

**THE MINUTES OF THE 665TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 JANUARY 2018
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Mike Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
H. Ahada Stanford, Commerce Department
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
James Bock, Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Lisa Armstrong, AKA
Mercedez Smith
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Amy Lambert
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
J.M. Duffin
Oscar Beisert
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
David Orphanides, Esq.
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Julia Terruso, Philadelphia Inquirer
Ross Weiss
Kevin McMahan, Powers & Co.
Shay Pilot
Dimitri Mavroudis
Mary McGettigan, WP3P
Celeste Morello
M. Hingot
D. Nordonk

L. Silverstein
G. Maguire
Antonio Castro
Dennis Probst, Sr.
Adam Montalbano, MotoDesignShop
William Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Brett Peanasky, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Jane Ahn, Ahn & Robinson Studio
Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
James J. Bock Jr., Secretary for Temporal Services, Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
K. Kelly
A. Ibrahim
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Brandon Lutz, Harmon Deutsch
Ross Weiss, Esq., Cozen O'Connor

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fink, Hartner, McCoubrey, Royer, Schaaf, and Turner joined him. Ms. Stanford joined later.

MINUTES OF THE 664TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to leave the minutes of the 664th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 December 2017, in draft form until the February 2018 meeting of the Historical Commission to allow for additional information on the discussion of historic districts to be included. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 100 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

CONTINUE TO APRIL 2018 COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION MEETING

Name of Resource: Rohm & Haas
Proposed Action: Designation of property, interior, and objects
Property Owner: KPG-IMW Owner, LLC
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 1301-25 CHESTNUT ST

CONTINUE TO APRIL 2018 COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION MEETING

Name of Resource: Grand Court, Wanamaker's
Proposed Action: Interior Designation
Property Owner: Behringer Harvard REIT
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 6369 GERMANTOWN AVE

CONTINUE TO FEBRUARY COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION MEETING

Name of Resource: "Genteel Two-Story Stone Dwelling"
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 6365-67 GERMANTOWN AVE

CONTINUE TO FEBRUARY 2018 COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION MEETING

Name of Resource: Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Residence
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 1821-27 RANSTEAD ST

CONTINUE TO MARCH 2018 HISTORICAL COMMISSION MEETING

Name of Resource: The Musical Art Club
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Bian and Lia Yu
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 2108 SANSOM ST

CONTINUE TO FEBRUARY 2018 HISTORICAL COMMISSION MEETING

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition with pilot house and decks

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Ianoale and Amanda Korson

Applicant: Joseph Ianoale

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman recused from the consideration of the continuance request for 100 S. Independence West Mall, owing to their firms involvements with the property. Ms. Turner assumed the chair. She announced that the Historical Commission could not proceed with the consideration of the continuance request for 100 S. Independence West Mall because it lacked a quorum without Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman. Mr. Farnham explained that continuance request was deemed approved because the Historical Commission would be unable to act on it until its February 2018 meeting at the earliest, and the April 2018 Committee on Historic Designation meeting, the requested meeting, would be the earliest for which the matter could be scheduled.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to continue the reviews of the nominations for 1301-25 Chestnut Street to the April 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation; the nominations for 6369 Germantown and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue to the February 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation; the nomination for 1821-27 Ranstead Street to the March 2018 meeting of the Historical Commission; and the application for 2108 Sansom Street to the February 2018 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 14 NOVEMBER 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 321 S. Camac Street and 1907 Pine Street. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had additional comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 321 S. Camac Street and 1907 Pine Street. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 127 KENILWORTH ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor front and first-floor rear additions; enlarge roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Claudia and Christopher McGill

Applicant: Lisa Armstrong, A K Architecture, LLC

History: 1855; historic stable demolished in 1993; new building constructed in 1999

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

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 Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct additions at the third-floor front and first-floor rear sections of the building and enlarge a roof deck on a building erected in 1999.

The Historical Commission designated the property in 1958. The building that stood on the property at the time was a mid nineteenth-century, two-story stable. Portions of the front façade of the building were demolished without the Historical Commission's approval about 1991. Violations were issued to owner, but the illegal work was not corrected.

In 1991, an architect submitted an application proposing to demolish the remainder of the building and erect a new building. On 12 June 1991, the Commission refused to act on the application because the architect did not submit a building permit application or provide evidence that the property owner had authorized the submission.

On 13 May 1993, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the remaining section of the stable to be Imminently Dangerous and ordered that it be demolished or repaired immediately. On 18 October 1993, the Historical Commission approved a permit application to demolish the building. The building was apparently demolished soon thereafter.

The property changed hands several times in the 1990s. In 1998, a new owner proposed to construct a building on the property that was very similar to the demolished two-story stable, but with a third floor set back three feet from the plane of the front façade. At the 14 October 1998 meeting of the Historical Commission, some Commissioners objected to the regulation of the property because the historic building had been demolished, and suggested that the Commission allow the property owners to construct a building of their choice. The Commissioners argued that there was no historic resource left to protect. Such a motion was made and seconded, but never voted upon. Ultimately, the Commission decided to remand the application to the Architectural Committee with the requirement that the applicants work with the staff and Committee to improve the application. On 13 January 1999, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a revised application to reconstruct the two-story stable with a third floor and some modifications to the front facade. In July 1999, the Commission's staff administratively approved the roof decks.

The current application proposes to construct an addition at the third floor, extending the existing third floor forward to the plane of the front façade, infilling the three-foot setback from the front facade. The existing third floor is conspicuous from the public right-of-way; the third-

floor addition would likewise be conspicuous. The application also proposes to increase the size of the roof deck and construct a small addition at the first-floor rear of the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Lisa Armstrong represented the application.

Mr. Baron pointed out that the applicant has submitted revised drawings. He explained that the applicant has withdrawn the request to move the third-floor addition forward and has lowered the pilothouse and deck. The applicant still requests to widen the pilothouse to accommodate a wider stair. The applicant proposes to move the deck railing forward. However, because the deck will be lower, the sightlines should remain the same. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he finds that the applicant has addressed the Architectural Committee's concerns. Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 12 January 2018, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 321 S CAMAC ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story rear addition; construct two-story rear addition; cut parking entrance in rear wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Catalina Gonzalez and Mark Galbraith

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1829

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the modifications to the rear garden wall, but approval of the addition, provided the green roof is screened, the skylight is not visible from the street, the connection of the addition to the cornice of the house is detailed, and corbelled brick is used on the cornice of the addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall and ell of an 1829 rowhouse on Camac Street and construct an addition. It also proposes to cut a parking entrance in a garden wall at the rear of the property on Fawn Street. This application presents a revised version of a design reviewed by the Architectural Committee in November 2017. This row house faces onto Camac Street; at the rear, a brick wall with pedestrian gate faces onto Fawn Street. Several designated houses face onto this block of Fawn Street. This application proposes to construct a two-story addition and green roof. The proposed addition has been modified to preserve the rear wall of the historic building. The new glass and stucco faced addition would be partially screened with a brick lattice wall and a trellis. The brick fence wall at the rear of the property would be largely demolished and replaced with wood doors.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 318 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Demolish portions of building; construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Mary Morrisette

Applicant: Mary Morrisette

History: 1970; Nancy Brewster Grace House; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish portions of the 1970 building at the corner of South 4th and Cypress Streets, which is classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, and construct an addition to create a three-and-a-half story modern building, using some of the existing building as a base. The existing red brick first floor would be retained, but the majority of the remainder of the building would be demolished. Metal panels are proposed for a bay on the second and third floors that would wrap around to Cypress Street.

An in-concept application, which proposed to construct a three-and-a-half story colonial-style building at this site, was submitted for review in June 2017. The Committee recommended denial, and encouraged the applicant to submit an application to restore the existing building, rather than to demolish its character-defining features. The application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission. Antonio Castro represented the application.

Mr. Castro explained that the project architect was unable to attend the meeting, but that he, a retired architect, is representing the property owner and the architect. They are looking for feedback on the proposed design. He asked about an acceptable level of change to the building. He asked if the Architectural Committee's comments indicate that they had proposed too much change to the historic building, or too great an increase in the volume of the building. He commented that the building footprint remains unchanged. The house was originally designed as a one-bedroom house, but now a family is moving in, which is the reason for the expansion. He opined that the level of demolition is not extensive, and explained that some of the bricks will be recycled and used in the new sections of the building. He stated that they are willing to compromise.

Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee was unable to provide comments directly to the owner or owner's representative because they were not present at the Architectural Committee meeting. He noted that the Committee would be happy to provide suggestions and comments directly to the owner or owner's representative. He explained that the Architectural Committee had made suggestions regarding the first application, which was for a Colonial-style building, which essentially indicated that the form, volume, and materials needed to be preserved in order to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and that perhaps there is an opportunity to extend at a low level at the rear behind the wall. He noted that this building was designed by Oscar Stonorov, a significant architect, and may be worthy of individual designation in addition to its designation within the Society Hill Historic District. Ms.

Cooperman agreed, and commented that it is an important Modern building by a very important Modern architect.

