

**THE MINUTES OF THE 646TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 JUNE 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Antonio Fiol-Silva, AICP, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Malcolm Burnley, Philly Mag
J.M. Duffin
Oscar Beisert
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech
Nancy Drye
Kathy Dowdell
Arielle Harris
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
James J. Bleu, JJB, LLC
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
James Wright, Peoples Emergency Center
Stephen J. Maffei, Abitare Design Studio
Herb Reid, Maze Group
John Christian
Chuck Bode
Lucia Esther
John C. Manton
Kiki Bolender, Bolender Architects
Anne H. Arfaa
Peter Arfaa
Sallie Parfett
John Phillips, Powelton Village Civic Association
Carolyn Healy

Polly Koster
Patricia King
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Thomas Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
Bill Steedle, Graboyes Windows
Yossi Cohen, C3CCP
Bob Powers, Powers & Co.
John Scott
Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects
Michael McHale, AP Construction
Sean McMullan
Nick Nehez
Paul Boni, Esq.
George Poulin, Powelton Village Civic Association
Darwin Beauvais, Esq.
Joseph Menkevich
Gabriel Gottlieb
Lee Berman

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fiol-Silva, Long, McCoubrey, Merriman, Royer, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 645TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 645th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 May 2016. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MAY 2016

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included an application for Alden Park, which is known by several addresses, 2951, 2967, 2979, and 3001R W. School House Lane and 5702, 5710, and 5714 Wissahickon Avenue. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. He then asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. Several members in the audience asked the Commission to remove the Alden Park application from the agenda and discuss it as part of the regular agenda. The Commissioners agreed to remove the application from the Consent Agenda and place it on the Agenda.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 3600-30 LANCASTER AVE

Proposal: Demolish mid-block rear ells; construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AP Construction

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects

History: 1878; William Fennell Row

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rooftop mechanical equipment is not visible from the street, the overbuild at the fourth floor on the historic buildings is removed north of the main corridor, and more red brick is employed on the primary elevations, with the allowance for more metal panels at the rear, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Pentz abstained owing to the fact that she arrived during the review.

OVERVIEW: The property at 3600-30 Lancaster Avenue is comprised of a block-long row of 16 three and four-story Italianate buildings that have been consolidated into one tax parcel. This application proposes to remove the rear ells on the central buildings and construct a four-story addition at the rear and a five-story addition along N. 36th Street.

The entire row, which was not designated as historic until October 2015, was slated for demolition, but was saved by the former Deputy Mayor and Historical Commission. The staff of the Historical Commission authored and submitted a nomination, which the Historical Commission adopted, saving the buildings from demolition. Since the property was nominated for designation, the property owner has stepped away from the demolition plans and has negotiated with the City Councilwoman, community, and City while seeking a plan that allows for the preservation of the buildings and a financially viable redevelopment of the property. Simultaneously, the property owner has appealed the designation; the case is not yet scheduled before the Court of Common Pleas, but likely will be if this application is not successful. The approval of a redevelopment plan agreeable to all parties would likely preempt that appeal. The applicant submitted a similar development proposal to the Historical Commission in March 2016. It proposed a three-story rear addition, but was rejected by the community and withdrawn before the Historical Commission reviewed it.

The row of buildings would be rehabilitated as a mixed-use, residential and retail development. The rear ells of the mid-block buildings, some with projecting bays, would be removed. The end-block building would be retained in the entirety. The addition would be constructed at the rears of the buildings, with a leg running southeast along 36th Street onto a property not designated as historic, 60 N. 36th Street; the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the construction proposed for this property because it would be an addition to a designated building. The new construction would clad in brick and aluminum panels and fenestrated with aluminum fixed and casement windows. The front and side facades of the historic buildings would be rehabilitated.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jonathan Broh and developer Michael McHale represented the application.

Mr. Broh directed the Commissioners to a diagram that he claimed demonstrated that the overbuild would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. He asked the Commission to reject the Architectural Committee's recommendation to remove the overbuild at the fourth floor on the historic buildings north of the main corridor because it would be inconspicuous from the street. Mr. Broh stated that they would gladly incorporate more brick into the street facades, as recommended by the Committee. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Broh if he had considered the potential views of the overbuild from places on Lancaster Avenue where the grade rises. Mr. Broh stated that he had not, but he pointed out that the existing historic building is four stories, not three, in height at the west where the grade rises. He contended that the taller historic building would block the views of the overbuilding where the grade rises. Mr. Broh conceded that, if one moves far enough away from the building, the overbuild will potentially be visible, but one would need to be so far away that the overbuild would certainly be inconspicuous. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee was concerned about visibility, but did not have enough information to judge that visibility with any certainty. Mr. McCoubrey as well as Mr. Thomas agreed that the staff could assess the visibility of the addition during its review of details. Mr. Thomas also agreed that the four-story historic building at the west will block public views of the addition from the high points on Lancaster Avenue. Mr. McCoubrey noted that rowhouses on Warren Street block most views of the rears of the buildings in question. Ms. Royer asked if the party walls would remain in place. Mr. Broh stated that they would. He noted that the residential units in the rehabilitated building will be the same size as the current upper-floor residential units; the party walls will be retained. Ms. Royer asked if the entire complex will have one floor elevation in the historic buildings. Mr. Broh stated that it would not. The floor levels will shift with the changes in grade. He stated that the floor to window sill height will be in the 18 inch to 24 inch range. He noted that the floor levels have not yet been completely defined; they are retaining a civil engineer to map the existing floor levels.

John Phillips of the Powelton Village Civic Association and attorney Paul Boni addressed the Commission. He stated that his organization is keenly interested in this project. He stated that the neighbors are primarily concerned with the retention of ground-floor commercial space. He stated that the neighborhood approved of the increased height of the building over the earlier proposal in exchange for the ground-floor commercial space. He said that they "really want the retail." He insisted that the Historical Commission require the developer to use the first floors of the buildings for retail or commercial use in perpetuity. Ms. Merriman reminded Mr. Phillips that the Historical Commission has no authority to regulate use, which is a zoning matter. She stated that use of the interior is outside the Commission's purview. The Commission cannot require the property owner to use the property in any particular way; it can only regulate the exterior appearance of the building to preserve historic resources. Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Merriman and suggested that the neighborhood organization to work with the developer on use outside the auspices of the Historical Commission. Mr. Boni claimed that the developer has asserted that the building needs to be taller than originally proposed to offset the cost of using the ground floor as commercial space. Mr. Boni stated that the developer is committing to ground-floor commercial space and he added that he and his client believe that the developer is committed to ground-floor commercial space. Mr. Boni claimed that the developer is asking the Commission to accept the "five-story package on that rationale." He said that the current owner may sell the building "in one year, five years, eight years, what have you" and the new owner may abandon the ground-floor commercial space if there is no legal requirement from the City to retain it. Mr. Boni asserted that the Historical Commission has the authority to require the owner to use the space for commercial activities and should exercise that authority. Mr. Thomas strongly disagreed. He stated that the Historical Commission is charged with ensuring that the proposed design satisfies preservation standards that relate to the design of the exteriors of the

