

**THE MINUTES OF THE 670<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 JUNE 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  
Melissa Long, Division of Housing & Community Development  
John Mattioni, Esq.  
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
R. David Schaaf, 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  
Leonard Reuter, Esq., City Law Department

**ALSO PRESENT**

Jerry Roller, JKRP Architects  
Matt Heckendorn, HAS  
Loretta Witt, Historic Germantown  
Russel Kleinboch, Penn Knox  
Andrew Balas, Graboyes  
Richard Crawford, Bartush Signs  
Ian Cope, Cope Linder Architects  
Sue Gefell, Penn Knox  
Connie Winters, Penn Knox  
Sue Patterson, Penn Knox  
Daniel P. McElhatton  
Allison Weiss, SoLo  
Cory Kegerise, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission  
Pierce Keating, Boys and Girls Club  
J.M. Duffin  
Brenda Cherry, SoLo  
Joseph Better  
Teri Buda  
Michael Prell, PANA  
Steven Peitzman, Drexel University

Lou Fillipone, Graboyes  
Lisabeth Marziello, Boys and Girls Club  
Joe Marziello, Boys and Girls Club  
Ariel Goldring, Boys and Girls Club  
Kelly Lemberger, Boys and Girls Club  
Harriet Rubenstein  
Donnie Richardson  
Jerald Goodman, Drinker Biddle  
Daniel Woolf  
Reuben Asia, Drinker Biddle  
Zach Davis, Boys and Girls Club  
Christian Busch, 20<sup>th</sup> Century Preservation  
Sasha Coviello,  
Joseph Beller  
Emma Brown, Boys and Girls Club  
Olivia Wayne, Boys and Girls Club  
Luke Antoneillo, Boys and Girls Club  
Susan Moskal, Boys and Girls Club  
Michelle Klein, Boys and Girls Club  
M. Wight, Boys and Girls Club  
Daniel Pedgatt, Boys and Girls Club  
Keri-Dean Plummer, Boys and Girls Club  
Brandi Levine, Penn Knox  
Catherine Ledwell  
Emily Harman, Penn Knox  
Monica Vohedarsky, Cross Properties  
Jacqueline Kluger, Cross Properties  
Kathryn Pyle  
Z. Abdullahi, Boys and Girls Club  
Imir Bailey, Boys and Girls Club  
M. Patrick, Boys and Girls Club  
Nasya Jenkins, Boys and Girls Club  
DyQuan Hill, Boys and Girls Club  
Hakeem Booker, Boys and Girls Club  
Aaron Botancourt, Boys and Girls Club  
Saliman Jackson, Boys and Girls Club  
Adriana Finney, Boys and Girls Club  
P. Bradley, Boys and Girls Club  
Jamie Shipton, Boys and Girls Club  
Mare Shipton, Boys and Girls Club  
Seth Miller, Boys and Girls Club  
Maria Garcia, Boys and Girls Club  
Jude Lerich, Boys and Girls Club  
Anthony Gonzalez, Boys and Girls Club  
William Mangold  
Megan Gatto  
Ryan Gatto  
Stan Stamoulu  
Carolyn Bergens  
Kubra Mescan

Craig Fulmore  
Fran Hunter, Boys and Girls Club  
Jerry Houck, Boys and Girls Club  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Katie Brill, JKRP Architects  
Kelly Murry, Boys and Girls Club  
Jordan Mesibov, Boys and Girls Club  
Kevin Michals, Cross Properties  
Kristin Cassidy, Penn Knox  
Matt Cadwallader, Penn Knox  
Craig Corelli, Car-Tel  
Libby Lescallat, Boys and Girls Club  
Denise Matza, Boys and Girls Club  
Dustin Hardymoore, Boys and Girls Club  
Jade McCurry, Boys and Girls Club  
Tarid Barrer, Boys and Girls Club  
Kierra Henry, Boys and Girls Club  
Amir Nealy, Boys and Girls Club  
J.F. McCarthy, Boys and Girls Club  
Zainab Abavilghi, Boys and Girls Club  
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Deidre DeAscanis, JKRP Architects  
Birzhe Busch, Penn Knox  
Kevin Kaminski, Kaminski + Pew  
Whitney Joslin, Kaminski + Pew  
Evelyn Blackwell, Boys and Girls Club  
Clifton Hayman, Boys and Girls Club  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Kiki Bolender  
Aaron Wunsch, University of Pennsylvania  
Jeff Cohen, Bryn Mawr College

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:19 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fink, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Schaaf, Stanford, and Turner joined him.

**MINUTES OF THE 669<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the minutes of the 669<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 May 2018. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2018**

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Thomas introduced the Consent Agenda, which included applications for 1601-03 Lombard Street and 1600-02 Wallace Street. He asked if anyone on the Commission or in the audience had comments on the requests. Mr. Farnham stated that he received an emailed request asking that the Commission hear the matter related to 1601-03 Lombard Street. He added that the email further requests that the application be continued to a later meeting. Mr. Thomas responded that he was removing the application for 1601-03 Lombard Street from the Consent Agenda to the regular Agenda.

**ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 1600-02 Wallace Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA**

#### **ADDRESS: 1601-03 LOMBARD ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story additions; restore historic facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CP Acquisitions 23, LP

Applicant: Meghan Brennan, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1914; Cinderella Inn, Apex Beauty School

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the guard rail is mounted to the inside of the parapet; the colors of the addition are compatible with the original brick color; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to remove non-historic sections of this building, restore the historic facades, and construct a three-story rear addition and a three-story rooftop addition on this two-story building. The property was mistakenly classified as both contributing and non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District. The current owner requested that the Historical Commission reclassify the property as non-contributing to correct the mistake, but, in November 2017, the Commission voted to reclassify the property as contributing, owing to new information regarding the use of the property for a short time as a branch of the Apex Beauty College. Before its conversion to the beauty school, the building was used as a bar.

The two-story building has been altered numerous times. Window and door openings have been infilled, windows and doors replaced, brick has been painted and stuccoed, the cornice removed, and an awning-like storefront cornice added. This application will remove the paint and stucco, restore brick, reopen window and door openings, and replace windows and doors. A stone or cast-stone beltcourse above the storefront will be added. Along 16<sup>th</sup> Street, a non-historic, three-story section, where a significantly altered rowhouse was merged into the larger building, will be removed and a new three-story section clad in brick will be constructed. At the

rooftop, a three-story addition will be constructed. It will be set back from the historic facades. It will be clad in metal panels and fenestrated with vinyl windows.

The building in question stands at the northwest corner of 16<sup>th</sup> and Lombard Streets. The buildings at the southeast and southwest corners are both tall four-story buildings. The buildings at the northeast corner are three-story rowhouses. The building to the north on 16<sup>th</sup> Street, across Addison Street, is a three-story parking garage, which is being converted for commercial and residential use. The buildings to the west on Lombard and Addison Streets are three-story rowhouses.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jerry Roller represented the application.

Mr. Farnham reported that he had received correspondence from neighbors, who request that the Historical Commission table the application until they have had an opportunity to meet with the developer, and from others, who advocate for the approval of the application because it preserves the Ajax Beauty School building.

Mr. Roller stated that the plan as currently proposed is almost identical to the plan that the neighbors reviewed and supported. He noted that the only difference is that they are now proposing to retain the historic two-story building at the corner, rather than replacing it with a three-story building. He added that the height of the five-story piece is identical to that approved by the neighbors. He rejected the neighbors' claims that the design had been significantly revised and asserted that his client would not need to seek a new zoning permit or undergo a new review by the neighbors. He again stated that the only change in the design involves the retention of the historic building, which the Historical Commission required.