Mr. Thomas commented that the matter relates to more than simply maintaining the footprint and materials. The applicants must consider retaining and reusing the entire building. Mr. Castro asked if the proposal involves too much square footage. Mr. Thomas explained that the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition. Standard 2 reads “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 9 reads “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 reads “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.” He suggested that the proposal is a radical change that does not come close to meeting the Standards. He suggested that Mr. Castro meet with the staff to discuss a more appropriate design. Mr. Castro responded that they are also going to try to contact the neighborhood civic association to obtain feedback.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Ross Weiss, an attorney representing Herb Gunther, the next-door neighbor at 320 S. 4th Street, commented that his client shares a party wall with the subject property, and agrees with the comments of the Architectural Committee. He commented that the Gunthers are concerned with the dramatic change to the building including such a large addition. He commented that the Gunthers have no opposition to expanding the basement, as long as it does not have an impact on their property. He noted that it is a corner property, so any change would impact both S. 4th Street and Cypress Street. Paul Boni, chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association, commented that the Civic Association supports the Architectural Committee’s recommendation of denial. He commented that it is an important building in the neighborhood and relates well to the property directly across Cypress Street. He noted that the property owner is not legally required to meet with the Civic Association, but the Association does meet monthly and would be happy to meet with the owner or owner’s representative to discuss the project and offer suggestions. He commented that the front second-story window has been open for a long period of time. Since mentioned at the Architectural Committee meeting, the window has been closed 90%, but is still open. He noted that the building has been vacant for up to two years. Mr. Thomas noted the property maintenance code, and the fact that the property owner should maintain the building. He acknowledged that the window may be jammed or rusted by being open. Mr. Boni commented that, from a personal point of view, he lived in a 681 square foot house for many years, and if he had a family, he would not buy that 681 square foot house. Rather, he would buy a larger house that would come better-suited for a family. He opined that the argument for changing a historic house owing to family size is not a strong argument. If one needs a big house, one should buy a big house. Mr. Castro explained that the house was inherited, but the family likes the neighborhood and they wish to live in the house. He explained that he is new to the Historical Commission’s review process, and does have concerns about the proposed addition shadowing the next door neighbor’s house. Mr. Thomas suggested that he consult a book entitled *The Architecture of Additions*. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that the proposed metal panels are not part of the vocabulary of Society Hill and would set a bad

precedent for other work in the area. Jane Ahn, a neighbor with a similar style house across Cypress Street, commented that she has undertaken a renovation of her home without changing any of the exterior features, and there are ways of meeting the new requirements without such a drastic transformation. Mr. Castro responded that he intends to discuss the project with the Civic Association and is also here today before the Historical Commission seeking feedback. He explained that they did not realize initially that the building was designed by a famous architect. Ms. Ahn commented that the way the building is sited forms a gateway to Lawrence Court with her house, and that should be preserved. Mr. Thomas noted that this is a historic district, where buildings work together.

Dennis Probst introduced himself as one of the property owners. He acknowledged that the front window is open, but explained that it is open because of a need for ventilation owing to mold in the house; it is the only operable window in the house. He stated that the entire front bay is rotted and part of the roof is rotted and ready to cave in. Mr. Thomas responded that there is a technique for allowing ventilation which is recommended by the National Park Service, and used on many of its vacant buildings. It involves purchasing an inexpensive metal window screen with louvers, which allows for ventilation without letting rain in. He concurred that it is critical to allow ventilation through the building. Mr. Probst explained that the overhang protects the window, and noted that it is a casement window rather than a double-hung. Mr. Thomas suggested that, if he cannot get the protective screen in, owing to it being a casement window, the sash could be removed, stored on site, and the screen could be inserted until such time that he is ready to renovate the building. Mr. Probst explained that he closed the window as much as possible, leaving it open approximately one inch. He stated that water is not coming through the window; rather, it is coming through the roof where it is deteriorated. He stated that the property is undersized. He asserted that, simply because Mr. Boni is able to live in 600 square feet, does not mean that he also wants to live in such a small house. Mr. Thomas responded that the Historical Commission cannot tell Mr. Probst how to live, but it can regulate the exterior appearance of the house, and assist him with meeting those regulations. He advised Mr. Probst to meet with the staff. Mr. Probst agreed, and noted that he simply wished to explain why the window was open.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1907 PINE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear of building; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joshua D. Hingst and Megan Hingst

Applicant: David Nordone, DNARCHITECTS

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, based on the structural report, by a vote of 3 to 2. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman dissented.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall, a portion of the roof, and approximately 12-16 feet of the interior structure of the rear of this three-story rowhouse and to construct a three-story rear addition. The demolition of one and two-story frame rear additions was approved at the staff level with the stipulation that no demolition of the rear masonry wall occur. After the removal of the rear additions, the applicant claims to have identified deficiencies with the rear masonry wall. The application proposes to rebuild the removed floors and a small portion of the rear wall in roughly their original locations and to construct a new three-story ell with a roof overbuild of 12 feet 4 inches. The addition, which would not be visible from the public right-of-way, would be clad in stucco.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 429 AND 431 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck; demolish one-story addition and construct townhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4507 Kingsessing LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch

History: 1870; one-story pool addition constructed at 431 S. 20th Street after 1973

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 429 S. 20TH STREET: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 431 S. 20TH STREET: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option B, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided the following:

- the cornice continues across the entire Lombard Street façade;
- the bay is limited to the second and third stories and does not project into the mansard roof;
- the mansard roof maintains the incline of the adjacent historic building;
- the roof deck is set back further from the S. 20th Street façade, with staff to review the visibility of the deck and railing from the public right-of-way; and
- the deck railing is metal rather than glass.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the front façade of 429 S. 20th Street and to demolish the rear roof slope and dormer to allow for the construction of a four-story addition. The application also proposes to demolish the adjacent one-story structure at 431 S. 20th Street and to construct a new four-story residence with a roof deck and garage entrance on Lombard Street. The property at 429 S. 20th Street is classified as contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District; the one-story structure at 431 S. 20th Street is listed as an addition to 429 in the inventory. The one-story structure was erected at some point after 1973, when the lot was listed a vacant and open in permit applications.

Work to the front façade of 429 S. 20th Street would include removing the first-story pent eave addition, shutters, storm door, and dormer awnings; installing new one-over-one aluminum-clad windows; widening the first-story window opening; installing a new aluminum-clad transom over the entryway; and modifying the existing walk-down basement entrance to a window well. The rear addition would contain a small setback from the rear wall of the proposed new construction and would feature a deck with a glass guardrail at the fourth story. The rear wall would be clad in stucco and would contain a series of aluminum-clad casement windows and vinyl sliding-glass doors.

For the new four-story residence at 431 S. 20th Street, the application proposes gray brick, aluminum-clad windows, and an abstracted mansard that maintains the proportions and cornice lines of the S. 20th Street row. At the Lombard Street façade, the elevation includes patterned brick at the center of the building's massing, a three-story bay over a garage, and composite metal panel cladding that continues from the S. 20th Street mansard. The applicant has offered two options with differing window configurations. Option A includes a series of casement windows, while Option B features more traditional one-over-one double-hung sash windows at the S. 20th and Lombard Street facades. The rear of the addition in both options would consist of a solid wall of gray brick at the first story, aluminum-clad windows at the return of the bay, and

vinyl door systems at the second and fourth stories. Access to the roof deck would be visible at this elevation and would include a stair from the fourth story to the roof. The deck would be enclosed by a glass guardrail system and would maintain a five-foot setback from the S. 20th and Lombard Street facades with no setback for a portion of the rear elevation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Rustin Ohler and attorney David Orphanides represented the application.

Ms. Keller noted that the revised application for 429 S. 20th Street shows that the applicant intended to replace an asphalt roof in kind. She clarified that the roof is slate, not asphalt, and stated that the applicant has agreed to replace the slate in kind or to maintain the existing slate shingles. Mr. Ohler agreed.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee was concerned with the amount of information presented, especially of the rear, on 429 S. 20th Street. He added that, even in the revised material, there is no photograph of the rear. Reviewing the drawings, he continued, it is clear that the entire rear wall of the historic structure and the majority of its roof would be removed. He noted that the Committee considered the removal of the rear wall to be demolition according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The wall, he added, is also visible, although the new construction at 431 S. 20th Street would largely obscure the rear of the historic property from the public view. It remains unclear, he continued, what extent the rear of the historic property would be visible. He observed that it is currently highly visible, but the visibility would be greatly reduced when the new building is constructed.

Mr. Thomas agreed that the proposed new construction would eventually hide the rear. In reviewing the front elevation of 429 S. 20th Street, he inquired about the windows at the first floor, observing that they look very much out of scale in the revised drawing. He commented that the proposed for the new construction seem well-proportioned for the first floor of a four-story townhouse. He commented that the first-story opening next door looked altered. Ms. Keller clarified that there were historically alterations to the first stories of most of the buildings in the row. Mr. McCoubrey added that the first-story opening is an existing masonry opening.

