sections of the building. He noted that the building

sits on two parcels, and that the staff believes the property line runs roughly down the center of the addition, not dividing the old and less old structures cleanly. He noted that the buildings are very much interconnected by a cross-gable and additions at the front and back. Both tax parcels, he continued, have been cited as Imminently Dangerous, and it is his understanding that all parts of the structures will be demolished.

Sean Whalen, the attorney for the equitable owner of the property, Ori Feibush of OCF Realty, spoke regarding the demolition of the property. He stated that both portions of the building were declared Imminently Dangerous and would be demolished entirely.

Nominator Andrew Fearon, a member of the Old Richmond community and architectural conservator, emphasized the importance of the 1892 addition, noting that it appears that stones from the older portion of the church had been used in the construction of the addition. He opined that there is an interesting opportunity to save a portion of the church and site and to reintegrate it into new construction on the site. He asked to have the nomination stand and be reviewed. Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Fearon to clarify whether he was suggesting that the 1892 portion of the building should be designated as historic. Mr. Fearon responded affirmatively. Mr. Farnham spoke about the nomination, noting that Mr. Fearon was not the original nominator. The nomination was submitted by another party, withdrawn in the face of community opposition, and then resubmitted by Mr. Fearon. He noted that, prior to editing by the staff, the nomination only proposed designating the original 1840s portion of the building, not the 1892 section of the building, and only identified the address 2644-58 E. Huntingdon for designation. He explained that the building has two tax account addresses, 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street. He stated that he had significant concerns about the Commission attempting to regulate a part of a building; the 1892 addition is connected to the 1840s church in several points, and the exact location of the property line between 2640-42 and 2644-58 is unclear. To ensure that the Commission could successfully regulate the property, the staff amended the nomination to include the tax parcel at 2640-42 E. Huntingdon. Since the nomination made no claims about the historical significance of the 1892 addition, he continued, the staff stipulated in the amended nomination that the 2640-42 E. Huntingdon portion of the lot, which includes some or all of the 1892 addition, would be considered a non-contributing or non-historic portion of the structure. He clarified that the staff simply adjusted the boundary description to include the whole parcel and added a sentence that said that the 1892 section, at least as far as this nomination is concerned, would not be considered historic. Therefore, he stated, even if the Commission were to adopt the nomination today, the nomination states that the 1892 portion of the building is to be considered non-historic. Mr. Farnham noted that, while it may be a valid exercise to consider the partial reuse of the 1892 addition as Mr. Fearon suggests, the Commission does not have the opportunity to do so with the nomination before it today. The nominator has not made a case for the architectural or historical significance of the 1892 addition. Therefore, the Commission should not consider designating it as historic pursuant to the nomination before it.

Mr. Schaaf responded that there was significant discussion at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting about the quality of the 1892 addition, the architects of which were Hazelhurst & Huckle, a high-profile late nineteenth-century architectural firm. He noted that he could not name other ecclesiastical structures they had designed, but that Bruce Laverty of the Philadelphia Athenaeum had assured him that they had designed such buildings. Compositionally, he continued, the two buildings together are fascinating and rich, the 1840s building sitting out at the street, and the 1892 addition sitting back from the street and deferring to it, while almost matching it in appearance. He suggested that Hazelhurst & Huckle augmented John Notman's original building with their addition. He noted that he was not saying that his observations negate the L&I's declaration of Imminent Danger, but that it was argued at the Committee meeting that both parts of the structure have significance. Mr. Farnham again

observed that the 1892 addition may be historically significant, but no claim of its significance is proffered in the nomination. The Commission's task is to determine whether the nomination demonstrates that the building is significant, not simply to determine whether the building is significant.

Attorney Stanley Krakower spoke on behalf of attorney Michael Fennerty, representative of Olde Richmond Civic Association. He noted that many members of the community are opposed to the designation of the property. Although the building is called a church, it has not been used as a church for many decades, and is a nuisance to the community. He opined that the building cannot be used in a way that is not problematic for the community, and asserted that the proposed development would be much more appropriate for the neighborhood than a derelict building. He urged the Commission to deny designation.

Mark Collazo, Chief of Staff for State Representative John Taylor's office, stated that the property falls within Representative Taylor's district. He noted that Mr. Taylor has lived around the corner from this property for many years, and during his lifetime, the property has never been used as a church, but rather as a nuisance club. He noted that his office received complaints when the building functioned as a club, and continues to receive them now that the property is vacant and dangerous. He explained that they understand and appreciate the historical significance of the architect, but, from a practical standpoint for the community, they are trying to find a way to make the property more in keeping with the residential nature of the neighborhood. He cited the Conservatorship Act, which allows groups to take control of neglected properties and repair repurpose them. He observed that they were unsuccessful in finding anyone to do that with this property. He opined that a church at that location would be impossible, and all that is left is a danger to the community.

Sean McMonagle, from the office of Councilman Mark Squilla, agreed with Mr. Collazo and members of the community that the building cannot be saved and is a threat to the community and should probably be demolished.

Aaron Wunsch, a contributor to the nomination and professor of historic preservation at the University of Pennsylvania, stated that the opinions of the community and its political representatives regarding the building's use and other aspects of the property are irrelevant to the Commission's decision. He opined that the 1892 building is freestanding and that the Commission is empowered to consider its historic merits. He asserted that the Commission's staff had argued for the historical significance of the 1892 addition at a previous meeting and suggested that information about that significance should have been included in the nomination. He stated that this case raises particular concerns about the way the Historical Commission addresses the Department of Licenses & Inspections' declarations of Imminent Danger. He lamented that he is unable to review an engineer's report regarding the condition of the building and that outside engineers have not been able to assess its condition. He asserted that this case is clearly political. Ms. Hawkins clarified and emphasized that the motion to deny designation was made based on the Department of Licenses & Inspections' determination that the building is Imminently Dangerous and must be demolished. It is not based on a former or potential use or on the fact that the community's political representatives have advocated against the designation of the property.

> **ACTION:** By a vote of 8 to 0, the Historical Commission voted to adopt Ms. Merriman and Mr. Mattioni's motion to reject the nomination for the property at 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street and to refuse to designate it. Mr. Schaaf and Ms. Hawkins abstained.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:40 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. McDade 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.

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.

§ 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.

DRAFT