buildings. He stated that the Commission must base its judgment on the satisfaction of the standards and cannot impose requirements on the project related to interior use. Mr. Thomas added that the Historical Commission cannot approve additional stories in exchange for a guarantee of interior use. He noted that the zoning regulations allow for bonuses for height in exchange for the advancement of the public good through the inclusion of affordable housing and other features, but the Historical Commission has no such bonus system. He noted the One Water Street zoning case, which has been in the news. He stated that, if the Historical Commission approves the top story proposed for this building, it will approve it because the design satisfies preservation standards, not because the developer has guaranteed commercial space or any other feature. He stated that the Commission's decision will comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Committee and staff have recommended that the design meets the Standards. Any approval will be related to the satisfaction of those Standards, not because of an exchange of height for commercial space. Mr. Schaaf stated that the property's use is governed by its zoning classification, which is CMX-2 in this case. It must have a commercial use in that zoning category. Mr. Thomas noted that there are exceptions with the zoning. He again noted that the community should work directly with the developer regarding use without the Historical Commission. Mr. Boni stated that he disagrees with the Commission's interpretation of its authority as well as some of its claims about zoning.

Mr. Thomas asked if anyone else in the audience wished to speak. Brian Keech of Drexel University stated that his organization supports the continuing discussions between the developer and the community. He also directed the Commission to legislation regarding a nearby site that is designed to protect its character. He stated that developers along Lancaster Avenue are replacing retail with other uses to the detriment of the community. He asked the Commission to protect retail along this corridor.

Mr. Farnham stated that the preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission to condition approvals at Section 14-1005(6)(c), where it states that:

The Historical Commission may require that a building permit for the alteration or demolition of any building, structure, site, or object subject to its review be issued subject to such conditions as may reasonably advance the purposes of this Chapter 14-1000.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission may condition approvals in ways that reasonably advance the purposes of the historic preservation ordinance. He contended that the purposes of the ordinance as laid out in Section 14-1001 do not include the regulation of use. He advised the Commission that it does not have the authority to condition an approval as Mr. Boni has advised. Ms. Cooperman observed that the exterior material on the buildings at the ground floor along Lancaster Avenue is within the Commission's purview. Mr. Farnham agreed. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that the community has a valid concern, but the Commission cannot dictate the use of the property. Mr. Thomas asked the Commission to focus on the appropriateness of the exterior alterations as evaluated under the Standards.

Mr. Broh stated that the project will require an application to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, which will provide an opportunity for the community to express its opinions about zoning matters. Mr. Thomas agreed that the Zoning Board was the appropriate venue to discuss the building's new use.

Ms. Merriman stated that she would move to approve the application as presented today to the Historical Commission, provided the mechanical equipment is not visible from the street and more red brick is incorporated into the street facades. Someone from the audience yelled out,

asserting that the upper story on the addition to the historic buildings should be disallowed. Ms. Merriman stated that she would move to approve the proposal as presented with the addition as designed. Mr. Thomas suggested that the staff should review the sightlines of the addition. Ms. Merriman agreed to amend her motion to include a staff review of the sightlines as they were shown in the submitted diagram, but asserted that her motion proposed to approve the design as presented to the Commission today, with the addition as designed.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, provided the rooftop mechanical equipment is not visible from the street, the overbuild at the fourth floor on the historic buildings is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, and more red brick is employed on the primary elevations, with the allowance for more metal panels at the rear, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2951, 2967, 2979, AND 3001R W SCHOOL HOUSE LA
5702, 5710, AND 5714 WISSAHICKON AVE, ALDEN PARK**

Proposal: Replace windows; construct swimming pool

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: L3C Alden Park Apartmentstic I LLC

Applicant: Eric Comp, Briarwood Construction LLC

History: 1925; Alden Park; Edwyn Grant Rourke, architect

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the remaining steel frames are coated to prevent rust and galvanic action and a rehabilitation plan is submitted for the common-area windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the 7400 windows and construct an in-ground swimming pool at a gated apartment complex set on 38 acres in northwest Philadelphia. It also proposes to construct an entry vestibule at the non-historic health club building, but that aspect of the application has already been approved at the staff level.

This application proposes to replace all 7400 windows in residential units in the complex. The historic windows in the common spaces would be retained. The application extensively documents the investigations of restoring and replacing the steel windows at the apartment complex. The applicant explored restoring the steel windows, which are deteriorated, contain lead paint, and fail water and air infiltration tests. After interviewing numerous window restoration companies, the applicant concluded that no company or group of companies has the capacity to restore 7400 windows within a reasonable timeframe. Moreover, many of the steel windows are beyond repair and would require replacement. The applicant also discovered that the steel window systems are integrated into the masonry window openings and their removal for restoration or replacement would result in damage to the surrounding brick and terra cotta masonry. Therefore, although much more expensive, the applicant has determined that the replacement of the steel windows with aluminum windows is the best option. To avoid damaging the masonry openings, the steel window frames would be left in place and the aluminum windows fitted over them. The new windows would have the same color, profiles, pane

configurations, and other details as the historic windows, but would deviate dimensionally, especially at the sills, jambs, and heads, to accommodate the retained steel frames. Unlike buildings in an urban setting, these nine and 12-story buildings in a suburban setting are not typically viewed from a close proximity, but are seen from significant distances. The public will not perceive the minor dimensional deviations of the new windows from the old.

An in-ground pool with surrounding terrace would be installed on the grounds. A simple, code-mandated, see-through metal fence would surround the pool. No historic landscape features would be disturbed for the installation of the pool. The pool would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Tom Chapman, preservation consultant Bob Powers, and owner's representative Yossi Cohen represented the application.

Mr. Chapman introduced his team and the project. Mr. Powers summarized the efforts to develop a plan to replace the windows. He stated that they first considered window repair instead of replacement, but decided that that was infeasible for numerous reasons. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the application for the windows was extremely thorough and well researched. He stated that the applicants made a compelling case for the proposed replacement windows. He directed the Commission's attention to the photograph showing an original and proposed window side by side. Mr. Thomas opined that there are slight differences between the two, but noted that the Architectural Committee found that the replacement was acceptable, owing to the many extenuating circumstances. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. He stated that the replacement windows represent a good compromise. He also reported that the original ground-floor windows in public spaces would be retained and restored. Mr. Thomas asked if the new windows would operate in the same manner as the originals. Mr. Powers confirmed that they would.