Mr. Ohler stated that the existing first-story window has been modified since construction. Most first-story facades of the row have been modified, he added. He contended that the proposal is to return the window back to the dimensions of the original opening. At the interior, he continued, he has completed selective demolition to expose the original masonry opening. He explained that he will maintain the sill in its current location, adding that the head height and transom were previously removed, which resulted in a shortening of the head height. He noted that a pent roof was also installed and that he is proposing to remove the non-original pent roof and to reinstall the transom, in addition to returning the window to its original sill and head height.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether Mr. Ohler has investigated the interior by removing plaster to find the original opening. Mr. Ohler affirmed that he had. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether Mr. Ohler is proposing to maintain the existing width and sill height, but raising the head. Mr. Ohler confirmed that he would maintain the existing width and sill height but raise the head height to its original location. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the sill height would have originally been lower. Mr. Ohler responded that it was not lower and compared it to the other sills within the row, adding that the buildings contain kitchens behind the front walls. He further noted that the

first-floor kitchens were raised. Mr. McCoubrey countered that the current sill level was not the original level.

Mr. Thomas opined that other properties in the city underwent similar alterations, sometimes to create a sense of security. He asked if any historic photographs of the façade are available. Ms. Keller stated that none are available in the Historical Commission's files, and Mr. Ohler added that he was not able to find any pre-designation photographs. Mr. Thomas then asked if there is a programmatic reason for maintaining a high sill at that location. Mr. Ohler replied that the sill will correspond to the height of a kitchen counter. He then explained that the first floor is raised approximately 12-inches above the door level. Mr. Thomas remarked that S. 20th Street is still a commercial street in part and that many buildings were altered, with steps removed and other modifications, long before designation.

Mr. Schaaf asked whether the Streets Department has approved the proposed curb cut on Lombard Street for the double-width garage. Mr. Ohler affirmed that it had.

Mr. Thomas inquired whether the applicant is requesting in-concept or final approval for 429 S. 20th Street. Mr. Ohler answered that he is seeking final approval and offered to summarize the revisions made following the Architectural Committee's review. Mr. McCoubrey asked to see a photograph of the current appearance of the rear. Mr. Ohler replied that he submitted the best photographs he could take of the rear at the Architectural Committee meeting, adding that the rear is not easily visible. He then argued that with the construction of 431 S. 20th Street, only approximately 2-1/2 feet of the rear of 429 S. 20th Street would be visible. The rest, he argued, would not be visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Orphanides clarified that the visible portion of the building includes the addition and not the historic portion of the building. He added that there is an engineering justification and code compliance driving the proposed plans at the fourth story. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification. Mr. Ohler responded that he is now proposing to retain the dormer and roof slope but is also proposing a pent with a door. He explained that the existing stairs run perpendicular to the party walls of the structure and, consequently, he is proposing code-compliant steps, which cannot maintain the same configuration and need to instead run parallel to the party wall. The pent, he continued, covers the stair landing and is set back from the dormer. Mr. Thomas asked whether the drawings show a passageway that cuts into the roof. Mr. Ohler affirmed that they do. Mr. Orphanides added that the pent will be tucked back between the new construction at 431 S. 20th Street and the existing dormer of the historic structure. He added that he is proposing to replace the dormer window in kind rather than cut down the frame to add access stairs.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that there is no indication of what the exterior wall looks like today, and the applicant is proposing to demolish the exterior wall of the building, including a good portion of the roof to cover the landing. Mr. Ohler replied that he submitted photographs to the Architectural Committee of the exterior wall to the third story. He added that he cannot get photographs of the fourth-story dormer due to visibility issues. Mr. McCoubrey countered that the rear wall appears to be visible from the corner. Mr. Ohler explained that the wall is stuccoed, there are air conditioning units at the rear, and a projecting deck exists. Ms. Keller provided a copy of the photographs that Mr. Ohler submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the photographs were taken from the alley. Mr. Ohler answered that they are from the rear yard of the adjacent property and alley.

Mr. Thomas requested clarification on visibility of the rear following the construction of 431 S. 20th Street. Mr. Ohler answered that none of the historic structure would be visible with the

addition at the first through third stories and contended that only 2-1/2 feet of the addition would be visible from a public right-of-way.

Mr. McCoubrey examined the photographs of the rear wall and commented that it appears the wall has been altered.

Ms. Royer asked for the dimensions and material of the addition. Mr. Ohler answered that the addition would extend 5 feet and that the wall would be stuccoed.

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

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 12 January 2018, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 13 DECEMBER 2017

Emily Cooperman, Chair

ADDRESS: 3200 BELGRADE ST

Name of Resource: Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 3200 Belgrade Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Catholic Church at 3200 Belgrade Street in the Port Richmond neighborhood and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the church, which fronts on Allegheny Avenue and upon which construction began in 1890, is significant under Criterion for Designation E as the work of preeminent nineteenth century ecclesiastical architect Edwin Forrest Durang.

The staff notes that the architectural description describes the building's cladding as brown granite, but is, in fact, brownstone from Yardleyville, Pennsylvania.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney Michael Phillips and James J. Bock Jr., the Secretary for Temporal Services of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, represented the property owner. Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

Mr. Phillips distributed paper copies of his PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Morello commented that Port Richmond is not well-represented on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and she hopes that this nomination will be the first of many for the area, specifically for the trio of churches along Allegheny Avenue, of which this is one. She suggested that some of the maintenance costs provided by Mr. Phillips in his presentation are deceptive and demand more discussion than can be afforded at this meeting. She noted that many churches designed by

Durang are designated as historic. She referred to the church as very well-maintained and with an active parish. She suggested that representatives from the parish should be allowed to decide whether or not their buildings are historically designated, since they give the largest amount towards maintenance of the buildings, rather than the Archdiocese.

Mr. Phillips stated that the parish's Father Dennis Fedak was unable to attend this meeting, but Mr. Bock is attending as a representative of the Archdiocese. He stated that he will not argue the merits of designation related to Durang, but rather is here to ask the Commission to exercise its discretion and deny the designation so that the Archdiocese and the individual parishes can continue their efforts to care for and protect their historic resources without the additional cost and time associated with Historical Commission oversight. He continued that the Archdiocese and individual parishes are allies when it comes to historic preservation. The Archdiocese is the steward and owner of over 100 buildings in Philadelphia that are over 100 years old. These buildings are being cared for and protected, regardless of historic designation. Nearly 25% of the 76 active parishes in Philadelphia have buildings already listed on the Philadelphia Register. Over the past 10 years, parishes have collectively spent nearly \$63 million on caring for their properties. Since 2013, parishes have spent nearly \$5.5 million on façade repairs alone. The estimated cost of future façade repairs is \$11 million. The majority of Durang buildings were commissioned for the Archdiocese. Approximately two-thirds of Durang-designed buildings in Philadelphia are owned by the individual parishes. Of the 40 buildings total, 18 are already on the Philadelphia Register. Individual parishes have spent \$9 million on Durang-designed buildings in care and upkeep in the last 10 years. There has been \$14 million spent on historically designated buildings. There is \$4.5 million projected for Durang-designed façade repairs over next five years. Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Roman Catholic Church (Nativity BVM), an active parish, has spent over a quarter of a million dollars in capital expenditures for façade repairs and upkeep over the past 10 years. There is \$240,000 projected for façade repairs over next 5 years. Nativity BVM Place is an example of adaptive reuse, having been converted in 2015 into 63 one-bedroom units for income-eligible seniors. Mr. Phillips highlighted examples of historic resources that the parishes take care of, some of which are listed on the Philadelphia Register, and some of which are not historically designated. He explained that the properties are cared for in the same manner, regardless of historic designation. He briefly discussed restoration work and financials associated with the following churches: Saint Francis Xavier, Saint Vincent de Paul, Saint Veronica, Saint Charles Borromeo, Saint Patrick, Saint Michael, Saint Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, Cathedral Basilica of Saints Peter and Paul, Saint John the Evangelist, Saint Francis de Sales, Saint John the Baptist, Old St. Joseph's, Our Mother of Consolation, Annunciation BVM, and Epiphany of Our Lord. He reiterated that the Archdiocese and parishes care for and protect their historic resources. He opined that this case is similar to the nomination of murals inside of the Cathedral Basilica, where the Commission chose to not designate the murals partially because they are being cared for. He explained that they object to the nominations because it adds an additional expense and burden to the individual parishes, especially when those parishes are already doing the work.

Mr. Phillips explained that costs provided in the PowerPoint presentation are estimates. He asked if Mr. Bock agreed with the information provided in the presentation. Mr. Bock responded affirmatively. Mr. Bock explained that he is involved in the day-to-day efforts of struggling parishes looking to maintain their buildings. He explained that they work with historic preservation experts such as Vitetta, and are actively working on renovation of the dome and roof at Saint Vincent de Paul, and recently finished a major restoration project at Saint John the

Baptist. He noted that they have an ecclesiastical exchange program, where sacred objects can be placed in other churches that can reuse the items.

Ms. Morello commented that the discussion seems to be shifting to how the Archdiocese maintains costs and affordability to keep its buildings in a condition that would satisfy the Historical Commission. She stated that she is friendly with Monsignor Kevin Lawrence from Saint John the Baptist, and is aware of some parishes partaking in online fundraising efforts. She stated that the issue is not whether the Archdiocese lacks creativity in raising funds to preserve its buildings. She produced a newspaper article about a Monsignor who embezzled money, and opined that the money could have been used for historic preservation. Mr. Phillips objected, noting that it is irrelevant to the discussion of historic designation of Nativity BVM. Ms. Morello responded that her family has contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars in free work, and she is sure that there are contractors who can offset costs, if the Archdiocese were to allow them. Mr. Thomas cautioned Ms. Morello to limit her comments to the merits of the nomination.