Stam Stamoulis introduced himself as a neighbor, who resides on S. 16<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that he was involved in the neighborhood's negotiations with the developer. He stated that his group does not have an overall objection to the plan. He conceded that the current plan is consistent with the earlier, approved plan. He stated that they are requesting a continuance of the review because they have not had time to "absorb" the design changes. He enumerated the changes to the design. He asserted that the tower has become more visible with the retention of the two-story building, rather than its replacement with a three-story structure. He stated that the proposed design is not in character with the neighborhood. He noted that a project to the north, across Addison Street, involves adding units to a parking garage, but retains the historic appearance of the exterior. He objected to the dark grey material and suggested that brick would be a more appropriate cladding. He concluded that he and his neighbors might not object to the design changes, but they want time to evaluate them. Mr. Roller responded that Mr. Stamoulis was mistaken about the materials. He stated that they are now proposing brick in all places where they had originally proposed brick. He stated that they switched from a red brick to a grey brick after the Historical Commission required them to retain the historic building because the new red brick would have competed with the red brick of the historic building. He stated that the grey brick will differentiate the new addition from the historic building. He assured Mr. Stamoulis that the material is a real brick. Mr. Roller explained that the metal panel cladding on the tower section of the proposal is the same metal panel material that the neighbors reviewed and approved. Mr. Roller asserted that the only significant change is the substitution of the two-story section for the originally proposed three-story section. He explained that they are now proposing only two stories because that is the height of the historic building, which they are required to retain. He stated that the setbacks from the street are the same; the unit layouts are

the same. Other than the retention of the historic building, everything is essentially the same as the approved proposal.

Mr. Thomas observed that the proposed design was reviewed by the Architectural Committee several weeks ago. He read the Architectural Committee's recommendation for approval with conditions. He observed that, if the recommendation is adopted, the staff will work with the architect to ensure that the color of the brick is compatible with the historic building and the historic district. Mr. Stamoulis stated that he and the other neighbors were surprised to learn of this application a few days ago. He stated that they had worked diligently with the developer on the earlier, approved scheme, but were surprised by this new scheme. Mr. Thomas responded that the Historical Commission met its notice requirements and adequately informed the public of this review as well as the earlier Architectural Committee review. He noted that the current application including the architectural drawings have been available online for several weeks. Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission has a record of the recipients of its email announcements of meetings and knows that one of the neighbors who participated in the negotiations with Mr. Stamoulis and the developer was informed of the review. Mr. Thomas also explained that the current applicant submitted an application proposing to change the classification of the building in the inventory of the historic district and, as a result of that application, the Historical Commission and Committee on Historic Designation held public meetings to review that application. He explained that at the conclusion of that review, the Historical Commission rejected the request that would have allowed the building to be demolished and required the owner to retain and reuse the building. Mr. Thomas observed that the design revisions that came about since the neighbors approved the first design resulted from the Historical Commission's requirement to retain the building. Now, the developer has complied with that requirement and has modified his original plan to include the retention of the historic building. Mr. Thomas concluded that all of these discussions have occurred at public meetings, which have been ongoing for several months. Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission has known since November 2017 that the design would include the two-story historical façade and not a new, three-story façade. Mr. Thomas added that he believes that the Historical Commission has done a good job of informing the public of these reviews. Mr. Stamoulis stated that the Center City Residents Association distributed a flyer to every neighbor regarding the zoning variance request for this project, which allowed the neighbors to engage with the developer. Mr. Stamoulis stated that he did not receive that kind of notice for the Historical Commission. He added that it is not his practice to constantly check the Historical Commission agendas to see if any projects involve his immediate neighborhood. He objected to the Historical Commission's notice requirements and asserted that they are insufficient. Mr. Stamoulis concluded that he objects to this plan as proposed and requests that it be modified.

Kevin Michaels of Cross Properties, the developer, introduced himself and explained that he and his company have been involved in numerous historic preservation projects. He stated that they originally intended to demolish the building and erect the structure approved by the neighbors, but had to modify their plans after the Historical Commission prevented the demolition of the historic building. He stated that they have tried to design a project that is in character with the historic building and the neighborhood. He stated that the current design is very close to the original, neighbor-approved design, but includes the historic building. He stated that the proposed project will be a great improvement over the existing buildings when completed. He stated that they have tried to be responsive to the neighborhood's needs and wishes. He stated that his company has been working for a long time on this project and any delay in the review of this application would result in a hardship. He asked the Commission to move forward with the review and not grant the neighbors' continuance request.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance acknowledged that the developer, Mr. Michaels, is a member of the board that oversees the Preservation Alliance. He stated that he supports the project as a good reaction to the Historical Commission's decision that the historic building should be retained. He stated that this project will honor the history of the building recently documented by Jim Duffin. He concluded that the Preservation Alliance supports the Architectural Committee's recommendation for approval.

Catherine Pile introduced herself as a neighbor. She stated that the neighbors had a six-month, productive conversation with the developer. She stated that the conversation ended with an agreement that defined the design and use of the new building. She stated that the agreement was adopted by the Center City Residents Association and then the Zoning Board of Adjustment. She stated that she and her neighbors learned of the change in plans through a rumor one week ago. She stated that she is glad that the historic building is being saved. However, she asserted, she and her neighbors would like this review postponed so that they can have an additional conversation with the developer. She stated that she thinks that the current design can be improved. She also asked whether their earlier agreement with the neighbors is in place. She asked for more time to have a conversation with Cross Properties.

Mr. Thomas stated that he has heard the concerns about notice, but contended that the Historical Commission has satisfied its notice requirements. Mr. Thomas explained that the Historical Commission has one task with regard to this review, to determine whether the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He explained that the Historical Commission's determination regarding the Standards does not preclude additional discussions between the neighbors and the developer regarding issues that are above and beyond the satisfaction of preservation standards. Mr. Thomas observed that the agreement the neighbors have with the developer must include provisions that address changes to the design; however, the private agreement between the parties is outside of the Historical Commission's concern or control. The Historical Commission must focus on its purview. Does the project satisfy the Standards? Delaying the review will not change the answer to that question. The revised design may need additional approvals like zoning approvals or neighbor approvals under a private agreement. Those approval processes are outside the Historical Commission's approval process and the Historical Commission cannot delay its review for reasons that are external to its process. Mr. Thomas asked his fellow Commissioners if they saw a reason to delay the review. The Commission can approve later changes if the developer and community agree on additional revisions, but the Commission cannot delay its review for reasons that are unrelated to historic preservation. Mr. Mattioni stated that he saw no need to delay the Historical Commission's review. It has met all of its notice requirements. Ms. Cooperman noted that the Commission's action does not preclude the neighbors from seeking to enforce any agreement they may have with the developer.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the guard rail is mounted to the inside of the parapet; the colors of the addition are compatible with the original brick color; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 1706 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Demolish gable roof and construct mansard, rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sasha Coviello

Applicant: Ivano D'Angella, Ivano D'Angella Architects

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal of the gable roof and construction of the mansard as well as the expansion of the roof deck if it proves to be conspicuous in a sight visit, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, and 5, and the Roofs Guideline; approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish the front slope of a gable roof and construct a mansard in its place to provide additional interior headroom at the top floor. The gable has a wide, non-original dormer. The rear slope of the gable was removed and an addition constructed during an earlier alteration. The application also proposes to construct a rear addition, which will be clad in metal panels. The application also proposes to construct a pilot house to access an existing roof deck. The deck is currently accessed through a hatch. The deck will be expanded in size. The proposed addition and deck will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way through a narrow slot on Panama Street, a small dead-end street that runs east-west to the south of the property. The Historical Commission recently determined that the visibility of a proposed deck and pilot house to the south of Panama through a similar narrow slot was acceptably inconspicuous. More compatible small-pane windows will be installed at the front façade.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Ivano D'Angella and Christian Busch, attorney Joseph Beller, and owner Sasha Coviello represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants have submitted a new drawing, revising the application to show the roof deck pulled back to its existing location, the construction of a mansard but with restoration of the existing dormer, and a different window configuration in the first floor and basement of the front facade. Mr. Thomas asked if the applicant had prepared a new section drawing. Mr. Busch said that he did not but that the section is largely unchanged. He said that they have simply refined the details for the basement openings and the first-floor commercial opening as well as provided an alternate for the dormer to bring it back to its Victorian appearance. He explained that they propose to reconstruct the dormer, salvaging elements that are original from the existing and rebuilding it on the new mansard. Mr. Busch introduced himself as the principal of 20<sup>th</sup> Century Preservation. His client wants to restore the house as much as possible below the cornice. The house has gone through a lot of change and was once a commercial space. They propose to add back the earlier character by adding six-over-six windows, shutters, and hardware. He said that this house was a twin to 1708 Delancey. They hope to make it look more like the neighbor by adding the mansard as well as providing more space for the owner's family. They will even add slate to the mansard. Mr. McCoubrey recapped his understanding of the history of the building, saying that it originally had a smaller dormer. The dormer was later enlarged. A mansard was added to the neighboring building at some point. He said that the members of the Architectural Committee, with one exception, found that



the gable roof was an important original feature that should be retained; they therefore recommended denial for this reason.