Ms. Cooperman asked about the proposed pool. She asked the applicants to explain where the pool would be located and to provide information about the historic use of the location. Mr. Powers stated that the pool would be located on a spot that was historically lawn. He noted that the area was flooded in the winter for ice skating. It has never been a formal planted area, but always just a grass area. Mr. Cohen explained that the original indoor pool is being restored. The pool in question will be a second pool, outdoors.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor for public comment. Nicholas Nehez stated that he is a long-time tenant of the complex. He stated that he applauds the plans and work of the current owner of Alden Park, especially the window replacement project. He stated, however, that he does oppose the pool, which would violate a 1981 open-space easement. He distributed copies of the easement and claimed that the construction of the pool would violate the easement. Mr. Thomas stopped Mr. Nehez and reminded him that the Historical Commission's task is to review the proposal based on the review standards set out in the preservation ordinance including the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. An easement is a private agreement between the owner and another party, which does not bind the Historical Commission. The owner must obtain the easement holder's permission to undertake the project, but that review would take place outside the auspices of the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas assured Mr. Nehez that the Commission's decision would not invalidate the easement or excuse the owner from its provisions. Someone yelled out from the audience. Mr. Thomas informed her that she needed to step up to the microphone and identify herself before the Commission could recognize her and

hear her statement. Mr. Thomas again reminded the audience of the Commission's authority, which is established by the preservation ordinance. The Commission cannot enforce third-party agreements. He stated that the Commission will consider the landscape history when making a decision about the pool.

Mr. Nehez stated that the proposed windows are "first rate ... A number one." Mr. Nehez stated that he was part of a group that approached the previous owner about seeking a grant to restore the tea garden. The project was lost in the shuffle of the change in ownership. Mr. Nehez stated that he is satisfied with everything but the pool.

Polly Koster introduced herself as a resident of Alden Park. Ann Hollingsworth Arfaa also introduced herself. Ms. Koster stated that some of the enhancements proposed for Alden Park are "excessive." She noted that the population at Alden Park is very diverse, some with pets, some without. She stated that they sent a letter to the easement holder, the Preservation Alliance, objecting to the pool. She stated that they polled the residents about the proposed pool, but she did not present the results of the pool poll. Ms. Arfaa asserted that the pool would destroy the ambience of the landscape. Peter Arfaa, a retired architect, introduced himself. He asked if the new windows would include screens. He stated that he was concerned about bugs. He stated that the complex has one pool already; it does not need another. He reported that his primary concern is bugs. Patricia King, a resident of Alden Park, stated that the complex is grand and beautiful. She stated that the complex does not need a pool. If someone wants to sit by a pool, that person can go to a resort. The pool will be a noisy, invasive imposition. The pool will compromise the beauty of Alden Park.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia reported that his organization holds an easement on the property in question. He stated that the Easement Committee of the Alliance has carefully reviewed the application as well as the position of the tenants in the context of the easement agreement. He stated that the Easement Committee voted to support the proposed work and the Alliance has consented to the work under the easement agreement.

Someone from the audience called out. Mr. Thomas requested that he step up to the table and introduce himself. He continued to call out. Ms. Merriman insisted that the gentleman introduce himself and address the Commission from meeting table, not from the audience. The gentleman stepped up to the table and introduced himself as Oscar Beisert. He asked about the origin of the garden where the pool would be located and whether it was associated with the Strawbridge family. Ms. Merriman asked the staff if the garden is called out in the nomination for the property and whether it was intended to be specifically protected. Messrs. Farnham and Baron stated that they did not know whether the nomination specifically identified this area of the landscape as historically significant, but they offered to research the question. Ms. Cooperman noted that the landscape is part of the designated property and therefore under the Commission's jurisdiction, even if not called out specifically in the nomination. She contended that the Commission does not have sufficient information before it to make a final decision on the pool. Mr. Thomas agreed. Mr. Powers stated that his team has questioned the history of this portion of the landscape as well, but has not discovered anything definitive. It may be a remnant of the Strawbridge Estate, but is more likely part of the Alden Park development. He stated that Sanborn maps do not show landscape features. He noted that they have a marketing brochure published when the complex was completed in the 1920s that shows the landscape features about as they exist today. The area where the pool is proposed has always been a lawn area with plantings along the perimeter. There was flagstone around the perimeter, but that was removed long ago. The 1920s brochure shows children skating in this area. It appears that the

area has always had multiple functions. Ms. Cooperman asserted that landscapes can acquire significance over time in ways that buildings do not. She again stated that she does not believe that the Historical Commission has sufficient information to make a decision on the pool today. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that the site plan does not sufficiently identify the location of the pool. He added that the plans and renderings for the pool are inconsistent. He asked why the pool was proposed for this location. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked the Preservation Alliance representatives to explain their support of the pool project. Mr. Thomas stated that the application materials are lacking; more information is needed. Mr. Chapman asked if the Commission would consider dividing the application, perhaps approving the windows and requesting additional information on the pool. Mr. Cohen explained that the property owner wants to return it to the elegance of the 1920s complex. They chose this spot for the pool because it is a centrally located gathering spot where a pool can fit well into the existing landscape. Mr. Thomas asked if other alternatives were considered. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the Architectural Committee review any additional information on the pool.

Ms. Arfaa submitted a document with information about the historic landscape.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the window portion of the application, provided the remaining steel frames are coated to prevent rust and galvanic action and a rehabilitation plan is submitted for the common-area windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to table the swimming pool portion of the application for a period not to exceed 60 days and to remand a revised and/or supplemented pool application to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1226 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story, rear addition, pilot house, and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lee & Karly Berman

Applicant: Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design Studio, LLC

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 11/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rear cornice is retained and the material choices are revised to reflect the Architectural Committee's advice, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The motion passed by a vote of 3 to 2.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade and construct a three-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot house on this circa 1825 house in the Washington Square West neighborhood. The rear of the property opens onto Waverly Street. The Architectural Committee reviewed an application for a rear addition that included the removal of the rear roof slope, rear dormer, and rear wall at its April 2016 meeting. At that time, the Committee recommended approval of the restoration of the front façade, and denial of the rear addition as proposed, with the recommendation that the addition should be reduced in size, the entire roof slope and

dormer retained, and the addition disengaged from the rear of the house as much as possible. The applicant withdrew the application prior to the Historical Commission meeting, so that it could be revised to reflect comments received by the Committee.