Mr. Thomas attempted to redirect the discussion to the topic of proposed historic designation of Nativity BVM. He referenced the murals in the Cathedral Basilica, which the Commission voted not to designate, even though it voted that the murals satisfied the Criteria for Designation, because the Commission believed those murals were being well-maintained. He cautioned that the Commission needs to look ahead when it comes to buildings, because buildings are sold and nominations are received too late to prevent alterations or demolition. He stated that the Commission is trying to be proactive rather than reactive. If a church is designated, sold, and there is no way to reuse the building, then the owner can submit a financial hardship application. He stated that the Commission is trying to avoid a situation where it has not planned well, and has not designated an eligible resource. He noted that he is not necessarily referring to this church. He explained that the Commission is not arguing that the Archdiocese has not maintained its building, but rather, the Commission needs to look ahead when it comes to designation matters. He noted that others in the City are doing the same, such as the Mayor's Task Force on Historic Preservation. He suggested that the decision about this proposed designation can be considered in two parts, the first being a vote on whether or not the church meets the Criteria for Designation, and the second being a vote on whether or not to designate the church as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He reiterated that the Commission needs to plan ahead so as to not miss an opportunity to preserve historic resources.

Mr. Phillips stated that he supports the two-step designation voting process, but reminded the Commission that, with respect to Nativity BVM, this is an active parish. There is money that has been utilized by the parish for building upkeep, and the same amount is projected over the next five years. The work to ensure that this church building stays in good condition is already being done, and so it is unnecessary to add the additional layer of oversight to both the parish and also the Commission. There are other cities that afford protections to historic resources of religious institutions so there is more of a cooperative working relationship. This is another instance where the church is being well-maintained by the parish. He asked that the Commission allow the parish to do that work, without the additional red tape and oversight. He stated that the work will be done in a respectful manner.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the Commission first address the question of whether or not the building satisfies the Criteria recommended by the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Morello asked why it would be a burden on the Archdiocese to have this building listed on the

Philadelphia Register. Mr. Thomas responded that her question should be held until after the Commission discusses the Criteria.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment regarding the nomination. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that he supports the designation. He opined that Nativity BVM is one of the most unique Catholic churches in Philadelphia. He commented that it is part of a complex of three churches on Allegheny Avenue, and helps to anchor Campbell Square. He noted that it is highly visible from Interstate 95. He commented that he cannot understand why a designation of this building would be a detriment to the parish and their efforts to maintain it. Mr. Thomas asked that public comment be limited to the nomination and the Criteria for Designation. Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the Alliance believes that this church building satisfies Criteria E and H and deserves to be added to the Philadelphia Register. Venise Whitaker, a Fishtown resident, commented that the building should be added to the Philadelphia Register.

Mr. Thomas asked that the Historical Commission vote on whether or not the property satisfies the Criteria for Designation. Mr. McCoubrey noted that Criterion H is not checked on the nomination form. Mr. Schaaf explained that the Committee recommended that the building also satisfies Criterion H, because of its adjacency to the other churches as well as it being a strong visual landmark on Allegheny Avenue.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3200 Belgrade Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and H. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Phillip stated that historic designation of this church building is not necessary because there is an active parish that allocates money to care for and protect the property already. If added to the Philadelphia Register, there are additional costs associated with review by the Committee and Commission, attorneys, and architects, and all of that is borne by the parish to accomplish something that is already being accomplished, where there is an active parish. These costs can increase exponentially when compounded on every church that comes before the Commission. It is a cost that is borne by the parish. It adds another layer of pressure that is unnecessary. In this case, the Commission can have faith and confidence, based on the condition of and the activity at the building that it will continue to be cared for without the unnecessary oversight. If the church were to begin to fall into disrepair, it could be nominated again. He reminded the Commission that the Committee commended the Archdiocese for taking such good care of the building. The Commission should exercise its discretion and make the reasoned decision to deny the designation based upon the fact that the resource is being actively cared for and well-maintained by the parish. Mr. McCoubrey asked how that differs from other property owners, individuals, and institutions that also care for and maintain their historic buildings. Mr. Phillips responded that other property owners and institutions do not have over 100 buildings that are over 100 years old and spend so much money on a parish level to care for and maintain the buildings. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he can think of a few examples. Mr. Phillips responded that one cannot say that the Archdiocese is like other property owners.

Ms. Royer stated that regular maintenance and restoration can be reviewed and approved by the staff, and only a proposed major alteration would require a presentation to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Mr. Phillips responded that work needs to happen to church buildings, such as repair of a roof or restoration of a dome. Ms. Royer responded that those things can be handled by a staff-level review.

Ms. Morello commented that parishioners are very proud to say if they belong to a parish that is historical. She stated that she has been responsible for historic markers being placed at five churches. It is what the parishioners want. It is a source of pride, and they are willing to provide money to do general maintenance. She opined that the Archdiocese misconstrues the significance of owning a designated property; the Archdiocese believes that it means that some other entity is exerting some type of power that takes away from or minimizes the rights of the property owner. The Historical Commission needs to clarify its authority for the Archdiocese so that it understands that it will still have control over its properties. Mr. Phillips stated that there are examples, such as the installation of an ADA ramp, which would likely exceed a staff-level approval. He stated that an additional layer of oversight is unnecessary. Mr. Thomas commented that much of the work highlighted in the PowerPoint presentation is excellent work, and done in consultation with excellent consultants. He noted that drawings would need to be prepared for the Department of Licenses & Inspections regardless for most scopes of work. He suggested that the advice received by a review by the staff, Architectural Committee, and/or Historical Commission can often result in a better design solution. He reiterated that the Commission does not know when a property will become at-risk. He stated that the situation discussed earlier regarding murals was an interior issue, and the designation of the exterior of the Cathedral Basilica was very appropriate. The murals were not at the same level of risk as a building that can be sold.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Archdiocese is increasingly facing nominations of churches simply because the churches are old buildings. This creates an additional constraint on the parishes, Archdiocese, and the religion as a whole. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he takes exception to the sense that Mr. Phillips is discrediting the review process and speaking like it is not a worthwhile process. Mr. Phillips responded that he is only saying that there is an additional cost. Mr. McCoubrey responded that there is an additional cost, but there is also a benefit. Good advice is offered that can contribute to the design. Mr. Phillips responded that he respects that, and did not mean to denigrate it whatsoever. He explained that the reason he showed his last PowerPoint slide showing consultants is because they are all well-respected in the field. He stated that the Archdiocese is already consulting with these experts, independent of whether or not the property is on the Philadelphia Register.

MOTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to designate the church property at 3200 Belgrade Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, based on the earlier finding that it satisfies Criteria for Designation E and H. Ms. Turner seconded the motion.

Mr. Thomas asked once again for public comment. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that applications proposing routine maintenance are typically reviewed by the staff. He commented that the Commission does not charge fees for review, nor does the staff charge for time and expertise. He commented that maintenance is not a Criterion for Designation, and buildings are nominated because they deserve it. This is not an indictment of the Archdiocese; if anything, it is a testament to their stewardship of a church like this, and it is recognizing it, rather than punishing it. He cautioned the Commission against a bifurcation of the vote. He noted that the Commission has discretion, but that the bifurcated practice confuses the process, confuses the public in attendance, and even seemingly at times confuses the Commissioners. He suggested that the Commission try to collapse the process to make it as clear and cohesive as possible. He concluded that the Alliance supports the nomination.

Mr. Phillips stated that he fears that this is leading down a path of nominating every Catholic church that is relatively old. That would create constraints. Mr. Thomas responded that this is not the case, and the Commission is not designating every Catholic church that is relatively old. He stated that a quality nomination must be prepared that makes the case for historic designation.

Public comment resumed. James Duffin thanked the Archdiocese for maintaining Nativity BVM. He reiterated that Committee members were impressed with the current state of the building. He cautioned the Commission that it should have firm evidence before it to substantiate the statements that have been made, such as if designation is going to create a greater financial burden. He commented that, in the past, where the Commission used to approve demolitions of designated buildings, it would require the owner to present documentation that the financing for the new project was in hand before it would allow for demolition. He commented that it might be helpful to ask the church owner to present budgets for the next five years, so that it is not simply a statement on the record, but rather it is substantiated. He commented that a fear of church demolitions over the last several years has been the driving force behind recent nominations. He commented that, at the moment, the only tool available in Philadelphia to prevent demolition is to list a property on the Philadelphia Register. He suggested that the Task Force discuss other tools that may allow for some sort of demolition review, but would not necessarily require the full measure of oversight that currently comes with listing on the Philadelphia Register. He suggested that the Archdiocese develop a proposal that it could present to the Task Force on what it would consider an acceptable level of protection from demolition for church buildings. He noted that it would be useful for all houses of worship, because they all face similar issues. Mr. Bock responded that he would welcome an invitation to participate in Task Force discussions, and has felt somewhat left out of the discussion. Mr. Duffin responded that he will make a point of it when he attends Task Force meetings. Mr. Thomas commented that he will too. Oscar Beisert, representing Keeping Society, cautioned the Commission against accepting this argument, because, unless the Archdiocese is willing to bring every building before the Commission for review, or is willing to enter into a memorandum of agreement in which every building over a certain age is reviewed, it ultimately would be out of the Commission's purview. The Commission would not know if the Archdiocese is going to demolish a building. He commented that Saint John the Baptist is an example of an incredible ensemble of buildings in Manayunk, and there are active demolition permits for two of the buildings. He commented that that is a perfect example of why these church complexes should be historically designated. He opined that those buildings would have been the easiest to reuse, but instead they are proposed for demolition. He asked that the Commission move forward with the designation, and thanked Ms. Morello for nominating it. He commented that there are a handful of buildings in Philadelphia that should not even require a nomination, but rather just a completed form, and even a judge would laugh if someone tried to claim them as not historic. He opined that this would be one of those buildings.