Mr. Busch said that, although the roof may be original, it cannot be seen by the public. He said it is the dormer that stands out and that they will enhance. The neighborhood has several mansards and they are hoping to gain additional space. Mr. Baron pointed out that the Committee recommended denial of the mansard, but approval of most of the rest of the application. Mr. Thomas said that the Commission often approves of changes on the rears of the property to gain space. He said that many people wish to gain space, but noted that the proposed mansard would be visible from the front. Mr. Busch said that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards provides guidance that does not preclude change. He said that the building has a history of change and that there are other mansards in the neighborhood.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none. Ms. Cooperman pointed out that that, if the gable roof was turned into a mansard, then it certainly would be highly visible as could be seen in the photograph showing the adjacent mansard roof.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the replacement of the gable roof with the mansard, but to approve the remainder of the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 8 June 2018, with the staff to review details. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2025 CHERRY ST**

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ryan and Megan Gatto

Applicant: William Mangold

History: 1845

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck as proposed, with the recommendation to consider putting the deck on the third-floor addition with access via the proposed pilot house, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on an existing two-and-a-half story rear addition, and construct a pilot house and roof deck on the rear roof slope. The deck would sit on posts atop the rear roof slope. A frame rear addition first appears at 2025 Cherry Street on a 1931 map.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission. Designer William Mangold and property owners Ryan and Megan Gatto represented the application.

Ms. Chantry explained that the Architectural Committee reviewed the application without having the advantage of understanding visibility of the proposed deck via a mockup. She stated that, since the time of the Committee review, she reviewed a mockup on-site. She displayed a photograph from N. 20<sup>th</sup> Street showing Mr. Gatto, who is six-foot, two inches in height, standing two feet back from the ridge of the roof. She noted that, based on his height and the height of

the proposed railing, the top of the railing would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Thomas commented that it would be considered inconspicuous, which is the standard for roof additions. Ms. Gatto explained that she and Mr. Gatto appreciate the opportunity to obtain more space in their home in a way that is unobtrusive. Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 1600 AND 1602 WALLACE ST**

Proposal: Construct four, four-story townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Group

Applicant: Don Ventresca, Venco Building Group

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee offered the following comments:

- the building façade should extend the full four stories, potentially incorporating a mansard;
- the first-story windows should be enlarged to relate proportionally to the second-story windows;
- the cornice should contain detail and shape; and
- the spandrels of the bays should consist of one panel rather than two.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct four, four-story rowhouses on two vacant lots within the Spring Garden Historic District. Historically, the two lots contained two rowhouses that fronted on Wallace Street. This application proposes to place the entrances to each of the four buildings on N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street and provide driveway access at the rears of the properties. The fronts of the buildings would consist of a red brick veneer with a modest cast stone base, aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung windows, a two-story projecting wood bay, and a fourth story clad with fiber cement lap siding. The rears of the properties would be similarly clad in fiber cement lap siding and would feature decks at the second story that would project over the shared driveway.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 248-50 MARKET ST**

Proposal: Install signage and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LCP Market Street LLC

Applicant: Richard Crawford, Bartush Signs

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the awnings and non-illuminated blade sign, but denial of the large panel signs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guidelines.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace awnings and to install signage on this corner property, which is both individually designated and is located in the Old City Historic District.

The original application proposed to re-cover some existing awnings, to install a non-illuminated blade sign at the second-floor level, and to replace six other existing awnings with two panel signs with illuminated letters. The signs would have been approximately 20 feet in length and mounted across existing transoms, open corner entrance, and a portion of the storefront cornice and featured projecting illuminated letters. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the awnings and non-illuminated blade sign, but denial of the large panel signs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guideline.

Following the Architectural Committee review, the applicant revised the proposal to reduce the panel signs to the width of the transom windows over the corner entrance. The signage panels would be flat with illuminated cut-outs of the logo and store name. The applicants have also proposed an alternative scheme that involves the installation of four-foot deep metal canopies with individually-illuminated lettering.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Designer Richard Crawford and tenant representative Craig Corelli represented the application.

Mr. Crawford stated that they have revised the application to respond to the Architectural Committee's recommendation that the signs not cover the transoms above the windows, and that much smaller signs should be located at the corner within the existing columns. He explained that the signs would be designed to fit within the space that is available. Mr. Crawford noted that they have also shown the blade sign in the revised rendering. Mr. Thomas replied that the Architectural Committee was in favor of the blade sign.

Mr. Crawford explained that, with the exception of the corner awnings, the hardware of the existing awnings would be refurbished and new canvas material installed on the existing frames.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the corner entrance is unusual in that, originally, it was probably open, but the transom line now carries around and engages the columns. He explained that the two signs will sit back on a transom fascia that is not likely original. He noted that there is a dropped ceiling in the corner entrance which was likely fully open originally. Mr. Schaaf asked whether the sign would sit in place of the transom window itself. Mr. McCoubrey replied that that is not communicated in the rendering, but that the staff should confirm through the shop drawing

process that the sign will nestle within that transom zone and be the exact height and width of the existing transom window.

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

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the corner signs fit the transom openings, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefronts Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 123-51 S BROAD ST**

Proposal: Modify storefronts; replace windows, construct rooftop additions and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Witherspoon Partners, LP

Applicant: Alyssa Galina, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1895; Witherspoon Building; Presbyterian Board of Publication; Joseph M. Huston

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973, 8/4/1977

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the incompleteness of the application.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace windows and doors and to construct small rooftop additions to the Witherspoon Building at the corner of Walnut Street and Juniper Street. The application proposes to replace all existing windows. The windows visible from the public right-of-way would closely replicate the appearance and configuration of the historic windows, but would be aluminum. Vinyl windows would be installed in non-visible areas of the building. The application also proposes to replace the existing non-historic, fully-glazed doors in the Juniper Street entrance, and to cut a new ADA-accessible door on the Juniper Street elevation and to infill an existing street-level entrance on the same elevation. At the Sansom Street entrance, the application proposes to infill a garage entrance. The application also proposes to construct rooftop stair and elevator overruns and a roof deck.

The Architectural Committee found the original application difficult to understand and recommended denial owing to the incompleteness of the application. Concerns included the original configuration of the second-floor windows proposed to be modified, the use of fully-glazed doors at the Juniper Street entrance, and the infill of the Sansom Street elevation. Following the Architectural Committee review, the applicants uncovered additional historic photographs and information pertaining to the Committee's concerns and revised the application to the Historical Commission. After the Historical Commission submission, the applicants learned that the original infill material above the second-floor windows was terra cotta rather than limestone, and have updated their drawings accordingly.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Deidre DeAscanis and Katie Brill represented the application.

