

**THE MINUTES OF THE 671ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 JULY 2018
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Mark Dodds, Division of Housing & Community Development
Mike Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
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.
Kimberly Washington, Esq.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Kathy Dowdell
James Milnes
James Hamilton
Jessica Rizzo
Mark Lord, Bryn Mawr College
Kim Bear-Bailey, Philadanco
Rojer Kern, Department of Commerce
Susan Reel-Panish
Emily Brown
Ken Weinstein, Philly Office Retail
Emma Erwin
Craig Deutsch, Harmon Deutsch Architecture
Chanel Williams
Oscar Beisert
Bill Graves
Elizabeth Stegner, Old City Historical Society
Dermot Dix, Local 274
Alfonso Clark
Juanda Myles, Citizen Planner

Laurel Raczka, Painted Bride
Joel Spivak
George Rosskan
Gail Lopez-Henriquez, Painted Bride
James Sloan, Painted Bride
Martha Adams, Original Church of God in Christ, Inc.
Emily Smith, Philadelphia Magic Gardens
Chris Kent
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
EM Swann, Painted Bride
Walter Modrys, Old St. Joseph Church
Agata M. Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects
Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
Steven Peitzman, Drexel University
Valorie Pearson
Julia Lopez, Painted Bride
Rebecca Trotta
Vincent Trotta
Stacy Holder, Painted Bride
Marty Brigham, Painted Bride
Harriet Rubenstein, Painted Bride
Joan Sloan, Painted Bride
Helen Heinz, Painted Bride
Kim Valentine, Original Church of God in Christ, Inc.
Peter McElhill, MEB Plumbing
Michael F. Doyle, Old St. Joseph Church
Kelly Wiles
Kerry Canal
Kevin Golden, Cozen O'Connor
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Carol Finkle, Painted Bride
Miriam Burnett, Jones Tabernacle
Lisa Brown, Jones Tabernacle
Valorie Pearson, Jones Tabernacle
Terry Mond, University City
Charles McMahon, Lantern Theater Company
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Noah Yoder

CALL TO ORDER

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

MINUTES OF THE 670TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the minutes of the 670th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 May 2018. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District to the September 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District located east of the 7300 block Germantown Avenue in the Mt. Airy neighborhood and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, I, and J. The nomination argues that the proposed district, which is composed of 22 buildings constructed between 1750 and 1972, is significant under Criterion A for the Seminary's history and evolution in Philadelphia as representative of, and associated with, the larger historical development of suburban institutional campuses in the city. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that six of these buildings were designed by architect Frank Furness or his firm Furness & Evans and these buildings represent work of an eminent Philadelphia architect whose work greatly influenced the architectural history of the city. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the site where the Seminary currently stands was historically occupied by the Mount Airy Estate and is therefore significant for its archaeological potential. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Seminary represents the historical heritage of religious and theological education and training in the United Lutheran Church.

It should be noted that since the owner was notified of the proposed historic district in April 2018, at least seven of the buildings owned by the Lutheran Theological Seminary are currently up for sale or have recently been sold to new owners.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas explained that the Lutheran Theological Seminary has requested that the Historical Commission to continue the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation for its 12 September 2018 meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation for its 12 September 2018 meeting. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 228-36 S 52ND ST

Name of Resource: The Locust Theatre

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Bushfire Theatre of Performing Arts

Nominator: Noah Yoder

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@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 228-36 S. 52nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 228-36 S. 52nd Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Locust Theatre, constructed in 1914, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the Locust Theatre is emblematic of the construction of small, neighborhood theaters in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century, as movies became affordable entertainment. The Theatre is also associated with successful baker William Freihofer, and the Bushfire Theatre of Performing Arts. Having entertained audiences for over a century, the Theatre exemplifies the development of the 52nd Street strip as a major cultural and commercial corridor of West Philadelphia. Under C, D, and E, the nomination contends that the Theatre still retains much of its original terra cotta, Beaux-Arts classical detail, and typifies the high architectural standard to which neighborhood movie theaters were held. The Theatre is clad in terra cotta ornament by the Conkling-Armstrong Terra Cotta Company, and is the work of noted Philadelphia architectural firms Stuckert & Sloan, and later the Hoffman-Henon Company.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas explained that the Bushfire Theatre of Performing Arts has requested that the Historical Commission to continue the review of the nomination to its 12 October 2018 meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to continue the review of the nomination for 228-36 S. 52nd Street and remand it to the Historical Commission for its 12 October 2018 meeting. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 230-36, 238 VINE ST, 255 BODINE ST

Name of Resource: The Painted Bride

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Painted Bride Art Center, Inc.