Ms. Stanford stated that she is struggling with Mr. Duffin's comment and the discussion of red tape and oversight. She stated that there is no agreement regarding the designation cost as opposed to the maintenance cost. She stated that the fact that the Commission cannot use that as its criteria is good, but she still is struggling to understand that. She commented that perhaps it is something that the Archdiocese or Task Force needs to do, so that it can be quantified when discussing economic burden. She stated that it does not change her mind in terms of this proposed designation. Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted that the Commission will take action today based on where things are now. He agreed that it is good that this discussion looked ahead, and encouraged the Archdiocese's participation in Task Force meetings.

Public comment resumed. Mary McGettigan, representing West Philadelphians for Progressive Planning and Preservation, commented that the two-step voting process perplexes her. She commented that, from the point of view of the nominators, there is a code to go by, which suggests that if a nomination is prepared based on certain Criteria for Designation and those Criteria are met, a vote is taken and a decision is made. She commented that there is a big difference between the code as it is written, and how the Commission operates. She commented that it puts nominators in a difficult position, because the word “discretion” has come up. She asked if “discretion” is a legal term. She commented that nominators follow the law, and come to the meeting with a nomination that has taken weeks to months to prepare and is based on the Criteria for Designation. She continued that nominators are then subjected to this notion of “discretionary allocation of the law.” She suggested that nominators cannot be prepared for this type of discussion unless they are psychic. She asked that this issue is addressed. She asked if this is the forum for a hardship discussion, and if so, it would put the nominators in a difficult position because they are not prepared to address financial aspects of designation.

Mr. Phillips stated that the two-step designation voting process is helpful because it takes the first question of whether or not a property merits designation off of the table, and then the discretionary role can be addressed. He noted that the ordinance and Rules & Regulations use the phrases “may designate” and “use an informed and reasoned opinion.” He opined that he is not making a financial hardship argument, but rather that designation is simply not necessary in this case. Mr. Thomas commented that the Commission meets at public meetings for a reason, and has technical committees made up of professionals in the field, in addition to the Commission being filled by professionals who can look at all impacts of historic preservation. He acknowledged that the Commission has discretion but does not use it often. He asked why there should be a Commission, if there is no discretion. He continued that the Commission meets at public meetings to listen to property owners and preservation advocates.

Mr. Farnham clarified that, by using its discretion during the designation process, the Commission is precisely complying with its statutory requirements. It is the statute that gives it that discretion. He warned that no one should leave the meeting believing that the Commission is somehow straying from its statute by using its discretion. It is the statute that says that the Commission “may” designate if it finds that a resource meets one or more Criteria for Designation. The Commission is never required to designate. Designation is always a discretionary decision. A property could meet all of the Criteria and the Commission could choose to not designate that property, for whatever reason it chooses to. The Commission is complying and has complied with the law in this regard. Any claim that it is not is misguided. Leonard Reuter, City attorney representing the Historical Commission, confirmed Mr. Farnham’s explanation. He explained that § 14-1004(1) of the Historical Commission’s ordinance explicitly states that a resource “may” be designated for preservation. The Commission has the discretion to designate or not designate. He commented that he cannot prevent the Commission from undertaking a two-step voting process for designation matters; however, he cautioned against it because it can create confusion on behalf of the public. He noted that, while interesting to discuss the larger policy question of designation of church buildings, the only issue before the Commission is designation of Nativity BVM. He commented that the Commission may consider the argument about additional costs incurred as a result of designation, but the relevance of that is the cost to the parish for this building, and not the idea that it is a slippery slope that all churches will get designated and will cost the Archdiocese. He agreed that it would be beneficial to have a larger discussion by the Task Force or at a later Commission meeting regarding designation of houses of worship. He commented that under Canon Law, the exterior portions of

a building are not considered sacred and therefore not governed by the same law that would govern the interior. He summarized that his point is that the Commission should go ahead and vote on the proposed designation, but it should vote on this particular church building. Mr. Phillips clarified that the nomination is limited to the church building, but not the rectory or school. Ms. McGettigan thanked Mr. Reuter for explaining what “may” means and for acknowledging that a bifurcated vote can lead to confusion by the public. Lori Salganicoff, “preservationist and someone with an iPhone,” read the historic preservation ordinance regarding the purposes of the Historical Commission. She concluded that the Commission has discretion, but is charged with preserving historic buildings.

ACTION: By unanimous vote, the Historical Commission adopted Ms. Cooperman and Ms. Turner’s motion to designate the church property at 3200 Belgrade Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, based on the earlier finding that it satisfies Criteria for Designation E and H.

ADDRESS: 2 E CHESTNUT HILL AVE

Name of Resource: 2 E Chestnut Hill Avenue

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 2 E Chestnut Hill Ave Partners LP

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2 E Chestnut Hill Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the house, constructed in 1863, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, E, and H. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the dwelling is significant as a reflection of the distinctive mid-nineteenth century form of the Gothic Revival cottage. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the building is representative of the work of James C. Sidney, one of the most important architects and surveyors of Philadelphia in the mid-nineteenth century, and his partner Frederick C. Merry. The nomination also asserts that the property is significant under Criterion H owing to its position on a prominent corner of Chestnut Hill and Germantown Avenues.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner. Lori Salganicoff and Amy Lambert of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy represented the nomination.

Ms. Salganicoff explained that the Conservancy nominated the building, which is one of 600 buildings identified as Significant in the Chestnut Hill National Register Historic District. She noted that she believed this would be the 92nd of those Significant buildings to be listed on the Philadelphia Register. She noted that this is an important building to be prioritized for designation because it sits at a very important gateway location right along the commercial corridor as it enters into the residential area of Chestnut Hill. Chestnut Hill Avenue has been especially hard-hit in terms of development and tear-down interest. She noted that 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue is significant for all of the reasons described in the nomination.

Ms. Lambert explained that she was hired by the Conservancy to write the nomination for 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue, which is a very special building that Samuel Austin developed in conjunction with the architectural firm of Sidney & Merry. This is one of four buildings on which they collaborated.

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

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and H, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2216 WALNUT STREET

Name of Resource: 2216 Walnut Street

Proposed Action: Classification

Property Owner: 2216 Walnut Street LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission classify the property at 2216 Walnut Street as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, for the following reasons:

1. the underlying 1880s rowhouse was so altered in 1950 that it lost all attributes of a residential building discernible to the public; and,
2. the commercial use as a sales office for business machines is not a use that would qualify the building for a classification of contributing under the statement of significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to classify the property at 2216 Walnut Street as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The building in question at 2216 Walnut Street was not explicitly addressed in the district inventory, but was apparently included within the inventory entry for the adjacent building, the Roosevelt Hotel at 2218-22 Walnut Street, which is classified as significant. At the time of the designation of the historic district, the parcels at 2216 and 2218-22 Walnut Street were consolidated as one tax parcel. The inventory entry, which numbers the property as 2216-24 Walnut, describes the 10-story residential hotel at the corner, which was built in 1927, but it makes no mention whatsoever of the four-story building at 2216, which began as a rowhouse constructed about 1888 and was significantly reconstructed as an office building in 1950. The 1950 reconstruction included a new front façade, floor-level modifications, and rear additions. From the public right-of-way, the building appears as a mid twentieth-century, four-story office building. The classification application argues that the statement of significance does not mention any historic buildings in the district that post-date 1935, that the statement of significance does not claim that office buildings played a role in the district's significance, and that the most analogous building in the district, 1606 Locust Street, which began as a four-story rowhouse but was refaced in the twentieth century as an office building, is classified as non-contributing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman recused from the consideration of the reclassification request for 2216 Walnut Street, owing to their firms involvements with the property. Ms. Turner assumed the chair. She announced that the Historical Commission could

because the Commission lacked a quorum without Mr. Thomas and Ms. Cooperman. Mr. Farnham apologized to the applicant and explained that the reclassification request would be heard at the February 2018 meeting of the Historical Commission.

ADDRESS: 4058 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: 4058 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Apostolos and Elizabeth Nares

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4058 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, but not Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4058 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the “restrained interpretation of the Italianate” twin satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G and J. The nomination argues that the twin, constructed between 1872-76 as part of the Thomas H. Powers development consisting of 4046-60 Chestnut Street, is one of a group of houses that has significant value as part of the development of the twin housing type and the formation of West Philadelphia as a suburb aimed to accommodate white-collar commuters whose influx into West Philadelphia was fueling this suburban development. The nomination further contends that the twin is part of and related to a distinctive area, owing to its listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing resource within the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner. Elizabeth Stegner, president of the University City Historical Society, represented the nomination.