Ms. DeAscanis explained that they reevaluated the Juniper Street elevation and revised the two storefronts at the ground-floor level to include wider stiles. For the windows at the second-floor level, Ms. DeAscanis explained that each column currently contains two double-hung windows, which they had previously proposed replacing with one large, double-hung window. Following

the Committee meeting, she explained, they found a historic photograph showing a larger double-hung window with a terra cotta sill and panels above. She noted that the revised drawings propose to match the head height of the windows in the historic photograph, but propose to retain the lower sill height. Ms. DeAscanis explained that, on Sansom Street, they revised the garage door opening shown on A3.5 based on the Architectural Committee's recommendation to widen the doors and install the louvers above. Mr. Thomas asked about the use of the opening. Ms. DeAscanis responded that the doors will access a trash room. She noted that the existing egress doors to the left of the garage opening are being retained.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the need to lower the sill of the proposed second-floor windows on Juniper Street. Ms. DeAscanis responded that she believes there was infill at that level at one time, and they would like to install a larger window for proposed loft units on the interior. Ms. DeAscanis explained that the project is also seeking federal historic preservation tax credits, and will be reviewed by the National Park Service as well. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that they are now proposing to restore the head height of the window from the historic photograph. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they would prefer to install a full-height double-hung window, but that the revised proposal is a response to the Architectural Committee's concerns and to match something that was there historically. Ms. Cooperman asked whether the applicants had found any other historic photographs, opining that the photograph is from 1951, which may not be the condition at the time of construction. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the photograph does not appear to date from 1951, based on the cars in the foreground. Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that the Philadelphia Building (c. 1925) has not yet been constructed in the photograph. Ms. Cooperman opined that the Commission needs to know the full history of the openings in order to determine what their appropriate treatment. Ms. DeAscanis directed the Commission's attention to the photograph on the bottom right of A3.0, noting that it is difficult to see the precise windows owing to the angle of the photograph. Ms. Cooperman noted that the heavy header was clearly part of the original construction. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the element that has been lost is the set-back sill visible in the windows on the right-hand side (north end) of the Juniper Street elevation photograph. Mr. McCoubrey opined that these windows have been heavily altered over time. He noted that it might be difficult to knit new limestone or terra cotta back in between the piers that have been nicely cut back, and that doing so might do further damage to the building. He suggested that perhaps it would be acceptable to install full-height double-hung windows. Ms. DiPasquale responded that that is what the applicants previously proposed, to match the windows on the right. Ms. Cooperman disagreed with that suggestion, noting that historically, the windows did not match. Mr. Thomas noted that, on the north end of the Juniper Street façade, there are large double-hung windows, but there are small windows on the south end. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the south end openings were altered at some point fairly early on in its history. Ms. Cooperman asked if the proposed changes have been approved by the National Park Service. Ms. DeAscanis responded that they have discussed the proposal with their historic consultant but that the National Park Service has not yet reviewed and approved the proposal. Mr. Thomas noted that there is not normally much communication between the Historical Commission and the National Park Service, but that they would like to be consistent. Ms. DeAscanis reiterated their preference to match the windows on the north end of the Juniper Street elevation. Ms. Cooperman expressed her concern about approving alterations that the National Park Service would not approve. Mr. Thomas noted that he cannot imagine the State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service approving the full-height double-hung windows on the south end. Mr. Thomas noted that one way of dating the historic photograph is the trolley tracks visible along Sansom Street. Ms. Cooperman questioned the age of the infill panels, and whether the National Park Service might consider it to have gained its own significance. Ms. Cooperman expressed concern over jeopardizing the

tax credits and the lack of information over the age of the window alterations. Upon further consideration, Mr. McCoubrey withdrew his initial suggestion, noting that the building had been designed with careful asymmetry.

Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission seemed to be in favor of the rest of the changes proposed in the application, and suggested that the Commission could leave the consideration of the second-floor windows to the staff to coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and National Park Service (NPS). If the staff determines that the windows that the Park Service is willing to approve are appropriate, the staff can sign off on that as a detail. If the staff disagrees with the Park Service, the staff can send the application back to the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman asked if the Commission could extend the staff's coordination with the SHPO/NPS to all aspects of the application. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the applicants had revised the other areas about which the Architectural Committee was concerned. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Commission's approval of one particular design did not bar the applicant from proposing an alternative design following the tax credit process, and that a SHPO/NPS-approved design would likely be able to be approved by the staff.

Mr. Thomas noted that it is an incredible building, and that he appreciates the investment that is being made into the building.

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 8 June 2018, with the staff to consult with the National Park Service and State Historic Preservation Officer about the design of the second-floor windows at the east facade, with the staff to review details. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 413 E CHURCH LN**

Proposal: Demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Buda

Applicant: Teresa Buda

History: Main house built 1910; Carriage house built c.1885

Individual Designation: 11/29/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the main house as necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish a Colonial Revival house constructed 1909-1910. The building is in extreme disrepair due to the previous owner failing to maintain the property. A significant portion of the roof is no longer extant and interior floors as well as porches have collapsed. In January 2018, an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections visited the property and issued an "Unsafe" building violation. The collapsing building is an attractive nuisance that poses a significant safety hazard. The issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest.

The current owner has lived next to this property for over 30 years and purchased the property in January 2018. The owner's application requests to demolish the main house for safety and liability reasons and has no intention to construct another building in its place. There is an existing carriage house on the property that dates to 1885. The demolition request does not include the carriage house. The owner intends to rehabilitate and maintain the carriage house.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Teresa Buda represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey requested clarification as to what happens once a designated building on a designated property is demolished. He inquired if a proposal for new construction on the site would be reviewed by the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas responded that the property is under the Historical Commission's purview, not just the building, and any new construction would be subject to the Historical Commission's review. Mr. Mattioni asked if the carriage house was included in the designation. Ms. Mehley responded that it was included as part of the designated property.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment.

James Duffin stated that he is familiar with this property and its deteriorated condition. He explained that he had a procedural concern and wished to make it clear that when the Historical Commission voted on this application, that the circumstances of the property are stated for the record. Mr. Duffin noted that the property technically only has an "unsafe" violation and he does not want it to become a precedent that any designated building with an "unsafe" violation could be considered for demolition. Mr. Duffin referenced Mr. Farnham's explanation of the "unsafe" violation at the 22 May 2018 Architectural Committee meeting in the case of this specific property. He noted that Mr. Farnham clarified at that meeting that an "unsafe" violation for 413 E. Church Lane is akin to an "imminently dangerous" violation because the building at 413 E. Church Lane is set back from the street, and because of this, it does not rise to the level of what the Department of Licenses & Inspections considers "imminently dangerous." Mr. Thomas agreed that this was his understanding as well.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that it is not in the organization's DNA to sit idly by as a designated building is threatened with demolition, but they have thoroughly reviewed this application. He continued that he admired the efforts that the current owner has gone through to demonstrate its condition and that the Preservation Alliance reluctantly supports the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

Allison Weiss asked the Commission to try to find ways to prevent buildings that are on Historical Register from being demolished by neglect. She inquired if there are any ways or plans to protect buildings on the Register from demolishing themselves. Mr. Thomas responded that in Philadelphia there is a property maintenance code, which requires all owners, not just of historic buildings, to maintain their property and that it is enforced through the City. Mr. Thomas noted that, given the large number of structures that in Philadelphia and the large number that do need attention, it generally behooves neighbors and other concerned citizens to bring it before the appropriate City agency, such as the Department of Licenses & Inspections or others. Mr. Mattioni stated that everyone should understand that it is the property owner's responsibility to adhere to maintenance code. He continued that the Department of Licenses & Inspections can issue every violation notice it wants to, but if a property owner either refuses to or does not have the wherewithal, demolition by neglect may be the result nonetheless. Ms.

Weiss stated that it would be helpful to know which properties are historic so that neighbors could be more vigilant. Mr. Thomas responded that Ms. Weiss could speak to the Historical Commission staff and added that designated property information is available online. Mr. Thomas also stated that for several years Pennsylvania has had a conservatorship law and, although it is an extreme measure, it is another strategy. Ms. Weiss responded that she had used this strategy and noted that it was time consuming process. She concluded by stating that the City needs to make it a little bit easier to save local history.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the demolition of the main house as necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d). Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2028 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Remove rear roofs, addition, rear ell wall; extend mansard; construct parapet & car port

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Marisa Rosenthal

Applicant: Kevin Kaminski

History: c. 1870; leaded glass and window alterations c. 1895

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmit@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmit@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of raising the parapet wall, the removal of the bay, and installation of the window boxes, but approval of the remainder of the application, with the suggestion to study the rear elevation and its windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application for 2028 Delancey Street, a contributing building within the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, includes paint removal, cleaning and repairs at the front façade, the installation of an elevator, the removal of an addition at the rear, and the construction of a carport and terrace. The property owner intends to revert the current multi-family building to a single-family residence.