Nominator: Emily Smith, Philadelphia's Magic Gardens

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@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 230-36 and 238 Vine Street and 255 Bodine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, H and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 230-36 and 238 Vine Street and 255 Bodine Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that Painted Bride Art Center is significant under Criteria for Designation E, F, H and J. Under Criterion F, the nomination argues that the mosaic façade of the building is one of artist Isaiah Zagar's defining works. The Painted Bride's 1991 commission to create a

public face for their organization represents a pivotal moment in Zagar's artistic development. The exterior facade is the artist's first use of his innovative "total embellishment" style, mosaics that encompass a building's exterior walls from street to roofline. Since the late 1960s, Zagar has created hundreds of murals in Philadelphia. Using donated and recycled materials, the artist's community-based works enliven building walls throughout Philadelphia with imagery, stories, portraiture, and word play, satisfying Criterion E. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that the vibrant mosaic façade of the building is inextricably linked to history of the Painted Bride and is a singular visual feature of the Old City arts district. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the property exemplifies the Painted Bride's influence on the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Old City and Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas explained that the Painted Bride has requested that the Historical Commission to continue the review of the nomination to its 10 August 2018 meeting.

Gail Lopez-Henriquez, a member of the Board of Painted Bride, requested a continuance to the August 2018 Historical Commission meeting. She explained that, although previous efforts to seek a resolution with the Magic Gardens were not successful, there was a potential opportunity that the Painted Bride recently became aware of that could lead to a successful resolution, with assistance by Paul Steinke. The Painted Bride would like the opportunity to discuss this opportunity further with the nominator and is therefore requesting a one-month continuance.

Emily Smith, the nominator and executive director of Philadelphia's Magic Gardens, stated that she will not be available to attend the August 2018 meeting and requested that the continuance be extended to the September 2018 Historical Commission meeting.

Ms. Lopez-Henriquez asked that the continuance be limited to a one-month extension for the August 2018 meeting. She explained that, prior to notice of the nomination, the Painted Bride had been in discussion with a potential buyer who had no intention of changing the building. She noted that these buyer discussions have been put on hold and future plans for the organization have been put on hold as a result of the nomination. She noted that it was a difficult decision for them to even ask for a one-month continuance, but the Painted Bride felt it was worth it to try to reach a resolution that would preserve the asset. Ms. Lopez-Henriquez added that a two-month continuance would present a problem for their organization.

Ms. Smith stated that she was prepared to present at today's meeting and only learned of the continuance request the previous evening. Ms. Smith continued that she wished to be prepared to present at the future meeting.

Mr. Thomas inquired about the potential buyer Ms. Lopez-Henriquez previously mentioned. She responded that they were in negotiations with a potential buyer who was interested in keeping the building exterior as it currently is. Ms. Lopez-Henriquez stated that those negotiations have been put on hold pending the resolution of the potential designation. She explained that the problem the Painted Bride is confronting is that the potential buyer may lose interest as result of further delay.

Ms. Smith stated that there have been ongoing discussions with the Painted Bride. She stated that it is her understanding that there is no contract for sale currently in place. Ms. Smith noted that they all hoping for a positive resolution.

Ms. Cooperman stated that it is important for the nominator to be present at the meeting during which the question of designation is considered.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination to the Historical Commission's 14 September 2018 meeting. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JUNE 2018

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the Consent Agenda, which included applications for 1026 Spruce Street, 236 S 22nd Street, 520 Queen Street, 321-27 Willings Aly, and 1920 North Street. He asked if anyone on the Commission or in the audience had comments on the requests.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 1026 Spruce Street, 236 S. 22nd Street, 520 Queen Street, 321-27 Willings Alley, and 1920 North Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1026 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Remove non-historic garage, construct wall and parking pad

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Scott Baldasare and Alex Cook

Applicant: George Baker, architect

History: 1865

Individual Designation:

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a paver strip is added between the parking spaces and side walk; the material of the paver strip is brick, concrete, or Belgian block; a brick party wall is added on the east side of the property and adjacent to the neighboring garage; pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a brick garage and construct a wall set back behind the garage and concrete parking pad. From maps the garage was constructed in the early twentieth century, much later than the Second Empire house at the front of the lot. The applicant seeks to create two open parking spaces on this alley. The staff would recommend demarcating the street line with a change in pavement.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 236 S 22ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition and deck on rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shawn Murray

Applicant: Scott Woodruff, Designblendz LLP

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the deck is pulled back to align with the western edge of the existing skylight at the alley side, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a small addition and deck on the two-story rear ell of this corner building. The addition would be clad in clapboard and the deck would be enclosed by a railing.