The current proposal for the rear addition would retain the existing rear wall of the historic house as well as the rear roof slope and rear dormer. However, visibility of these historic elements would be blocked by the addition when viewing directly from Waverly Street at the rear. There are several other examples nearby of large rear additions, most notably the property next door at 1228 Pine Street, which the Commission approved in 2004. In that instance, however, the historic building including the rear had been altered prior to the approval of the large rear addition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Lee Berman and architect Stephen Maffei represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the application was revised to reflect comments from the Architectural Committee regarding materials for the rear addition.

Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Committee recommended approval with a vote of 3 to 2, and that the concern amongst those opposed was that the pilot house and addition are significantly larger than the historic house. He stated that the Committee assumed that the addition and pilot house will not be visible from Pine Street, based on the architect's sightline drawing. He stated that the revisions correspond with the Committee's recommendations. Mr. Schaaf asked about the functions inside of the pilot house. Mr. Maffei responded that the pilot house is the full width of the property, but only to house the switchback stair. He confirmed that the pilot house will not be visible from Pine Street. He explained that the restoration of the front dormer will be handled with the staff. Mr. Maffei commented that the property owner is looking to retain the property as a single-family home, but needs four bedrooms. He explained that the initial application proposed the removal of the rear wall, but that application was withdrawn prior to review by the Commission, and a new application was submitted that retained the rear wall and rear roof.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 10 June 2016, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1531 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct four-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: BG Capital LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: c. 1885

Individual Designation: 7/1/1982

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the one-story garage; denial of demolition of the rear ell and construction of the addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition except in cases of hardship and public interest in the preservation ordinance.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the entire historic rear ell and possibly the rear wall of this historic property and to construct a new, deeper and wider addition at the rear and side of the property. The provided documentation implies that the only demolition is of the historic bay and some non-historic additions; however, the interior plans show that the entire ell will be removed. The application also proposes to demolish a freestanding, non-historic, one-story garage at the rear of the property. The proposed new construction would be clad in brick and feature a cast stone base and cast stone lintels and headers.

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

Mr. Thomas noted that the property is located in a National Register Historic District and asked if the property is located in a local historic district. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the property was individually designated along with several other properties on the same block, but is not in a locally designated district.

Ms. Cooperman asked on what basis the south side bay window was identified as non-historic. Mr. Dry responded that they had originally assumed it was non-historic because it was clad in vinyl, but that they later learned from the staff of the Historical Commission that it was historic. Mr. Dry noted that there are a series of additions on the rear, and that they had assumed the bay was a non-historic add-on, but that they now realize that it is historic.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee had noted that this property never had a party wall condition, and that the site was always open front to rear. He noted that this project was not only a demolition, but also fundamentally changed the character of the relationship of the building to its site.

Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that this property, like many around it, was built as a very large house on a very large site. Most of North Philadelphia, he noted, is characterized by row buildings, and in some cases twins, but that this block features large, originally single-family homes. He commented that there are freestanding properties, such as one of the Disston mansions, just across the street.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the demolition of the one-story garage; and deny the demolition of the rear

ell and construction of the addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1528-30 N SYDENHAM ST

Proposal: Demolish building; construct two three-story buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: D & A Investments

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: c. 1885

Individual Designation: 7/1/1982

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to proposed demolition and incompatible design of the new construction, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition except in cases of hardship and public interest in the preservation ordinance.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a nineteenth-century carriage house at 1530 N. Sydenham Street and construct two three-story buildings on the site, which includes historically open land at 1528 N. Sydenham Street. The proposed new construction would be clad in fiber cement boards and brick, and feature paired casement windows.

The Historical Commission designated fifteen properties on the 1500-block of N. 16th Street including 1527-29 N. 16th Street with one nomination on 1 July 1982. At the time, the property at 1527-29 N. 16th Street extended from N. 16th Street east to N. Sydenham Street and included what is now known as 1528-30 N. Sydenham Street. A house faces N. 16th and a carriage house facing Sydenham. The house is described in the nomination, but the carriage house is not mentioned or pictured. In fact, none of the carriage houses associated with the houses on the block is mentioned in the nomination. The Historical Commission informed Walter and Frances Barker, the owners of the property, in writing of the designation on 6 July 1982. Frances Barker sold the property on 30 April 1986 and the new owners subdivided it in 1988 into 1527-29 N. 16th, with the house, and 1528-30 N. Sydenham, with the carriage house. The Historical Commission was unaware of the subdivision and did not add the Sydenham address to its Register until the submission of the current application.

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

Mr. Dry commented that this application differs slightly from the previous application in that his client will suffer more of a hardship if it is not approved. He reiterated Ms. DiPasquale's comment that the property has undergone several subdivisions, and that they had completed approximately 80-90% of the documents needed for a building permit for the demolition and new construction, when they were alerted by the Department of Licenses & Inspections that the property was flagged as historic. He noted that, following the Architectural Committee meeting, he met with Ms. DiPasquale and presented two alternative scenarios for the two lots. One of the scenarios retains the carriage house and brings back some of the character of a carriage house, very little of which remains. Scheme A, he noted, retains the carriage house, but installs a fixed carriage-style door with operable casement windows. Mr. Dry presented a schematic massing

drawing showing the retention of the two-story carriage house at the front of the lot, with a free-standing, three-story addition at the rear.

The second scheme, Mr. Dry continued, proposes to demolish the carriage house and construct two matching buildings. He opined that two identical properties may give the street more of its original character. He commented that this scheme would give a more creative opportunity to adapt the idea of a carriage house and establish a new language on the block. He noted that in both schemes, he took inspiration from two carriage houses across the street.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that he appreciates the challenges Mr. Dry presented, but would greatly prefer Option 1, or A, which retains the existing building, but still allows for adjacent new construction.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee would be in favor of the option that retains the carriage house.

Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that he began doing work in the neighborhood in the 1970s. He commented that all of the properties are differentiated, and that doing something different on the two lots would be in keeping with the actual character of the street. He opined that the complete demolition of the carriage house is not something the Historical Commission would likely approve, but Option 1, which retains the building, would be the better option. He noted that he personally thinks that echoing the carriage doors and constructing a three-story addition behind the carriage house, with a different house next door, is an excellent approach. He stated that this block was never a row development of the same buildings, but all different, individual carriage houses.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that one feature worthy of preservation on the existing building is the corbelled cornice on right hand side of the façade. He recommended retaining that feature and carrying it across the front elevation.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application with Option 1A, provided the cornice with corbelled brick end blocks is reconstructed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 317 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear dormer and roof; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Margaret Petri