Ms. Stegner stated that a representative of the property owner was unable to attend the meeting, but is in support of the designation. Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented that it is an interesting example of a Thomas Powers development. Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4058 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2041-55 CORAL ST

Name of Resource: Harbisons' Dairies

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Fozan Ehmedi

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 2041-55 Coral Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, F, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2041-55 Coral Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the four buildings and iconic milk bottle water tower formerly owned by Harbisons' Dairy satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, F, H, and J. The nomination argues that Harbisons' Dairy developed into a leading dairy company that served many Philadelphians through what began as a home milk delivery service and later expanded into a large-scale production facility. The nomination asserts that owners Robert and Thomas Bartley Harbison were significant Philadelphians, owing not only to their role in establishing and growing the prominent dairy business, but also for their involvement in educating and promoting the safe storage and transport of milk products. The nomination further contends that the milk bottle water tower is significant for its innovative use as an advertisement and as a familiar visual feature of the neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney William Martin and owner's representative Adid Ibrahim represented the property owner. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert stated that Harbisons' Dairies was one of the most important dairy and milk delivery businesses in the city. The company's dairy facilities, he continued, included the main office and plant at Kensington and Huntingdon Park Avenues, the Kensington service plant at Front and Diamond Streets, the Tioga Service Plant on Old York Road, an ice cream plant on Torresdale Avenue, the Frankford Service Plant on Kensington Avenue, and a plant serving Bucks County in Langhorne. He asserted that the nominated property serves as only one of these facilities that attests to the imminence of the company and stands as the only intact facility that survives to date at the original site where the dairy was founded in Kensington. Each facility, he argued, contained technology to pasteurize and bottle milk with specific facilities for bottle washing, butter manufacturing, milk storage and pasteurization, receiving room tanks, and other machinery. He added that there was usually a stable at each location for milk delivery. Mr. Beisert noted that building number 4, as labeled in the nomination, is the oldest building subject to designation, dating to the 1890s. Buildings 1, 2, and 3, he commented, were built in the 1910s and were designed by Stearns & Castor. Mr. Beisert remarked that the iconic milk bottle water tower stands in addition to the dairy itself, adding that there are other areas of significance associated with the site, such as those related to several members of the Harbison family.

Mr. Martin introduced himself and noted that the property owner, Fozan Ehmedi, has owned the property for more than 30 years. He explained that Mr. Ehmedi could not be present at the meeting and that his nephew and business partner, Mr. Ibrahim, is appearing on Mr. Ehmedi's behalf. He commented that Mr. Ibrahim is familiar with the property. Mr. Martin then stated that the property owner has no objection to the designation of the milk bottle water tower, though he strongly objects to the designation of the building on a number of grounds. First, he continued,

the nomination should have been dismissed as being incomplete for the following reason: the nominator referenced buildings 4, 3, 2, and 1, and gave some history, but omitted a still-extant original part of the complex. That extant building, located at 2042-46 Amber Street, Mr. Martin added, is now the Milk Bottle Condominium Building, which borders the nominated property and was part of the original Harbisons plant. He acknowledged that the building was sold out of the group in the 1910s, but argued that the building is not at all alluded to in the nomination, aside from the inclusion of a historic photograph on page 37. Mr. Martin argued that designating a subportion because it is owned by one property owner and ignoring another portion merely because it is owned by another property owner is inconceivably inappropriate. He called the potential practice arbitrary and capricious, and suggested that it would leave the Commission's decision subject to reversal. He recommended that the nomination be returned to the nominator for additional research and asked that the Commission be able to consider the nomination of the Harbisons' Dairies properties as a whole. To block off 80% of the whole and not consider the buildings on the other 20% because of ownership, he continued, is not rational. Mr. Martin argued that there is no logical explanation offered for not nominating the entire historic complex.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Beisert if he wants to address Mr. Martin's concern. Mr. Beisert responded that the Historical Commission designates by parcel and in many cases, such as this nomination, the work is compiled by volunteers who have a very long list of potentially eligible properties that should be nominated. He then contended that by the early twentieth century, Harbisons had sold the property noted by Mr. Martin and had acquired the nominated properties. The use of that original property, he continued, comprises a very short period of the company's history. Mr. Beisert added that the photograph on page 37 shows a two-story building, and the current building on the site is three stories in height. He noted that he would need to research whether it is the same building and to determine when it was built, altered, and whether the Harbisons enlarged the building. He suggested that the present building may no longer represent Harbisons' Dairies and may instead represent a later period. The larger portion of Harbisons' Dairies, the more significant portion, is the property before the Commission today, he argued. These buildings, Mr. Beisert added, consist of a building with an 1890s construction date and a much more expensive plant, which was designed by Stearns & Castor and added between 1912 and 1913 with the iconic milk bottle water tower.

Mr. Martin countered that the nomination is replete with narrative regarding the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and argued that it is disingenuous to not include the original building because it was not part of the plant after 1915 or 1917. The entire nomination, he added, includes significant detail regarding the nineteenth century and early twentieth century and serves as part of the basis upon which the nominator applies the standards and which the Committee made its determination. He questioned Mr. Beisert's statement about requiring research to understand whether the building on page 37 is the building in question when Mr. Beisert presented the photograph in the nomination. If this photograph of the building is not what it is alleged to be, he continued, then the entire nomination should be discarded for continuing questionable information.

Mr. Beisert responded that it is not uncommon, when discussing the history of a firm or business, to include the earlier part of a company's history to discuss how it developed. He contended that there are limited photographs of Harbisons' Dairies available to the public and that this early photograph shows the company's more humble origins, which is quite significant to include, whether or not the building still stands. He contended that the building represents how the company evolved and how important it became by acquiring nearly the entire block and hiring an important architectural firm to design a building. Mr. Beisert argued that whether the

original building is included in the nomination is irrelevant and reiterated that the building may or may not appear as it did when Harbisons owned it, since it now stands at three stories rather than the original two. He suggested that the most important aspect of the building is that it was small and represented the earlier period of the company. Had the company not evolved, he continued, there would likely be no discussion at the current meeting.

Mr. Martin clarified that the property under discussion is physically attached to the nominated properties and is not an out-parcel that was discarded so the company could move down the block. He then stated that he has marketing materials from the condominium building regarding the history of Harbisons' Dairies at that location. He then argued that there is no factual dispute and that the facts show that a portion of the attached and existing building is not being nominated. Mr. Martin reiterated that for the Historical Commission to designate a subset based upon property ownership is arbitrary and capricious and subject to reversal.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the two-story building with the jack-arch windows shown in the historic photograph on page 37 of the nomination is the earlier building. Ms. Cooperman replied that it is the earlier building, which Harbisons then sold. She explained that the building went to a different owner for a different use in the 1910s. Ms. Cooperman compared the process to Keystone Saw, a company that began in Northern Liberties and moved to Tacony and added that sharing a party wall is irrelevant. The company, she continued, made a transition to a new facility and deaccessioned the earlier one in the 1910s. She noted that the company could have moved down the block or halfway across the city, but the building was no longer associated with Harbisons and instead went to a new owner and a new use. Ms. Cooperman then stated that the Committee concurred with the nominator on the buildings and boundaries proposed for designation. The Committee, she added, was convinced that the adjacent parcel under discussion was appropriately excluded.

Mr. Beisert added that he would not have been able to nominate that property as part of the current individual nomination and that it would have required a separate individual nomination. He argued that he did not leave out a portion that would have been allowable in this nomination.

Mr. Martin argued that, while the point was made that the property was transferred out in the 1910s, page 21 of the nomination discusses the fact that it was a portion of a complex completed in 1895, two years older than the rest of the facility. Again he continued, there was a unified Harbisons operation between approximately 1895 and 1915 or 1917, which utilized building 4, which is proposed to be designated, and the adjacent and adjoining property, which is now a condominium, which is left unprotected and unaddressed by this or any other nomination. He stated that even beyond the fact that he finds the nomination to be incomplete, he opposes the individual points. He noted that much has been made of Mr. Harbison as a successful businessman in Philadelphia, and he agreed with the statement. However, Mr. Martin questioned whether that fact is sufficient for preserving a property. He contended that the majority of footnotes in the nomination consist of two sources: a calendar produced for the Harbisons centennial and a vanity family history published by one of the family members. He asserted that voluminous footnoting should not lead to the mistaken impression of the family or business's significance. He reiterated that the milk bottle water tower is appropriate for designation, claiming that the vast majority of the nomination addresses issues related to the structure. Mr. Martin clarified that he is not arguing against the designation of the water tower but is arguing against designation of the building. Under Criterion for Designation H, he argued that the established and familiar visual feature is not the building but is only the water tower. The building, he continued, was a manufacturing building constructed and added to several

times, repaired and replaced with marginal consideration for its architectural features. He asserted that the individual photographs in the nomination shows a mishmash of bricks and facades with different types of inserts for windows. In some cases, he added, those inserts were there from the beginning. He then questioned how one would adaptively reuse the building and whether windows would be allowed where inserts were placed historically. To not allow for the installation of windows, he contended, the Commission would be compelling the building to function as an industrial island in what has become a sea of residential properties.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Ibrahim how the property was used most recently. Mr. Ibrahim answered that it was used as a grocery warehouse but that it is not currently used for storage, because the neighbors were annoyed by the trucks that would access the property. Mr. Martin added that there is no way today to allow trucks to load and unload without going onto a residential parcel due to the small street. Mr. Martin then asked about the interior of the building and whether the floors are level or differentiated in height. Mr. Ibrahim replied that the building is open from the first-floor level to the ceiling in building 4 and that the floors in building three consist of multiple levels. Mr. Martin added that portions of the buildings were never used by the owner. When the property was nominated, he continued, the city assessed it at approximately \$560,000. He argued that it is relevant to understand that the city identified the property has holding a value of \$9 per square foot. He claimed that there is rarely a residential property valued less than the City's assessment. He asked that the Commission review the photographs and added that the water tower is what residents want protected. When the Preservation Alliance placed the property on the 10 most at-risk properties list, he continued, they included only the water tower. Mr. Martin then implored the Commission to designate the water tower and to decline to designate the building, arguing that the building is not appropriate for designation. In doing so without considering the balance of the historic Harbisons property, he continued, the Commission would be placing its action at significant risk of reversal. He concluded that designation is a significant burden to the property owner.