The front-façade windows were replaced with vinyl windows without the Historical Commission's approval since the property was designated in 1995. The windows are not addressed in this application, but should be brought into compliance under a separate application.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 520 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Alter façade; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2622 West Hagert Street LLC

Applicant: Gerald Boyce

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 8/21/1973

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the front façade window openings are returned to their original sizes; the dormer cheek walls are clad with wood clapboards; the dormer's segmental arch and surround are restored; all front façade windows are wood six-over-six double-hung sash; the brick cornice is restored; the pilot house not visible from public right-of-way; and the historic garage door is documented with details and dimensions prior to demolition; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story rear addition with pilot house and roof deck and to alter the front façade. The roof of the proposed addition would abut the rear slope of the existing roof just below the ridge. The pilot house would be set back on the addition and would feature a sloped roof to minimize visibility from Queen Street. A rear elevation was not provided, but the cover letter notes that the rear walls and pilot house would be clad in cement siding and a wrought iron railing would be installed at the deck.

The proposed work to the front façade includes reconfiguring the ground-story door to allow for car access to the garage. A new pedestrian entrance would flank the garage door, and the existing transom configuration would remain. The pedestrian entrance and garage door would

be composed of wood and would be installed within the existing masonry opening. The application further proposes to remove the existing aluminum siding and to restore the brick to the roofline. The cheek walls of the dormer would be clad in cement siding, and the windows of the façade would be replaced to reflect the historic configurations, although the windows are identified as one-over-one sash windows in the elevation drawing.

At its 22 May 2018 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application for the property that proposed to demolish much of the structure and to construct a four-story building. At that time, the Committee advised the applicant to restore the Queen Street façade and to work with an architect to determine whether the rear of the property could be redesigned or reconstructed to allow for additional living space with limited or no visibility from Queen Street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct building on vacant lot; demolish non-historic vestibule and site wall

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: David Altenhofen and Mariette Buchman

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1886

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot known in the Historic District inventory as 2026 Spring Garden Street.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to subdivide 2026-28 Spring Garden Street to create two lots, remove and reconstruct a non-historic one-story vestibule at 2028 Spring Garden Street, and construct a four-story residential building on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. In the Spring Garden Historic District inventory, 2026 Spring Garden is listed as a vacant lot. Historic maps show that the vacant land at 2026 Spring Garden Street was always the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Despite this, 2026 Spring Garden Street was given its own entry in the Historic District inventory, as shown below:

2026 Vacant lot.

2028 3-story, 2-bay, brick, Italianate semi-detached house. Marble watertable; marble steps with iron railing; segmental arch entrance opening with paneled wood jamb; double-leaf, full-glazed door with transom; segmental arch window openings; 1/1 wood sash with exterior storm windows on 1st to 3rd stories; marble segmental arched window hoods with carved end brackets and sills; bracketed and sub-bracketed wood cornice; gable roof.

East elevation: brick with fanlight at gable.

Built c. 1886. Alterations: 1-story, 1-bay flat roof entrance to the east with modern paneled door; alterations to exterior and interior, 1990. Contributing.

Documentation: NPS Tax Credit Application.

The applicant has submitted this in-concept application to gain clarity from the Historical Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street. The staff suggests that the Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over any proposed new construction at the site because it was a developed site at the time of the Historic District designation; the site should be considered developed because it was historically the side yard for the property with the building at 2028 Spring Garden and because a wall with fence stands on it.

Owing to extremely limited information provided for the proposed new construction, the staff suggests that the Committee limits its comments to the appropriateness of a four-story building at the site.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

Ms. Chantry explained that this in-concept application was supplemented since the time of review by the Architectural Committee. The non-historic one-story vestibule referenced in the staff overview is now proposed for removal rather than removal and reconstruction. New renderings were provided by the applicant to show two concepts. One concept is for a three-story building and the other concept is for a four-story building on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street.

Ms. Reister explained that she is looking for the Commission to opine on the two concepts. She stated that, in order to match the cornice line of the adjacent building, the project will need to go through the variance process at the Zoning Board of Adjustment because the cornice itself exceeds the allowable height per zoning regulations. She stated that the client would like to proceed with the Commission's recommendation. She explained that she initially proposed a three-story structure in front to allow for a by-right project, but now she is asking for the Commission to support the concept of a four-story building because it will have to go through the variance process regardless. She stated that the building is proposed to occupy the entire width of the lot, with an overbuilt alleyway for ADA access to an accessible unit at the rear. She acknowledged that the proposal will need to be presented to the Commission for a final review at a future date. She clarified that the building as proposed is exceeding allowable width and height per zoning regulations. She asked that the Commission comment on the proposed width

of the building and she requested that it recommend approval of the concept of the full-width building so that she and her client know it will not be an issue when the project comes back for a final review.