Applicant: Sean McMullan

History: 1815; storefront added in early 20th century; storefront removed 1958

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear slope and dormer of this house and construct an addition. This addition would demolish character-defining elements of this important, early, individually-designated house. Owing to its location at a corner, most aspects of the house including the rear dormer and roof are highly visible from the public right-of-way. A rear addition behind the existing rear ell may satisfy the Standards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Sean McMullan and architect Kiki Bolender represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee found that the proposed alteration would inappropriately change the mass and shape of the building, would be highly visible to the public, and would result in the removal of significant fabric. Ms. Cooperman said that undertaking the project would likely result in the removal of original roof framing. Mr. McMullan claimed that his father had replaced the dormer and probably some of the roof when he gutted the building in 1973. He explained that that he was proposing to retain five or six feet of roof above the addition. Mr. Thomas stated that he understands that adding onto the first floor might result in a less desirable interior layout, but he noted that St Joseph's is a public right-of-way; the Standards charge the Commission to protect historic spatial relationships seen from public rights-of-way. He suggested that, if there was a way to reorganize the first floor, it could be beneficial from an ADA standpoint, especially if this bedroom was intended for an older relative. Ms. Bolender said that the yard is a great amenity and they don't want to build anything that would block access to it. She offered that the addition could be setback slightly from the edge of the roof and still be supported by the bearing wall because the wall is several bricks thick. Mr. McMullan concurred that you could keep the line of shingles coming down the gable line of the roof. Ms. Merriman opined that, in her mind, the addition would not be conspicuous. Mr. Schaaf disagreed and said that he thought the proposed setback was de minimis and would not help the fundamental visible change to the roof slope. Ms. Bolender stated that she does walk these streets and finds that this addition would not be highly conspicuous. Mr. Thomas countered that he is relying on the sketch that the applicant submitted that shows that it would be highly visible. He asserted that, according to the Commission's Standards, it should not be visible. Mr. McCoubrey added that, in fact, with an individually designated building, even if the addition was not visible from the street, the roofline of the main block should be protected. Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission needs to be consistent on these matters. Mr. Fiol-Silva said that he does not think that the proposed addition would overwhelm the existing structure, but he is concerned about the plans for the building as a whole. He said that the stuccoed rear seems out of place and suggested that the renovations could perhaps address that issue. It was pointed out that the stucco is now painted yellow and seems to have been changed since the photograph was taken. Mr. McMullen reported that it was painted since construction began. He

said that the building had a garage in the rear and that the stucco was added by his father-in-law in 1973. Mr. Schaaf offered a suggestion to create a new gambrel addition on the roof of the rear ell that would intersect the rear slope of the main building. New dormers could be created in the addition. The chimney would then remain free-standing. Mr. McMullan distributed an historic photograph of the building with a ground-floor storefront.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any public comment.

Paul Boni explained that he is a neighbor across the street. He said that he favors the expansion of the building on the roof. He said that he never looks up when he is walking on St Joseph's Way and he does not think that the addition would be noticeable. He claimed that the Commission often approves rooftop additions for developers and that this proposal is not conspicuous by those standards.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked if the applicants could submit a revised proposal if this application was denied. He was told that they could. Ms. Merriman said that she planned to vote against a motion denying this application. Mr. Thomas said that he did not think that there was enough in the proposal to approve it in concept.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Merriman dissented.

ADDRESS: 1501-05 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark J. Kreider

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch

History: 1930; Overseas Motor Works; Samuel Brian Baylinson, architect

Individual Designation: 2/13/2015

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. The addition would overwhelm the historic building, destroying spatial relationships that characterize the property. The addition is not compatible with the historic property in size, scale and proportion, and massing.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on and adjacent to a one-story Art Deco commercial structure. The addition would be three stories in height on the historic building and four stories adjacent to the historic building, on what is now a surface parking lot. The addition would be set back 13'-7" from the Fairmount Avenue façade and 15'-7" from the 15th Street façade, slightly more than the dimensions of a tower at the corner of the historic building. The addition would be clad in a silver-gray metal panels at the three street facades and stuccoed at the west façade. The one-story Art Deco building would be rehabilitated with storefronts based on historic photographs.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Rustin Ohler, attorney Darwin Beauvais, and developer Herb Reid represented the project.

Mr. Schaaf pointed out that this block was once probably composed of three-story rowhouses that were demolished to make way for this building. He said that, in a way, this design reestablishes the three-story height of the block. He opined that the addition should be pulled back a considerable amount farther from Fairmount Avenue, but does not need as large a setback on 15th Street. Mr. Thomas said that he thinks that it is less necessary to pull it back so long as there is more breathing space for the tower. He said that in the current design it is crowded with only a one-foot nine-inch setback. He suggested drawing a radius around the tower and creating an inside corner or a bevel at the tower to allow the tower to shine. Mr. McCoubrey suggested more setback but also differentiation through materials. Ms. Cooperman said that the Standards call for differentiation but that the two pieces of the building must not fight with each other. Mr. Fiol-Silva also suggested warmer colored materials for the building.

Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that he agreed with the opinions offered by the staff and Commissioners. He said that the proposed setbacks of the addition from the historic facades are not sufficient. He recommended a change in materials as well. Lori Salgonicoff, the former director of the Fairmount Community Development Corporation, said that she was shocked that the architect did not respect the historic building, especially in light of the fact that his architectural firm has constructed so much infill in this neighborhood. Mr. Beauvais responded that he was shocked at the the “bashing” of his client.

Mr. Baron commented that the Standards suggest that the addition is differentiated from, but also compatible with, the existing building. He claimed that the architect's use of the three-part bays of the historic storefronts was one appropriate aspect of the design. The feature was valuable in terms of the rhythm and scale of the new building. He explained that the architect used the metal panels to distinguish the new building from the pink cast stone of the original building. He observed that the pink cast stone panels at Symphony House had not been perceived as a success and questioned whether they would be successful on this building.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that he would move to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, but informed the applicants that such an action would not preclude the submission of a subsequent application that accounted for the Commission's suggestions.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10; the addition would overwhelm the historic building, destroying spatial relationships that characterize the property. The addition is not compatible with the historic property in size, scale and proportion, and massing. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1132-40 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct addition and stair tower, replace and add windows and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Franklin Properties

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1864; enlarged 1880; J.A. Dougherty's Sons Distillery Bonded Warehouse

Individual Designation: Not designated, but under consideration for designation

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the ground-floor Front Street windows, transoms, and panels approximate the appearance of the historic windows and doors in wood; the upper-floor Front Street windows in the historic building are wood arched six-over-six windows; the windows in the addition are differentiated from but compatible with the windows in the historic building; the height of the parapet of the addition is reduced; and the color of the addition is lighter than proposed and differentiated from but compatible with the color of the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and stair tower, and replace and add windows and doors. The property is not yet designated as historic, but a nomination is pending for the property. The nomination will be considered by the Committee on Historic Designation on June 15 and the Historical Commission on July 8. The property was recently sold. The Historical Commission notified the former owner of the pending nomination, but not the current owner. The current owner became aware of the nomination when he applied for a building permit to rehabilitate the building.