The application proposes to clean and remove paint from the marble water table and door surround at the front façade. The front steps are to be reset and the existing metal railing is to be repaired rather than replaced, at the suggestion of the Architectural Committee. At the fourth story, the two-over-two double-hung wood dormer windows are to be replaced, and the sills and frames are to be repaired, rather than replaced, as previously proposed.

At the rear of the property, the application proposes to remove the existing glass vestibule, as well as the existing first-story rear addition, patio, fence and garage door, which would be replaced with a new carport and terrace. The application has been revised to remove the vinyl siding from the second-story bay and retain it, as recommended by the Architectural Committee. The bay's existing openings would be altered to accommodate new French doors. The application also proposes to extend the bay up one story and install new double hung windows to match existing.



The mansard roof at the fourth floor would be extended to enclose the elevator and a new dormer would be added. The existing windows, frames and sills are to be replaced at the west façade.

A previous plan to raise the parapet at the west and south facades has been removed from the proposal, at the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Committee. Architects Kevin Kaminski and Whitney Joslin represented the application.

Mr. Thomas asked the applicants to explain the revisions they had made to their proposal. Mr. Kaminski explained that after going before the Architectural Committee, they had revised the drawings to keep the proposal as a very sensitive restoration. He explained that the work proposed at the front façade had not changed significantly from what had been presented at the Architectural Committee; however the drawings had been updated to note that the dormers and windows at the fourth floor would be repaired rather than replaced. Mr. Kaminski told the Historical Commission that they had done additional research on the street, and as a result saw that there was a precedent for double-height bays at the rears of the properties. He mentioned that he had photographs with him of examples that had not been submitted in the application if anyone wanted to review them, and that they were now proposing to do a double-story bay in lieu of the single-story bay. Mr. Kaminski added that they had not been able to find photographic evidence that showed whether the subject property had originally had a single or double height bay; however, based on the openings of the windows and the infill door above the second-story bay, there was, at one point, the opportunity for a double story bay. Mr. Kaminski said that they were also proposing a garage with a wood-paneled door at the rear.

Mr. Thomas asked if the parapet wall was above the garage entrance, and Mr. Kaminski clarified that it was at the third story. He directed Mr. Thomas to a drawing in the submittal packet and explained that they had originally proposed building the parapet up to the same height as the bump out at the mansard; however, that design element had been removed from the proposal to retain the slope of the roofline.

Mr. Thomas confirmed that the parapet wall at the third story had been brought back down to the roof level, that a parapet was proposed at the rear deck over the garage, and that they were proposing a two-story high bay, and Mr. Kaminski said that this was all correct. Mr. Thomas asked if the subject property backed on to Panama Street, and Mr. Kaminski confirmed that it did. Mr. Thomas asked whether there were any homes that faced Panama Street on this block, adding that there were some west of Fidler Square with principal facades facing Panama Street. Mr. Kaminski and Ms. Joslin confirmed that most, if not all, of the houses on this block had their front facades on Delancey Place, not on Panama Street. Mr. Thomas said that though it was a public way, it was more of a service street with garages rather than a principal street.

Mr. Thomas asked whether there were any other comments or questions, and Mr. McCoubrey remarked that he thought that the revised proposal was very consistent with the Architectural Committee's recommendations. He further commented that he believed that there was a strong likelihood that there had previously been a double height bay because of the existence of the masonry openings. Mr. McCoubrey said that he believed that all of the other comments made by the Architectural Committee had been incorporated, including how sensitively the applicants had introduced the elevator into the building, which was always a difficult challenge. He said that the biggest change from what was there on the original bay was the introduction of the

French doors at the lower bay in place of the double hung windows, but that he was unsure of how visible this would be from the street given the parapet at the garage.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **ADDRESS: 6369 GERMANTOWN AVE**

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**

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission has been holding onto tabled nominations for the properties at 6365-67 and 6369 Germantown Avenue at the joint request of both the property owner and nominator since the spring of 2017. In that time, he continued, the parties discussed historic preservation mechanisms aside from designation to the Philadelphia Register. Mr. Farnham stated that the parties have reached an agreement that provides for preservation and that they now request that the Historical Commission allow for the withdrawal of the nominations. He added that the staff recommends that the Historical Commission grant the withdrawal request and relinquish control over these properties. He then clarified that this situation is not at all akin to the recent request to withdraw a nomination for the property at 2101 Washington Avenue. These buildings, he asserted, will be preserved, though perhaps not the same way as under the Historical Commission's authority.

Mr. Thomas asked about the nature of the agreement and whether the agreement is for a preservation easement. Mr. Farnham replied that the agreement is not an easement but is a contractual agreement between the property owner and nominator to take some preservation measures. Historic Germantown Preserved, a consortium of groups in Germantown, also signed as a witness to the agreement, he added. He noted that the document gives the nominator the opportunity to pursue the terms of the agreement if the owner does not comply. In general, Mr. Farnham concluded, the agreement should lead to the retention of the buildings and allow them to be adaptively reused. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff was recently provided with a copy of the agreement, though it had not been distributed to the Commission.

Mr. Thomas asked how the agreement will endure. Mr. Farnham answered that it is a contract signed by the nominator and property owner and witnessed by Historic Germantown. Mr. Mattioni asked if Historic Germantown has any rights under the contract. Mr. Farnham

responded that he is not familiar with the specific terms of the contract but would gladly turn it over to an attorney.

Mr. Reuter asked Mr. Farnham if the withdrawal request had gone to the Committee on Historic Designation for its recommendation. Mr. Farnham clarified that the matter has not been presented to the Committee, explaining that the Commission's recourse, were the Commission to reject the withdrawal request, would be to remand the nominations to the Committee on Historic Designation for review. He further explicated that the Committee has not reviewed the nominations on their merits and has made no recommendation. Mr. Farnham stated that similar agreements had been fairly common, and until the Commission adopted the unwritten policy that it would not unilaterally allow nominators to withdraw nominations, many nominations were withdrawn with similar agreements in place.

Mr. Thomas observed that the agreement is between the owner on one part and the Keeping Society and Historic Germantown Preserved on the other part. If the Keeping Society were to go out of existence, he continued, Historic Germantown could enforce the contract. Mr. Farnham noted that a representative of the Keeping Society is present and could answer questions related to the agreement.

Mr. Reuter advised that because there is no recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation before the Commission, there would be no harm in granting the request to withdraw the nominations. If the agreement falls through, he added, the properties could again be nominated.

Ms. Cooperman asked for confirmation that the agreement does not preclude a future nomination. Mr. Reuter answered that it does not. Mr. Mattioni stated that in reading the parties to the agreement, Historic Germantown is a party to the agreement. He clarified that the organization is more than a witness.

James Duffin stated that he worked with Oscar Beisert to craft the agreement and explained Historic Germantown's role. He stated that he and Mr. Beisert sought to engage with a local community organization concerned with historic preservation to ensure that the agreement meets the general community needs for historic preservation while allowing for growth and development within the community. Historic Germantown, he continued, will likely outlive the Keeping Society, since the organization has survived for 118 years, formerly as the Germantown Historical Society, and will likely continue to be active for many more years.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to accept the request to withdraw the nominations for the properties at 6365-67 and 6369 Germantown Avenue from consideration for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, given the preservation agreement executed between the nominator and the property owner. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 100 S INDEPENDENCE W ML**

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Thomas recused from the consideration of the withdrawal request for 100 S. Independence West Mall, owing to his firm's involvement with the property. Ms. Cooperman also recused from the matter, owing to her firm's involvement with the property, and left the meeting. Ms. Turner assumed the chair.