Mr. Beisert responded to the comment of the property being a mishmash of trivial buildings and urged the Commission to turn to page 31 where he included a survey of Harbisons Dairies, ca. 1918. That survey, he continued, does not include trivial buildings, like the original building which was very small and added to over time. He contended that the property was an important industrial site designed by an important architectural firm and was the center of a large and important dairy in the city of which there is very little visible evidence left. He argued that, even without considering the milk bottle water tower, the buildings themselves retain architectural and cultural significance and the Harbisons were important to the pure milk movement. He also commented on the presence of Harbison Avenue, suggesting that major city avenues are not generally named after insignificant individuals. The major avenues, he asserted, are named after people or events that were historically significant.

Mr. Ibrahim asserted that both the interior and exterior of the building are in very poor condition. The water tower is also in poor condition, he added, and the owner is not currently occupying the building. Mr. Martin stated that his client will be advised of his legal obligation regarding the water tower if it were to be designated.

Venice Whitaker noted that, as a Fishtown resident, a building of this caliber would benefit the community along the elevated line. She remarked that it could promote more density and allow for commercial space on the ground floor, which, she argued, would work better than allowing for the building's demolition and the construction of townhouses, which would potentially be the property's future. She contended that the community wants to retain its large buildings, such as

2041-55 Coral Street, along the elevated line, because it allows for density and more renters. During the time that Harbisons began its business, she continued, Irish immigrants settling in the area faced many challenges. That the Harbisons were able to create the milk movement and go on to build other buildings is very significant, she added. Ms. Whitaker stated that the river wards have become ground zero for demolition and deserve more designated properties to promote character and appreciation for the neighborhoods.

David Traub of Save Our Sites reiterated Mr. Martin's statement that the owner has no objection to designating the water tower. He argued that the building and milk bottle water tower are fused together as one image that falls under Criterion H and that stand as one familiar visual feature. He asserted that it is hard to imagine one without the other and asked that the Commission designate the whole complex.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that his organization agrees with the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation that the property satisfies Criteria A, D, F, H, and J. The building, he continued, exhibits significant character as part of the development of the neighborhood and the city and that it embodies distinguishing characteristics of an industrial architectural style, the likes of which have been preserved and adaptively reused in buildings throughout the neighborhood and city. He added that the property contains elements of design that represent innovation, due largely to the Harbison company's innovations in milk processing and distribution in the city. Mr. Steinke argued that there is no question that this building, in part because of the presence of the milk bottle water tower, is an established, familiar, even beloved, visual feature of the neighborhood. When the Preservation Alliance listed the water tower as a place to save, he continued it was without prejudice to the building on which it sits. He then noted that the property exemplifies the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the city, in particular, because the Harbison company was a household name in the city. He claimed that anyone over the age of 50 who has lived in Philadelphia remembers Harbisons milk. He again argued for designation, adding that should the property be designated, it does not hinder the owner's continued use of the building. Instead, he added, it would give the property a chance to live on for another day within its current use parameters or for a potential new use in a neighborhood of the city that has seen rising housing demand and increased economic prosperity. Part of that prosperity, he contended, is due to the former industrial character of the Kensington neighborhood, of which this complex is an important part. Mr. Steinke reiterated that he concurs with the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation and encouraged the Commission to designate the property.

James Duffin stated that, as a trained historian, he must understand context. He argued that the milk bottle water tower without the building completely destroys the context of what the milk bottle represents. He asserted that milk bottle functioned as a water tower to the building and is tied to a building that represents the industry that the milk bottle depicts. Protecting the milk bottle water tower without protecting the building, he continued, effectively allows the milk bottle to become a tombstone and symbol of loss rather than a symbol of the larger history of the building, industry, and complex.

Mr. Martin stated that if the milk bottle water tower were to be designated, any changes to it, including any proposals to remove the building below it, would have to come back for review by this Commission under the permitting limitations. He added that several individuals spoke about how the water tower is only relevant in the context of the building and noted that, in the visual exhibits contained in Appendix A of the nomination, there are numerous depictions only showing

the water tower and not including the building. He argued that only the milk bottle water tower is iconic and not the building.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2041-55 Coral Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, F, H, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1401 S WATER ST

Name of Resource: Engine 46 Firehouse

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Cedar-Riverview LP

Nominator: Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 1401 S. Water Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1401 S. Water Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former fire station is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H. The nomination contends that the building represents a period in which the City of Philadelphia invested heavily in the expansion of municipal services and in the architectural character of its facilities, satisfying Criterion A. The nomination argues that the Flemish Revival style reflects the environment of the late nineteenth century, satisfying Criteria C and D, and is an early work of John T. Windrim, satisfying Criterion E. Lastly, the nomination contends that the former fire station represents an established and familiar visual feature of the Pennsport neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H. A small portion of a circa 1999 addition stands on the building's historic and current legal parcel, and is considered non-contributing for the purposes of the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney Brett Peanasky represented the property owner. Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi represented the nomination.

Ms. Chantry stated that a letter from Powers & Company was distributed before the start of the meeting, which requests to clarify the designation boundary in regards to a non-contributing portion of the tax parcel. Mr. Steinke commented that the building stands as an example of a period of transition when the fire company was switching from an all-volunteer system, to a professional system, with purpose-built buildings by the City. He noted that this building was nearly lost to demolition, owing to an active demolition permit for this property for several years.

Mr. Peanasky stated that his client does not oppose the designation of the firehouse, and there are no current plans to alter or demolish the property, although it has sat vacant for several years. They are currently exploring ways to reuse the building. Powers & Company was retained to research existing conditions and additional history of the building. He requested that the designation boundary excludes the portion of the shopping center that abuts the firehouse. He agreed that the firehouse is significant, but does not want the designation to limit the ability

to reuse or repurpose that portion of the shopping center, which is not historic. He noted that the letter proposes the addition of a paragraph to the designation language to clarify the boundary and make clear that the significant portion of the tax parcel that is not part of the firehouse is not included in the designation. Mr. Steinke commented that the nominators have no objection to this request. Ms. Cooperman asked about the tax parcel shown in the nomination. Mr. Peanasky responded that it shows the current tax parcel. Mr. Thomas asked the difference between the blue line and the white line. Mr. Peanasky responded that the white line is the tax parcel, and the blue line is his proposed boundary.

Mr. Thomas asked what would happen if they proposed to build up the eastern side of the firehouse. Mr. Peanasky responded that, if the building is designated, anything that would abut that property line would have to be reviewed by the Historical Commission because it would touch a historically designated resource. He reiterated that they do not have any current plans, but want to have flexibility of designing on the eastern side of the property line which would otherwise be included in the designation. To the extent that any future proposal for new construction affects the historic firehouse in any way, the project would need to come to the Commission for at least a review by the staff. Mr. Thomas commented that often times there is an agreement as to what type of setback could be allowed, so that it is known ahead of time what the required footage of setback is from the side of the historic building. He asked if they are planning to subdivide the property. Mr. Peanasky responded that they are not looking to subdivide the small portion of the tax parcel off at this time.

Leonard Reuter, the City attorney representing the Historical Commission, asked if Mr. Peanasky is accepting of the designation covering everything that is within the tax parcel upon which the firehouse sits, and that everything outside of the parcel lines can be explicitly defined as not containing historic fabric and not part of the designation. He asked for clarification as to what Mr. Peanasky is asking for in regards to the portion of a building that is not part of the firehouse itself but is still within the parcel. Mr. Peanasky responded that they are looking for that to not be included in the designation. He commented that they proposed a similar scenario in regards to the designation of the PECO power station at 1325 Beach Street, where they agreed on the boundary of the historic parcel and where the boundary of the designation should be, and that any future application would have to demonstrate to the staff that nothing of historic significance is being impacted. Mr. Reuter asked if Mr. Peanasky would concede that the remainder of the parcel is still designated, if and when the non-historic building is removed in the future and the historic firehouse wall is exposed. Mr. Peanasky responded that, if an application is submitted for the address of 1401 S. Water Street at any point in the future, it would still have to be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Mr. Reuter responded that he wanted to make sure that Mr. Peanasky and his client understand that as long as a proposal is within the boundaries of the parcel, it is all designated, but the Commission will recognize what is non-historic and therefore non-contributing fabric. Mr. Peanasky responded that they understand, and the purpose of this discussion and clarification is so that if they submit a proposal in the future to do work to the shopping center, it would be a staff-level review because it would be recognized that the shopping center is non-historic and non-contributing.