The four-story building was built as part of a large industrial complex known as J.A. Dougherty's Sons Distillery in two phases in 1864 and 1880. The building faces N. Front Street to the east. The Market-Frankford elevated line runs along N. Front Street, very close to the building in question, and block most views of the upper floors. The building backs up to a vacant lot along N. Hope Street to the west. Historically, a structure of similar height facing N. Hope Street stood against the rear wall of the subject building; that structure has been demolished, leaving a vacant lot. All of the openings in the rear wall have been infilled and would have been interior openings historically.

The application proposes to construct a one-story rooftop addition clad in stucco and occupying the entirety of the roof. It also proposes to construct a five-story stair tower along the south wall of the building. The main entrance to the building would be located at what was historically the rear party-wall façade, which faces the vacant lot along Hope Street. New door and window openings would be cut and doors and windows added at the Hope Street and south facades. At the Front Street façade, the six ground-floor arched openings, which have been infilled to varying degrees, would be reopened for windows. Historically, four were door openings and two were window openings. Historic window sills would be retained at the two window openings. Panels up to the sill heights would be installed in the four door openings. Paired windows would be installed in all six openings. Panels would be installed in the transoms. At the upper floors, the windows would be replaced with square-head one-over-one windows. The historic windows were arched, six-over-six windows. The brick facades would be repointed.

Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulates that:

The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.

The former owner of the property was notified of the Commission's intent to consider designation on April 28. The current owner and developer learned of the Commission's plans upon the submission of a building permit application on May 9. The owner/developer of this property has demonstrated that substantial development plans were in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation. While the proposed rehabilitation may not satisfy a strict reading of the Standards in every regard, it would preserve the character-defining features of the vacant building, returning it to active use and improving its appearance, especially if more appropriate windows are installed at the Front Street façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Rustin Ohler and developer Steve Franklin represented the application.

Mr. Ohler stated that he responded to the comments of the staff and Architectural Committee and tried to implement all but the specification of arched-top windows for the upper floors of the front façade. He explained that the elevated train tracks run very close to this façade and obscure the details of the upper-floor windows. He stated that the windows cannot be seen from in or across the street. When one looks up at them from the sidewalk, the details are indiscernible. He added that the windows must have significant soundproofing qualities because of the proximity to the trains. The window manufacturer supplying the triple-pane windows is unable to produce arched-top windows with triple-pane glass. He reported that they investigated custom windows but were unable to get the soundproofing required.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he believes that the applicant has made sufficient modifications to the plans as suggested by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thomas stated that he understands the sound issue. He explained that his mother grew up on Kensington Avenue; her windows were about four feet from the elevated train.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, but there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 10 June 2016, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

RECONSIDERATION OF ACTION

ADDRESS: 101A W GRAVERS LANE

Proposal: Reconsider designation of property owing to missed correspondence

Nominator: Jennifer Robinson

Owner: John and Eva Tierno

OVERVIEW: At its 13 May 2016 meeting, the Historical Commission designated the property at 101A W. Gravers Lane as historic. After the Historical Commission meeting, the Commission's staff received an email from the property owner requesting that the Commission table the review to allow for discussions about a façade easement to progress. The email request had been sent prior to the Commission meeting, on 10 May 2016, but had not been received in a timely manner, owing to the Historical Commission's move and related computer problems. When alerted of the failure to receive the tabling request in a timely manner, the property owner requested that the Commission seek a remedy for the problem. The staff consulted with the Law Department, which advised that the Commission could reconsider the matter and could, if it so chose, nullify the earlier vote and then table the review of the nomination to a later meeting. The staff then consulted with the Commission chair, who advised the staff to place the matter on the current agenda.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that, owing to the communications failure resulting from the office move and pursuant to the advice of the Law Department, the Historical Commission nullify its action of 13 May 2016 to find that 101A W. Gravers Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, to designate it as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; and to table the consideration of the nomination for 101A W. Gravers Lane to the Historical Commission's meeting on 9 September 2016.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused, owing to her involvement in the writing of the nomination. Mr. Farnham presented the request to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner.

Lori Salganicoff of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society explained that the new owners are discussing the possibility of a preservation easement with the Society and would like additional time to consider that approach to preservation before the designation is finalized. Ms. Salganicoff stated that a designation at this time would have a chilling effect on her organization's capacity to take on new preservation easements. She stated that nomination is an effective tool for bringing property owners to the table to discuss easements, but designations that result from those nominations can preclude easements. She stated that her organization would like to work as a partner with the Historical Commission, using the Historical Commission's nomination process to compel owners to consider alternative preservation methods to designation such as easements. She asked the Commission to nullify its action and allow her to continue to discuss an easement with the owners.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the request is reasonable. He noted, however, that he is concerned that a nullification in this case could set a precedent for later cases. He asked if the City Law Department opined on the precedential value of such a nullification. Mr. Farnham responded that the Law Department did not. Mr. Thomas suggested that, if the Commission decides to grant this request, it should clearly indicate in the motion why it granted in these particular circumstances. Mr. Thomas stated that, as someone who has been

involved in easements, whether or not a property is locally designated can have a significant impact on an easement.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved that, owing to the communications failure resulting from the office move and pursuant to the advice of the Law Department, the Historical Commission nullify its action of 13 May 2016 to find that 101A W. Gravers Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, to designate it as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; and to table the consideration of the nomination for 101A W. Gravers Lane to the Historical Commission's meeting on 9 September 2016. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION COMMENT

ADDRESS: 1401-09 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Progress Lighting Manufacturing Company

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

According to the nomination, the Progress Lighting Manufacturing Company Building was constructed between c.1890 and 1944 and is significant under Criterion A, Industry, for its association with a prominent Philadelphia-based residential lighting fixture manufacturer. While located at 1401-1409 Germantown Avenue from 1938-1964, the Progress Lighting Manufacturing Company Building both specialized in the design and manufacture of fluorescent and incandescent residential lighting fixtures and was also well known for their innovative contributions to the lighting industry. Prior to the use of the building by the Progress Lighting Manufacturing Company, the building was wholly occupied by the B. Bernheim and Sons Company, manufacturers and refinishers of show and display cases. The period of significance begins in c.1890, with the earliest phase of construction, and ends in 1964, when the Progress Lighting Manufacturing Company relocated to a larger facility in Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the correct language for the statement of significance summary paragraph is "Criterion A, in the area of Industry" rather than "Criterion A, Industry." Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Paul Steinke, Executive Director of the Preservation Alliance, commented that the building seems worthy of National Register designation. He asked if it is listed on the local register. Ms. Broadbent responded that it is not listed on the local register. Mr. Steinke asked if the Commission would be able to consider whether it meets the