Mr. Farnham explained that this situation is similar to the one the Commission just confronted with the two properties on Germantown Avenue. The Historical Commission, he continued, has been holding onto nominations for the interior, exterior, and objects at 100 S. Independence West Mall without review since the summer of 2016 at the joint request of the property owner and nominator as they discussed alternative historic preservation mechanisms, other than designation. He noted that the parties have reached an agreement that provides for preservation and are requesting that the Commission allow for the withdrawal of the nominations. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff recommends that the Commission grant the withdrawal request and relinquish control of the property. He added that the Committee on Historic Designation has not reviewed the nominations on their merits and has simply recommended that the Commission table the reviews, which it has done repeatedly for almost two years.

Ms. Turner asked for public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance nominated the building's exterior, portions of the interior, and several objects. Since submitting the nomination, he continued, the Alliance has engaged in productive negotiations with the property owner, Keystone Property Group, on an alternative preservation strategy which includes a preservation easement that will protect the building in perpetuity with regular inspections by the Preservation Alliance. It is a legally sanctioned program, he continued, under National Park Service rules and regulations. He remarked that the Preservation Alliance has held easements on properties since 1979 and currently holds 240 such easements in its portfolio within the City of Philadelphia and surrounding suburbs. Mr. Steinke commented that the easement on the Rohm & Haas building will be the Alliance's 241<sup>st</sup> easement and, as a result of that agreement, the property owner and Alliance jointly request to withdraw the nominations from consideration by the Historical Commission.

Attorney Brett Feldman, representing the property owner, agreed with Mr. Steinke's comments, adding that both parties have worked on a tremendously detailed easement for the property and that the agreement has taken significant time. He asserted that the easement is an appropriate preservation strategy for the property. He further clarified that the property lies within the Independence Mall District subject to Art Commission approval of any building permit application. Past changes to the building by Keystone Property Group, he explained, have been approved by the Art Commission through a public process. Mr. Feldman noted that he submitted a formal written request prior to the meeting and asked that it become part of the record.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to accept the request to withdraw the nominations for the property at 100 S. Independence West Mall from consideration for listing on the

Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, given the execution of a preservation easement that is held by the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 23 W PENN ST**

Name of Resource: Germantown Boys' Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Germantown Boys' Club

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Penn Knox Neighborhood Association

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 23 W. Penn Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that Germantown Boys' Club is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criteria A and J for its association with the Boys' Parlors Association, which became the Germantown Boys' Club, and which provided a community center to serve the growing working-class community of Germantown. The nomination further argues that the building is significant under Criterion D, as an example of the Colonial Revival style as articulated in institutional buildings of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Lastly, the nomination claims that the building satisfies Criterion E, owing to its designer, architect Mantle Fielding, Jr. The staff recommended to the Committee on Historic Designation that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 23 W. Penn Street satisfies any of the Criteria for Designation. The staff delineated its concerns about the nomination. The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination and disagreed with the staff, and voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 23 W. Penn Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H, and J. The Committee rejected the nomination's claims regarding Criterion A and added Criterion H, even though it is not addressed in the nomination. The Historical Commission reviewed the nomination and accepted extensive testimony at its meeting on 12 May 2017. At the conclusion of that review, the Historical Commission tabled the review of the matter to a special meeting, which was scheduled but eventually cancelled at the request of the nominators and property owner, to provide an opportunity for them to meet and discuss their differences. The nominators and property owner discussed the matter for about a year, and recently the nominators requested that the Historical Commission restart its review of the nomination, and reach a conclusion on the designation question. Regarding today's discussions, the staff notes that the Historical Commission held a full hearing on the matter in May 2017 and took extensive testimony. The Commission need not restart the review from the beginning today. All of that is still on the record and is part of the file. If today's decision is appealed, all of that testimony as it is recorded in the minutes and all of the documents that were presented would be included in the record that would go up on appeal. The staff suggests that the Commission hear briefly from the nominators and property owner regarding their discussions over the last year, and then move to deciding the question. The staff acknowledges the Commission's policy of encouraging public participation in its deliberations, but reminds everyone that the Rules and Regulations authorize the Commission's Chair to impose reasonable limitations on public participation to ensure that the participation is relevant and avoids excessive repetition.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Daniel P. McElhatton represented the nomination. Attorney Jerald Goodman represented the property owner.

Mr. McElhatton stated that he represents the nominator and the Penn Knox Neighborhood Association, in addition to the other community organizations that have been involved in the discussions. He explained that he and Mr. Goodman discussed the process for today's meeting and agreed to not present new evidence or testimony from outside parties, but rather to only discuss what has transpired since the May 2017 Commission meeting. He stated that he and Mr. Goodman believe that the May 2017 record was thorough, extensive, and complete. He stated that he and Mr. Goodman ask that the Commission vote on the nomination at the conclusion of their remarks. Mr. Goodman confirmed this agreement. Mr. Thomas agreed that the Commission is looking for an update since the May 2017 Commission meeting. Mr. McElhatton asked if there had been supplemental filings that have become part of the record, made by the nominator and/or the property owner. Mr. Farnham confirmed that supplemental filings were received from Sue Patterson of the Penn Knox Neighborhood Association and were distributed to Commissioners.

Mr. McElhatton stated that this meeting is a hearing on the nomination, and is not a public policy discussion. It is a discussion on the fulfillment of the Historical Commission of its responsibility to vote on a nomination. He started to provide information as to what has transpired over the last year. He explained that in the months following the May 2017 Commission meeting, there were fits and starts of meetings between the community and the Boys and Girls Clubs. Ultimately the different sides got together at different points, and in early 2018, a proposal was made by the Boys and Girls Clubs, one that removed the ice hockey rink from consideration for the community. That was a big concession by the Boys and Girls Clubs, because it removed one of the major concerns of the community. The discussion then turned into a discussion about preservation of the building and what the Boys and Girls Clubs could do within the framework of the existing building. He noted that the proposed designation only covers about 8% of the entire site, and does not include the interior of the building. He explained that the Boys and Girls Clubs came back with a proposal in February 2018, which would install an elevator and make other improvements that would allow the building to be preserved. It was that proposal that prompted the community to be hopeful that a resolution could be achieved. He listed the community groups that have been involved as follows: Penn Knox Neighborhood Association, SoLo Germantown Civic Association, West Central Germantown Neighbors, Penn Area Neighborhood Association, Banton Hill Neighbors, Germantown United Community Development Corporation, West Side Neighbors, Wakefield 49s Development Improvement Association, Southwest Germantown Neighbors, Swampoodle Neighbors, Blue Bell Hill Civic Association, 12<sup>th</sup> Ward Democratic Leadership, Historic Germantown, and Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia. He explained that those are the groups that Penn Knox Neighborhood Association has been working with. He stated that once the proposal was made and it moved along, the community groups decided that they could support the concept, particularly if it was under the control of the Historical Commission staff. It was communicated to the Boys and Girls Clubs that the community groups believed that the revitalization of the Boys and Girls Clubs could work effectively under their plan. The community groups were not trying to be difficult or obstructionist. He noted that if the Boys and Girls Clubs wants to build something in the back that is brand new, then that is their decision and they can do that, because they own the ground.