Mr. Reuter asked if the eastern wall of the firehouse is breached. Mr. Peanasky responded that there was a fire separation and a breach to the firehouse when the shopping center was added. Mr. Grossi noted that the eastern wall was exposed historically, and is largely intact. He stated the Alliance would have no objection to a proposal that would seek to demolish the circa 1999 shopping center. However, the Alliance would hope that the project would go through a typical

Commission review, whether by the staff or the full Commission, to negotiate a setback or reconnection points to the eastern wall.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the Commission has previously accomplished this type of request by stating that the portion of the parcel that is outside the envelope of the historic building is non-contributing. Mr. Reuter agreed, and noted that everything outside of the parcel is simply not covered by designation at all. Mr. Thomas commented that the important thing to remember is that if the non-historic portion of the parcel is removed, whatever is built on the property is going to have to take into account the impact on the historic resource. Mr. Steinke commented that it can be handled in the normal fashion by a review by the staff and, if necessary, by the Architectural Committee and Commission. Mr. Grossi commented that the recent addition to the Chestnut Hill firehouse is an example.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that he supports the designation. He commented that the tower is similar in some ways to the Harbisons' Dairies milk bottle. He noted that the tower of a firehouse is a function element, used to hang wet fire hoses.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the firehouse at 1401 S. Water Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The area of the parcel outside of the envelope of the firehouse is to be considered non-contributing to the designation. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION'S RULES & REGULATIONS

Mr. Farnham provided an overview of the draft revisions to the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations. He explained that the revisions include:

- reducing the quorum from 8 to 7 to correspond to the reduction in the numbers of Commissioners from 14 to 13, which was instituted by the charter change that went into effect on 1 July 2017 (page 14);
- eliminating abstentions from the total vote count when determining whether a majority adopted a motion (page 17);
- deleting the section regarding the Harry A. Batten Fund, a bank account in the name of the Historical Commission, which the City Treasurer's Office closed in 2016 (page 66); and,
- updating the citations to the historic preservation ordinance in the Rules & Regulations so that they refer to the current numbering, which was revised when the zoning code was updated (throughout).

He explained that, if adopted by the Historical Commission, the revisions will be reviewed by the Law Department for compliance with the law. If approved by the Law Department, the revised Rules & Regulations will be advertised to the public by the Department of Records for 60 days, during which time anyone may request an additional public review by the Historical Commission. At the end of the 60 days or after an additional review, the revised Rules & Regulations will become effective.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed changes and agreed that they reflected their suggestions for changes offered at recent meetings of the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas noted that removing abstentions from the total vote count on a motion would allow Commissioners to truly remain impartial and would avoid the misunderstanding encountered with the recent 1020-24 Christian Street vote. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience wished to offer comments on the proposed changes. None were offered.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the proposed changes to the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations as reflected by the draft under review. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CLG COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

STRAWBRIDGE & CLOTHIER DEPARTMENT STORE AND WAREHOUSE, 901 POPLAR STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 901 Poplar Street, known as the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store Warehouse. 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 Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store Warehouse is located at the northwest corner of Poplar and 9th Streets in the Lower Northern Liberties neighborhood. The Historical Commission contends that the more accurate location is the West Poplar neighborhood. The building consists of two connected sections, a ten-story front Warehouse constructed in 1918 and a five-story rear Remote Delivery Station addition constructed in 1928. The nomination states that the building is significant under Criterion A in the area of commerce for its association with Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, a leading retailer in the Philadelphia area from the mid-nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. Due to the company's strong growth around the turn of the twentieth century, Strawbridge & Clothier constructed off-site services buildings to support and facilitate its operations. The building reflects the evolution of Strawbridge & Clothier and the larger trends in twentieth century department store development.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

The Commission agreed that the building satisfies National Register Criterion A in the area of Commerce for its association with the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, a leading retailer in the Philadelphia area from the mid nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. The Commission members contended that the property retained sufficient integrity to recommend listing on the National Register. The Commissioners noted the adjacency of the property to the Strawbridge & Clothier store at 8th and Market as well as to the rail line.

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER, 2903-09 N. 16TH STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2903-2909 N. 16th Street, known as the International Harvester Company Building Philadelphia Branch House. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the nomination, the International Harvester Company Building, located in Philadelphia's Allegheny West neighborhood, consists of one building that was constructed in 1922. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion C, in the area of Architecture, stating that it is a fine example of the company's intentionally standardized style and method of construction for which it was known.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Schaaf noted that the building is proposed for adaptive reuse in the Philadelphia City Planning Commission North District Plan. The Commission members contended that the property retained sufficient integrity to recommend listing on the National Register.

BUICK MOTOR COMPANY, 2917-37 N. 16TH STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2917-2937 N. 16th Street, known as the Buick Motor Company Building. 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 Buick Motor Company Building, located in the North Philadelphia section of the city, consists of one building that was constructed in 1925. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion A, in the area of Industry, for its "prominent position in Philadelphia's automobile industry and its role as the primary regional distribution center for two major national auto brands."

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Cooperman commented that Ms. Schmitt should be using the phrase “in the area of” when describing the category of the criterion the nomination argues is being met.

Mr. Schaaf noted that this building is immediately adjacent to the International Harvester Building and is also proposed for adaptive reuse in the Philadelphia City Planning Commission North District Plan. The Commission members contended that the property retained sufficient integrity to recommend listing on the National Register.

FRANKLIN CARPET MILL, 2141-45 E. HUNTINGDON STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2141-2145 East Huntingdon Street, known as the Franklin Carpet Mill. 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 Franklin Carpet Mill complex, located in Philadelphia's Kensington neighborhood, consists of two buildings that were constructed in 1879 and 1909. The nomination contends that the Franklin Carpet Mill is significant under Criterion A, in the area of Industry, because of its association with Kensington’s rich history as the leading carpet manufacturing center in the country.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

The Commission members contended that the property retained sufficient integrity to recommend listing on the National Register.

WAVERLY GARAGE, 414-22 S. 16TH STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 414-22 S 16th Street, known as the Waverly Garage. 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 Waverly Garage, located in Philadelphia's Rittenhouse Square neighborhood, was constructed in 1926 by contractor J.M. Rosenberg for the entrepreneurial Frank family. The nomination contends that the building is significant under National Register Criterion C, Community Planning and Development, as an exemplifying the design and construction trends typical of early parking garages in Center City. The nomination argues that the garage, which served neighborhood residents, daily commuters, and commercial visitors, serves as a reminder of how the automobile transformed the built environment in downtown Philadelphia and the American city in general. The garage is listed as Contributing in the Philadelphia Register-listed Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Royer recused from the discussion of the National Register nomination of the Waverly Garage, 414-22 S. 22nd Street, owing to her firm's involvement with the property. Ms. DiPasquale presented the National Register amendment to the Historical Commission.

The Commissioners contended that the resource retains sufficient integrity to be added to the National Register, and agreed that it satisfies National Register Criterion C in the area of Community Planning and Development. Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. Mr. Traub asked how the Waverly Garage was listed in the local historic district, and Mr. Thomas confirmed that it was listed as Contributing to the district.

GOTHAM SILK HOSIERY COMPANY, 2000-34 N. 2ND STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 2000-2034 N. 2nd Street, known as the Gotham Silk Hosiery Company Building. 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 Gotham Silk Hosiery Company Building is located in the Kensington section of the city and was constructed in 1922. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion A, in the area of Industry, for being "one of the largest hosiery manufacturers in the United States and one of the largest textile firms of any kind in Philadelphia during the 1920s and 30s."

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

The Commission members contended that the property retained sufficient integrity to recommend listing on the National Register.

WEST PHILADELPHIA STREETCAR SUBURB DISTRICT BOUNDARY INCREASE

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of a proposed boundary increase for the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District. 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 West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1998 under Criterion A, community development, and Criterion C, architecture. The new nomination proposes to increase the boundary in the northeast section of the district centered on S. 40th and Ludlow Streets. The eight properties (6 contributing, 2 non-contributing) proposed reflect the themes of the original nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the National Register amendment to the Historical Commission.

The Commission agreed that the proposed historic district boundary amendment satisfies National Register Criterion A in the area of Community Development, and Criterion C in the area of Architecture. One Commissioner noted that the boundary increase includes 22-26 S. 40th Street, which was added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 2017. Historically known as the West Philadelphia Institute, the building served as an early lending library established for working-class residents and a precursor to the establishment of the Free Library of Philadelphia. Another Commissioner commented that the recent removal of 1970s sheet metal siding from the exterior of 22-26 S. 40th Street revealed a high degree of architectural integrity.

Mr. Thomas asked if it was necessary to adopt a motion for the comments, to which Mr. Farnham replied that they could if they chose to, but a motion was not necessary. Mr. Thomas stated that it would be sufficient to request that the staff convey the Commissioners' support of the proposed nominations to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:53 p.m., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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 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.

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

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

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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