criteria for local designation as well. He added that this question pertains to all three National Register matters on the agenda. Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Steinke if he is requesting that the Commission consider whether or not the property satisfies the criteria for local designation now, or at some point in the future. Mr. Steinke responded that he is asking the Commission to consider whether this property satisfies the Philadelphia Register Criteria for Designation now, at this meeting. He then modified his request, and suggested that the Commission consider it after research. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commissioners can discuss the building and whether it meets the criteria for local designation, but he advised them not to take a vote on it, as there has been no notice to the property owner and no way for the property owner to participate in this discussion. They should not reach a conclusion as a Commission, but they could reach conclusions as individual Commissioners and make comments. Mr. Steinke responded that he understands, and is not asking for the process to be short-circuited, but is simply saying that, since the building is now on the Commission's radar, the process should begin. Mr. Thomas responded that the question Mr. Steinke is raising can be discussed later at this meeting, as to whether listing on the National Register can trigger consideration for local designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved that the Philadelphia Historical Commission support the nomination proposing the listing of 1401-09 Germantown Avenue on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: MULTIPLE ADDRESSES

Philadelphia Public Schools, 1938-1980
Multiple Property Documentation Form

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) of the *Philadelphia Public Schools, 1938-80*. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

An effort was undertaken in the 1980s to list Philadelphia schools as part of a Thematic Resources nomination process. This effort was limited to schools built prior to 1938, and discounted many school buildings that had additions built after that year. The intent of this MPDF is to facilitate the eligibility evaluation and listing of current or former, mid and late 20th century Philadelphia public schools in the National Register of Historic Places. Properties will need to be individually nominated, but the MPDF will ease preparation of future nominations. It is not itself a nomination, and is not a district, but is a document that provides context and requirements for listing a common type of property found within a specific geographic area. Schools mentioned in either MPDF are not automatically considered eligible for listing. Each school will need to be individually evaluated and nominated following standard procedure. Most

schools nominated under this MPDF will be pursuing Criterion A or C areas of significance, most-likely Education, Architecture, and/or Social History. The MPDF covers elementary, middle and high schools currently or formerly owned by the School District of Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the MPDF to the Commission.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the cut-off date of 1980, noting that more schools will become eligible for National Register designation with each passing year. He asked if there could be more general language to account for this. Ms. Cooperman responded no, and stated that there are two issues. First is the 50 year rule, which is a general rule of thumb that properties that are less than 50 years of age are not eligible for National Register listing, unless they are exceptionally significant. The second factor is the MPDF itself, which has its own specific rules; properties can be listed in the National Register according to the rules that are written in the MPDF. She commented that this particular document is written to enable the designation of properties that were built between 1938 and 1980, but that does not mean that schools that cross the 50 year mark are ineligible; rather, it means that they may be designated individually on their own merits. She commented that this document is intended to simplify and ease the process of designating a group of schools that were built between 1938 and 1980, and opined that it will be a wonderful tool for tax credit applications.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Kathy Dowdell commented that she did not have a chance to read entire MPDF, but she asked for the Commission to keep in mind prominent school architect Irwin Catharine. She opined that he is one of the unsung success stories in terms of architecture, and does not have the reputation that he deserves. She commented that the fact that his buildings are still standing after years of deferred maintenance speaks volumes, and she opined that he was a terrific architect and his buildings need to be on the public radar. She opined that many are good adaptive use candidates, and asked the Commission to present some of these buildings to local developers as great opportunities for tax credits and adaptive use. Mr. Schaaf responded that he shares her appreciation of Irwin Catharine, but contended that he was not designing much later than 1936. Ms. Dowdell responded that she does not know enough about him, but she believes he was designing into his 80s and 90s, opining that he had a long and prolific career. It was noted that Irwin Catharine retired in 1937 and died in 1944 at the age of 60.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved that the Philadelphia Historical Commission support the adoption of the Multiple Property Documentation Form of the Philadelphia Public Schools, 1938-80. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2539 N 16TH STREET

M. Hall Stanton School

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of the M. Hall Stanton School. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation

matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

This school was chosen to be prepared in conjunction with the *Philadelphia Public Schools, 1938-80* Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) from a short-list of other schools, after consideration of mostly practical issues. These included

- the desire to nominate a school that was a bit more “ordinary” in appearance, and not an architecturally unique property, to better serve as a model for other nominations;
- the school's vacant status, as logistically it would be more difficult to nominate one of the City's active schools;
- the school's apparent significance, and individual eligibility;
- community engagement in planning for the future of the school—listing may add to its chances for positive adaptive reuse.

According to the nomination, the M. Hall Stanton School in North Philadelphia is significant under National Register Criterion A in the area of Education. It reflects key developments in the history of public education in Philadelphia and meets the registration requirements for the property type of the single building multi-room school, as described in the *Philadelphia Public Schools 1938-1980* Multiple Property Documentation Form. The period of significance begins with the school's construction completion in 1961, and encompasses a period of community involvement predominately associated with racial segregation and curriculum concerns through to 1968, when M. Hall Stanton was included in the planning for Lyndon B. Johnson's Model Cities Program in North Philadelphia. An example of the International Style, the school's simple, L-shaped plan and factory-like features neatly echo North Philadelphia's history as a 19th century industrial hub.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked for more information about the National Register review process. Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission is commenting on the National Register nominations to maintain its Certified Local Government (CLG) status. He explained that a link was provided in the Commission materials to access the National Register nominations online. Ms. Cooperman agreed that the Commission is being asked only to comment. Mr. Thomas explained that as a CLG, the Commission must comment on at least 75 percent of National Register nominations. Mr. Farnham noted that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission's (PHMC) Board has already commented on the nominations. The state is required to give the CLG 60 days notice, to give it time to comment, but the state has routinely provided less than the required 60 days to the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham remarked that he hopes that the state will provide the nominations well in advance of the state board meetings to allow the Historical Commission and public an opportunity to comment. Ms. Cooperman clarified for the audience that the state board is not actually designating these properties, rather it is voting to recommend or not recommend the properties for designation. The Keeper of the National Register in Washington D.C. ultimately decides to designate or not. She noted that every MPDF must be accompanied by at least one National Register nomination in order for it to complete the process. This school's nomination is the one that is accompanying the MPDF that the Commission voted to support a few minutes ago. She stated that she does not know how the short list of schools was developed. Ben Leech commented that he was informally advising the staff of the PHMC when they were looking for test cases to develop a National Register

nomination for this era of schools. They worked closely with the School District, which had concerns about pursuing a nomination for an occupied school. This resulted in a small pool of potential candidates, but it does not mean that an occupied school cannot be nominated. He noted that a school designed by a well-known architect was not chosen on purpose, because they needed a test case where even an “ordinary” school could be shown to meet the criteria.