Mr. Thomas asked if the only variance needed from the Zoning Board of Adjustment is for height. Ms. Reister responded that this is correct, but that if she has to provide a side yard, it will technically generate additional zoning reviews. Mr. Thomas opined that the Zoning Board is unlikely to deny the construction of a four-story building on a block that is lined with four-story buildings. Ms. Reister responded that she understands, and the concern now is more about occupying the entire width of the lot, and if the Commission would be willing to approve that. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission would consider the entire design.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there are openings on the side elevation at 2024 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Chantry responded that there are no openings on the party wall, where the proposed building would attach. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there are a few openings on the side wall at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Reister clarified that there is a cellar window and one window on the first floor at 2028 Spring Garden Street, but that the elimination of the one-story vestibule would in effect create a side yard so that those windows would not be blocked by the new construction, even if the new construction is built to the property line at 2026 Spring Garden Street.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Commission should determine if the in-concept proposal satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Cooperman commented that, from the standpoint of the Standards, the removal of the historic wall and fence is troubling, as they are historic features of the vacant lot. She acknowledged that her fellow Commissioners may not agree. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is important to remember that this application is in-concept, and the Committee and Commission will have another opportunity to review the project. He observed that the building is three bays in width rather than two bays, if it spans the full width of the lot. He stated that the Committee was in favor of the concept of a four-story building at this site, adding that it was preferred, given the height of the rest of the block. He commented that the odd thing about the site is that that building at 2024 Spring Garden Street has a party wall and looks like it is missing its twin, although it never had a twin and the lot actually belonged to the adjacent property at 2028 Spring Garden Street. Mr. McCoubrey commented that perhaps there are ways to retain and incorporate parts of the wall or fence in the new building. He noted that the site wall has been altered, as one end was cut off to put the gate in, likely when the one-story vestibule was constructed. Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted that not every twin on the block is the same. He expressed his approval of a four-story, full-width building on the lot. Mr. Mattioni asked if an in-concept approval included the proposed full-width lot coverage. Mr. Thomas confirmed that it would.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application in concept. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 321-27 WILLINGS ALY

Proposal: Install ADA ramp and lift; relocate historic plaques/sculpture

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Old St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church

Applicant: Barry Eiswerth

History: 1838; Old Saint Joseph's Church and Rectory

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the following suggestions: the relocation of the historic plaques is studied; the width of the treads is revised; the exterior railings are evaluated to meet ADA requirements; and the benches are free-standing rather than built-in; with staff to review details; pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make alterations related to ADA accessibility in the courtyard at the Old St. Joseph's Church complex. In order to make the main floor of the building accessible, the application proposes to raise an existing door and to construct a new ramp and landing. These elements would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. In order to make the lower level accessible, the application proposes to install a lift that would lower parishioners to an existing open areaway. The application proposes to install a brick wall to conceal the lift and to blend in with the brick wall behind it. To preserve the iconic view of the courtyard from Willings Alley through an historic carriage entrance, the application proposes to relocate the historic plaque and sculpture from the obscured historic wall to the new brick wall.

The staff suggests reducing the height of the new screen brick wall if the dimensions of the lift allow, and retaining the plaque and sculpture in-situ.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 226-30 S 3RD ST

Proposal: Alter facades; construct addition, pilot house, and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Vince and Rebecca Trotta

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects

History: 1974, Charles F. Kain, Zenith Engineers, Inc.

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the pilot house is pulled back four feet from the parapet wall; the existing windows are not altered and the new windows match the existing windows; and the infill along Willings Alley is a lighter design element like a storefront system, is set back four inches from the exterior plane, and the brick base wall is retained.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify window openings, alter the building's asymmetrical form, and to construct a pilot house and roof deck. The two-story corner building, which is listed as Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, features numerous character-defining arched and round windows. The original application proposed to remove the arched

windows on the S 3rd Street elevation and to install two bays of rectangular windows set into two-story cast stone surrounds, as well as to replace a round window on the Willings Alley elevation with a rectangular window with a cast stone surround. Following the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicants revised the 3rd Street window proposal to eliminate the alteration of the existing windows and to install an additional bay of windows replicating the existing windows, per the Committee's recommendation.