Mr. McElhatton explained that when the proposal was made, one of the initial conditions was that there be a development agreement. He noted that he has been involved in development

agreements, both as an attorney and when he served in Philadelphia City Council for four years. Development agreements do not always work. The smaller the group, the more likely it is that it is feasible. He stated that, in his estimation, any kind of development agreement that would encapsulate the interests of all 14 groups would not be logically feasible and would be financially disastrous. He asserted that every group has its own interests. He used the example of the now-demolished Sears on the Boulevard, which he said would still be standing if they had waited until they had achieved a community consensus. He stated that they believe that, if the Boys and Girls Clubs can preserve the building, as it appears that they have acknowledged they can do, it is best done with the oversight of the Historical Commission. He stated that his experts, including Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin, claim that all modifications recently proposed can be approved by the staff, and would not have to be reviewed by the full Commission. He asked that the Commission consider what the building is now, and what the owner says it can be. He asserted that one of the major players in the community's interaction has been State Representative Rosita Youngblood. He read her letter of 6 June 2018, which had been distributed to the Commission at the start of the meeting:

I am writing to support the application of the Germantown Boys' Club, located at 23 W. Penn Street, to be memorialized and registered as a historic building by the Philadelphia Historical Commission. The Germantown Boys' Club, which was originally the Boys' Parlors Association, was built in two phases, with the original structure being built in 1898 and the addition being completed in 1909. Located in the Penn-Know section of Germantown, the Colonial Revival style building's design can be attributed to Mantle Fielding, Jr., a well-known master architect from Philadelphia who also resided for many years in Germantown. Fielding designed the addition to the Club, which also improved upon the original structure and in turn complemented and concluded the building. Since 1898 this building has been a keystone to the Germantown community by serving as a hub for activities and education, special events, social gatherings, and every day happenings. To this day, it continues to operate as the Germantown Boys' and Girls' Club of Philadelphia, which happens to be one of the oldest operating Boys' and Girls' Clubs in the nation. Its cultural significance as a structure, inside and out, is one to be acknowledged and preserved. Subsequently, considering the constant use of the building, it has remained structurally sound, which is a testament to its architect and the importance to the community who utilizes its services. It has stood the test of time and remained a constant reminder to Germantown residents, and its visitors, that there is history here, and that we take pride in our community: past, present, and future. That being said, I wholeheartedly support the application for the Germantown Boys' Club to be honored by being registered as a historic building by the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Thank you for your consideration of this request. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Mr. McElhatton opined that Ms. Youngblood is a very engaged community person. He noted that there were allegations at the May 2017 Commission meeting that were beneath the dignity of the people making those claims. He stated that the Commission decides on the merits or lack of merits, and not on other issues. Mr. Thomas cautioned that Mr. McElhatton not stray too far from the topic of new information. He explained that the Commission received Ms. Youngblood's letter. Mr. McElhatton agreed, but noted that matters have occurred in the past 24 hours that should not come before the Commission today. Mr. Thomas agreed that the Commission will focus on the Criteria for Designation. Mr. McElhatton stated that there was ample testimony and evidence presented at the May 2017 Commission meeting to support the nomination. He requested that the Commission vote to list 23 W. Penn Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Goodman stated that the May 2017 Commission meeting provided an opportunity for extensive testimony both in support of and against the nomination. He stated that the Boys and Girls Clubs continues to oppose the nomination, and the staff recognized that the nomination itself is deficient. He stated that the building does not meet the Criteria, and, even if the Commission finds that it does meet one Criterion, it is not obligated to designate. The Commission “may” designate. The Boys and Girls Club’s position is that designation of 23 W. Penn Street is not in the public interest, which was made clear at the May 2017 Commission meeting. He noted that the Commission felt conflicted at that meeting regarding the strength of arguments and emotions on both sides, and asked both parties to adjourn, continue the hearings before the Commission, and engage in discussions. He referenced minutes from the prior meeting, where former Commissioner Anuj Gupta suggested that the stakeholders, community groups, Boys and Girls Clubs, and near neighbors meet, discuss, and seek a compromise in good faith. Mr. Goodman asserted that that is what the Boys and Girls Clubs has tried to do over the last year. It has acted in good faith, and there were a number of meetings. The first meeting occurred in July 2017. It was a small group meeting, was productive, and arguments were shared on both sides. The Boys and Girls Clubs explained to community groups in attendance why it sought to demolish the building, which is because it is the most cost-effective way to provide a state-of-the-art facility for the children of Germantown. Demolition of the building would allow for construction of a single-story, accessible structure with unlimited sightlines, which could provide all of the services. This was explained to the people in attendance at that meeting. It was also explained to them that there is a cost premium involved with maintaining the existing building, and the Boys and Girls Clubs would be required to spend additional money and get less in return. He noted that the existing building has structural limitations, uneven floors, is inaccessible, has a huge unusable atrium, and is unsafe. Mr. Thomas cautioned that this information was already expressed to the Commission at its May 2017 meeting, and that the discussion today should focus on what has happened since that Commission meeting.

Mr. Goodman continued, and explained that after that meeting in July 2017, the Boys and Girls Clubs proposed that it would consider keeping the building as part of the new facility, and to incorporate an ice hockey rink. He noted that everyone seemed receptive to that idea, and so they moved forward. Another public meeting was held in August 2017. That meeting quickly became unruly and disruptive and nothing was resolved. He asserted that one thing that has been made consistently clear, is that in exchange for considering the preservation of the building, and incorporating it into the project, one thing was asked for in return. The Boys and Girls Clubs asked to be relieved of the obligations of historic designation. The Boys and Girls Clubs asked that it enter into an agreement with the nominators that would require the nominators to withdraw the nomination, and in exchange for that, the Boys and Girls Clubs would agree to maintain the structure and incorporate it into a new facility. That has been the position of the Boys and Girls Clubs since the beginning. Since August 2017, after the large public meeting that did not go well, another meeting was scheduled but canceled because the Boys and Girls Club’s CEO was in a car accident.

Mr. Goodman explained that, in an effort to keep things moving and to keep the momentum going, he spoke with Mr. McElhatton and sent him a draft of an agreement to consider on 31 August 2017. The response from the nominators was that they rejected it, and refused to consider it. They also refused to consider a further continuance. As a result, he explained that he and the Boys and Girls Clubs prepared for the September 2017 Commission meeting, and right before the meeting was to begin, at the urging of its counsel, the nominators agreed to a



further continuance to continue discussions. Over the fall and winter, there were a number of scheduling issues, and the parties were unable to meet. While that was taking place, there were discussions taking place within the organization. The Boys and Girls Clubs spoke to its donors. It had discussions with Snider Youth Hockey Foundation. It was mutually decided that the ice hockey rink was very contentious. After those fall discussions, Snider Youth Hockey Foundation agreed to withdraw from the project. The ice hockey rink was eliminated as part of the project. Mr. Goodman explained that it was believed that the ice hockey rink was one of the major issues that was troubling the community. The Boys and Girls Clubs then reached out to the community and tried to schedule a meeting. The meeting was in February 2018.

Mr. Goodman stated that since the ice hockey rink was no longer part of the project, the Boys and Girls Clubs began to consider a scaled-down facility. In discussions with donors, and in response to the heated opposition, there was a proposal made to try to adaptively reuse the building and live within the four walls of the existing structure, despite the fact that it comes at a cost premium and it requires the Boys and Girls Clubs to cut several programs from what was proposed. It does not allow for a full-size regulation gym or basketball court. At the February 2018 meeting, their architect presented a slideshow that showed this scaled-down proposal. Mr. Goodman stated that it was made clear at that meeting that this was a conceptual plan, not final, and not funded. It was put out there as a concept, and an offer of what the Boys and Girls Clubs may be willing to do, if the community were to enter into an agreement and withdraw the nomination, and then agree to not oppose the Boys and Girls Clubs in the zoning process. That was the quid pro quo. Mr. Goodman explained that the response from the nominators was that they were not willing to enter into an agreement, and they refused to consider an agreement for a variety of reasons, some being that the group is unruly, there are too many people, or that they do not know how to enforce it. He explained that he has personally been involved in other situations where agreements have been reached with community organizations. He stated that the Boys and Girls Clubs has compromised quite a bit. It has eliminated the ice hockey rink. It has proposed to consider keeping the building and adaptively reusing it, and the one thing it asked for is that there would be an agreement with the nominators that they would withdraw the nomination so that the Boys and Girls Clubs would not be burdened by the additional expense and administrative hassle of owning a historically designated structure. That was the one thing that the Boys and Girls Clubs asked for, and the nominators refused to provide it. One year ago, the Commission asked both sides to compromise. He noted that a compromise is a settlement of a dispute where both sides give up something. One cannot have an agreement where only one side compromises and the other side is inflexible. He commented that the Boys and Girls Clubs is frustrated by that, because it is where it finds itself today. The nominators and community groups have refused to consider entering into an agreement, and it is the one thing that has been asked for. The Boys and Girls Clubs has completely changed the plan from what was proposed one year ago, and yet the answer is still that the nominators cannot enter into an agreement. He explained that after the February 2018 meeting, the Boys and Girls Clubs was surprised to see that the plans, which were conceptual plans and which was made clear at the meeting and which is why hardcopies were not distributed, were made public via the Penn Knox Neighborhood Association website, as someone had taken photographs of the slideshow using their phone. He stated that the nominators are acting as if this is a fait accompli. It is not a fait accompli. It was a proposal of an offer that was made in exchange for an agreement to withdraw the nomination.