Mr. Farnham explained that properties are typically nominated to the National Register so that they are eligible for historic preservation tax credits. However, some nominations and MPDFs result from the Section 106 review process and are required as mitigation. He commented that he is not sure if this specific nomination and MPDF result from mitigation. He offered a hypothetical example of an MPDF resulting from Section 106 mitigation: PennDOT needs to demolish a historic school building in order to widen a highway, and to mitigate that adverse effect on the historic resource, PHMC would require PennDOT to fund a study and the writing of an MPDF on additional schools not yet on the National Register.

Ms. Cooperman noted that, unlike a local designation, a property cannot be listed in the National Register over owner objection.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved that the Philadelphia Historical Commission support the nomination proposing the listing of 2539 N. 16th Street on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION

Mr. Farnham stated that the following persons have been nominated to serve on the Committee on Historic Designation:

- Chair: Emily Cooperman, historian, member of the Philadelphia Historical Commission
- David Schaaf, architect and planner, City Planning Commission, member of the Philadelphia Historical Commission
- Janet Klein, former member of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission
- Jeffrey Cohen, architectural historian, Bryn Mawr College
- Bruce Laverty, curator of architectural collection, The Athenaeum of Philadelphia
- Doug Mooney, archaeologist, URS Corporation, Philadelphia Archaeological Forum

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to appoint the nominated members to serve on the Committee on Historic Designation, chaired by Emily Cooperman. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mses. Long and Merriman excused themselves from the meeting. Without a quorum of Commissioners present, the meeting was adjourned.

The remaining Commissioners conducted a public discussion of the Historical Commission’s activities including:

- Public Policy and Purposes of the Commission;
- Composition of the Commission;
- Powers and Duties of the Commission;

- Regulatory Functions: Permits and Inspections of both Work and Maintenance;
- Designation of Individual Properties and Districts; and,
- Enhancing the Activities of the Commission.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment.

Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, made the following recommendations:

- The Historical Commission website should provide online access to all public documents under review by the Commission.
- The Historical Commission staff should conduct more timely reviews of nominations, perhaps within a two-week timeframe.
- The Historical Commission should retain its independent voice as it becomes part of the new Department of Planning & Development.
- The Historical Commission should remove obstacles in place so that local historic districts can once again be considered for designation.
- The Historical Commission should identify tactics that have been used in other cities that could be adopted here, such as a temporary moratorium on demolition permits for buildings greater than 50 years old.
- The Historical Commission should support the creation of a tax abatement that applies specifically to historic buildings.
- The Historical Commission should advocate for historic preservation to Mayor Kenny.
- The Historical Commission should create an inventory of the city's historic resources.

John Manton, the preeminent research historian for Roxborough and Manayunk, Ward 21, stated that the Historical Commission office is not up to the standard of those in other large cities. He opined that the Historical Commission's staff spends too much time correcting the writing style of nominations, stating: "If the nominator holds advanced university degrees, it is ludicrous to assume that he or she does not by virtue of said education have an excellent command of the English language." He opined that Mr. Farnham interprets the preservation code in a manner that creates a timeframe of vulnerability for nominated buildings. He stated that nominators are volunteers who enable the Historical Commission to do its job. He opined that the review of nominations is just as important as the approval of contractor's permits. He stated that these issues need to be addressed.

Joseph Menkevich, nominator, demanded that the Historical Commission take jurisdiction over a property the moment that a nomination is received. He suggested that the Commission put nominations on its website the day that they are received, so that the Department of Licenses & Inspections can go onto the website and know if a building is being considered for historic designation. He also stated that he can mail a letter to the Department of Licenses & Inspections informing it that the Historical Commission has received a nomination and therefore the Department of Licenses & Inspections should defer to the Commission. Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission's authority to review building permit applications begins the day that the Historical Commission sends a notice letter to the property owner, telling the owner that the Commission will consider a nomination to designate a property as historic. He continued that the Commission's Rules & Regulations tell the staff that before they can send the notice letter, the staff must verify that the nomination is correct and complete. The staff shall not forward incorrect or incomplete nominations to the Committee on Historic Designation or the Commission. Mr. Menkevich responded that he does not care when his nominations get reviewed, as long as the building is protected. He stated that he will take the Historical

Commission to court over this subject. Mr. Manton responded that Mr. Farnham is correct in his interpretation of the code provision, but that the code itself is the problem, and needs to be corrected. Mr. Menkevich suggested that the Commission “borrow people from L&I” to use as staff for the Historical Commission. Kathy Dowdell opined that the Department of Licenses & Inspections does not have staff to spare. Mr. Thomas noted that most employees of the Department of Licenses & Inspections likely do not meet the education requirements to be employed on the Commission’s staff. He suggested that the Commission staff may be able to use volunteers.

Oscar Beisert, architectural historian, commented that the Commission is severely underfunded. He offered the following suggestions:

- The staff should only check boundary descriptions once nominations are received, and then immediately send notice to property owners, so that the Commission can take jurisdiction over properties immediately.
- The Committee on Historic Designation should meet more than four times per year.
- The staff could review all demolition permit applications for undesignated buildings and make that information available to the public.
- The Historical Commission should convene a forum of history-minded organizations and encourage each of the organizations to submit one volunteer nomination per year.
- The Historical Commission should embrace thematic district nominations.
- The Historical Commission should consider façade districts, where only the façade is protected. He offered Chestnut Street as an example.
- The Historical Commission should consider “categorical designation,” in which some designated neighborhoods are not held to the same restoration standard as other more affluent neighborhoods.
- The Historical Commission should form a volunteer nomination review committee.
- Nothing else should be demolished on Germantown Avenue without the Historical Commission’s review.

Chuck Bode, representing West Powelton/Saunders Park RCO, stated that the Historical Commission should develop a mechanism to protect neighborhood character and ambiance without requiring strict reviews of all building permit applications for designated buildings.

Kathy Dowdell suggested that the Historical Commission hold additional conversations like this one. She suggested that they could also occur at the Committee level. She suggested that, as an example, the Architectural Committee could have a general discussion about how it reviews additions to historic buildings, or the Committee on Historic Designation could have a general discussion about how reviews of nominations can better be streamlined. She stated that the Commission has been in a reactive mode for a long time, but ideally it would be in a more proactive mode in leading these types of discussions, perhaps in the evening when more people can easily attend. She stated that there are a lot of people who would love to see preservation move forward and would love to see the Commission take a leadership role in that movement.

Mr. Thomas thanked everyone for participating in the lively and stimulating discussion.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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.

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

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

Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations

The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.