Mr. Goodman continued that over the last year, the Boys and Girls Clubs has compromised again and again, in an attempt to move forward with this project, and has been frustrated by the lack of compromise on the other side. The Boys and Girls Clubs continues to oppose the

nomination. It does not wish to be burdened by restrictions and additional costs and burdens of a designated property. The Boys and Girls Clubs is a non-profit organization which has to raise funds from donors. Every dollar spent on buildings or administrative approvals is a dollar that is lost from programming and from executing on its mission. He stated that the nomination does not satisfy the Criteria for Designation, it is untrue and incomplete, and should be denied for those reasons. He reiterated that even if the Commission does choose to find that the property satisfies one or more Criteria for Designation, it is within its discretion to decide whether it is appropriate to designate. He asserted that it is not in the public interest to designate. He stated that the Boys and Girls Clubs should be allowed to continue to advance its mission in a way that it deems best to serve the children of Germantown, as it has for the last 100 years, without additional encumbrances that would result from owing a historically designated structure.

Mr. McElhatton responded that the agreement which was provided had a provision that said that during the development, the nominators shall not oppose the new facility project, including without limitation, any Boys and Girls Clubs application for permits, approvals, variances, or other zoning relief, or relief from any other governmental or quasi-governmental restriction. He stated that it is a blanket statement without regard to what the zoning variance may be. He suggested that no group should agree to that. He acknowledged that he understands why it is in the agreement, but that it is a key provision that caused the community groups to say no. He stated that the community is willing to work towards an agreement, but not sign a blank check. He suggested that any discussion of financial hardship is not pertinent to today's meeting. He opined that some may consider historic designation a burden, but that the residents consider it a blessing.

Mr. Goodman responded that the agreement was provided as a first draft, and that anyone who has negotiated agreements understands that there is give and take. The first draft of an agreement is provided as an opportunity to sit down and negotiate the terms, rather than reject it outright. He stated that the nominators did not offer to sit down and try to negotiate terms with the Boys and Girls Clubs.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Commission is charged with determining whether the nomination demonstrates that the property meets at least one of the Criteria for Designation, and then decide whether or not to designate. He suggested that perhaps additional time is needed to further discuss an agreement. Mr. McElhatton commented that he was unable to find anything in the record that states that something in the nomination is false. Mr. Thomas commented that all of the Commissioners have reviewed the record.

Mr. Goodman noted that the Boys and Girls Clubs did not ask for this matter to be placed on today's agenda, and was willing to continue to discuss a compromise with the nominators. The nominators requested that this matter appear on today's agenda.

Mr. Thomas asked for limited public comment. James Gilfillan commented that he supports the historic designation of the building. Reverend Allan Robinson, pastor of New Bethel AME Church of Germantown, commented that he stands with the following other local clergy in opposition to the historic designation: Reverend Doctor Allan Waller, Pastor of Enon Tabernacle Baptist Church; Reverend Gregory Holston, pastor of Janes Memorial United Methodist Church and Executive Director of Philadelphians Organized to Witness, Empower and Rebuild (POWER); Reverend Derick Brennan, pastor of Canaan Baptist Church; and Reverend Bob Coombe, pastor of First United Methodist Church of Germantown. He thanked the Commission for its hard work. He commented that he and the other pastors stand in solidarity with the Boys

and Girls Clubs, because they believe in its mission to provide for the children, and they believe that historic designation of this particular building will be a burden. He noted that the structure was designed many years ago for meeting the needs of the children, but it has served its purpose and the Boys and Girls Clubs has now outgrown the space. He commented that the children of Germantown deserve a much larger facility. Mr. Thomas thanked him for his comments, and noted that he received correspondence that Mr. Robinson and other clergy are in opposition to the designation, but that these arguments were already covered in great detail at the May 2017 Commission meeting. Mr. Robinson continued that the Commission has a history of being lenient, as evidenced by its earlier decision at this meeting to approve the demolition of 413 E. Church Lane. He commented that the Commission recognized that the building was beyond repair, and it could be let go. He reminded the Commission that the land at 23 W. Penn Street was designated for children, and suggested that the Commission acknowledge that the space is for the children. He commented that there are many other opportunities in the city to designate historic buildings, and that the Commission should be lenient with this review. He commented that if the Commission can make the decision to approve demolition of 413 E. Church Lane, it can make that same kind of decision for the Boys and Girls Clubs. He reminded the Commission that the staff recommended to the Committee on Historic Designation that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 23 W. Penn Street satisfies any of the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Thomas responded that it is not a question of being lenient, but rather it is a matter of following the ordinance and Rules & Regulations as closely as possible.

Mr. Goodman and Mr. McElhatton agreed that they are not in agreement at the moment. Mr. Thomas asked if they felt that they may benefit from more time to discuss a compromise. He noted that the Commission has delayed voting on the matter for one year, to allow time to listen to both sides and allow those sides to try to reach a compromise. He stated that if there is no reason to wait, the Commission will take action today. Mr. McElhatton asked for a moment to consult with his client.

After the passing of several minutes to allow for consultation with his client, Mr. McElhatton requested that the Commission table the matter for a period of 90 days, to allow for an opportunity to continue the dialogue between the Boys and Girls Clubs and nominators. Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission would like to see this matter amicably resolved for the benefit of everyone, including the children. He suggested that they come back to the Commission with an agreement that addresses what and how an alternative to local historic designation would work. He noted that there are many ways to protect historic properties that do not include listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni commented that this situation reminds him of his first days as a law clerk many years ago. He had complained to the judge that he worked for about wasting time trying to settle a case, and had suggested that they just get on with it and let the lawyers go. The judge explained that their job is not to decide the case, but rather it is to get the case decided. The judge had explained that a settlement is always better than having the bloodletting, because someone is going to bleed. He noted that, no matter what the Commission decides, one side will be in disagreement, and in the long-term, the entire community will suffer. He suggested that it sounds as though a compromise may be able to be reached, but that perhaps there are too many people involved and that is making it difficult. Mr. Thomas reminded everyone that historic designation does not regulate work to the interior, and encouraged both parties to look at potential funding options.

Ms. Stanford asked about the economics of the situation. She displayed a proposal from the packet, which was provided by Sue Patterson of the Penn Knox Neighbors, and asked where it

came from and who developed it. Mr. Goodman stated that it was submitted by the nominators and is not a proposal. Mr. McElhatton suggested that it was maybe one of the submissions made in 2017 by Ms. Patterson in support of the nomination. Ms. Patterson clarified that Oscar Beisert, one of the nominators, made a request for specific architectural changes related to three proposals which were originally reviewed in August 2017. There was a back-and-forth on the specific architectural details, because up until that point, there was no clarity. In the Commission's packets are copies of both that and the exchange from when the architectural details were reviewed. She noted that this was all from a time at which the ice rink was still part of the plan, which it no longer is, so the information which she recently provided to the staff to provide to the Commission is now irrelevant.

Mr. Goodman briefly consulted with his client. He stated that the Boys and Girls Clubs will agree to a further continuance, as it has always been willing to speak to the community in an effort to work out an agreement.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 23 W. Penn Street for 90 days, to the September 2018 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 12:14 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning. 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.

Storefronts Guideline: Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.

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

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

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

### **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.