The application also proposes to remove the V-shaped inset walls along Willings Alley to gain additional square footage. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the infill, provided the infill is set back four inches from the exterior plane, the brick base is retained, and the infill system is a lighter design element like a storefront system, with windows and panels in the same plane, rather than punched openings. The applicants complied with the first two recommendations, but retained the punched opening and panel system, rather than a glazed, single-plane system as suggested by the Architectural Committee.

The application also proposes to install excavate the planter area along S 3rd Street and to install window wells. This portion of the application was not addressed by the Architectural Committee.

Finally, the application proposes to construct a sloped pilot house and roof deck. The Architectural Committee recommended pulling the pilot house back four feet from the parapet wall, and suggested that the color of the pilot house match the surrounding brick material. The applicants appear to have pulled the pilot house back, but the dimension is not specified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jose Hernandez and property owners Vince and Rebecca Trotta represented the application.

Mr. Farnham noted there was confusion at the Architectural Committee as to whether the building was designed concurrently with the neighboring I.M. Pei buildings. He clarified that the building is not related to the neighboring I.M. Pei buildings. The building in question was designed by Charles F. Kain of Zenith Engineers, Inc. and dates to 1974.

Mr. Hernandez explained that the floorplan of the property is rotated 45 degrees, which creates an uncomfortable layout and series of awkward spaces. The house, he noted, was designed for a doctor in the 1970s, and the architecture is a response to what the area was like at that time. He noted that the property owners have three children, and are looking for a way to create a single-family home that accommodates their family. He explained that the triangular piece on the exterior is inaccessible from either the interior or exterior, so they propose to infill that section to maximize the available floor space. He stated that they are willing to work on the aesthetics of the infill cladding, but do not feel that a storefront system works for the interior plan. He noted that they could have illustrated a storefront system, but their actual intent is to utilize a panelized system. He explained that the critical portion of the application is to infill the area to maximize the square footage. He noted that they do not mind setting the infill back four inches or pulling back the pilot house and working with the staff on minor details.

Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee believed that infilling the V-shaped portion of the exterior would be a major change, but understood that the plan is largely unworkable inside. He noted that the Committee urged the applicants to embrace the idiosyncrasies of the building to the extent that they could, but understood that making a workable plan was important. He opined that the revisions as presented well reflect the

Committee's comments, but noted that the color of the pilot house should be a darker and more recessive color.

Ms. Cooperman noted that it is helpful to know the correct information on the architect and date of construction. She commented that the design is clearly by someone who was looking at I.M. Pei's designs, but did not have the same understanding of scale and proportion as Pei.

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

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1920 NORTH ST

Proposal: Construct 3-story building with garage and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kerry Canal

Applicant: Kerry Canal

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 commented that the building should be reduced in height to more closely align with the adjacent structures; the pilot house and roof deck should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way; and an archaeologist should be retained to determine the likelihood of extant burials.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rowhouse with pilot house and roof deck on a vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot is located mid-block and historically served as the rear yard of 1919 Wallace Street. The property was subdivided in September 2017, though the district's inventory identified 1920 North Street separately and listed it as "a vacant lot with wood lattice fence." Pursuant to the inventory entry for this parcel, the Historical Commission's level of review should be review-and-comment, not full jurisdiction. The proposed new construction consists of a red brick façade with aluminum clad two-over-two double-hung windows, a wood entry door with transom, and a bracketed wood cornice. A wood-paneled garage door with transom windows is proposed at the ground story. The application further proposes to construct a pilot house and roof deck set back from the front façade.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 20 JUNE 2018

Emily Cooperman, Chair

ADDRESS: 1301-25 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Grand Court, Wanamaker's

Proposed Action: Interior Designation

Property Owner: Behringer Harvard REIT

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Grand Court satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the interior, the Grand Court, of the former John Wanamaker Store at 1301-25 Chestnut Street as historic and list in on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property's exterior is already designated as historic. The nomination contends that the Grand Court, a significant work conceived by Philadelphia merchant John Wanamaker and architect Daniel H. Burnham, stands as the unifying core of one of America's most acclaimed and influential department store designs and serves an expression of Beaux-Arts classicism. The nomination further argues that the Grand Court reflects the environment of an era shaped by the City Beautiful movement as applied to monumental commercial buildings and that the interior space includes two of Philadelphia's most recognized and established icons, the Wanamaker eagle and Wanamaker organ, which are situated in a unique and familiar architectural setting within the heart of Center City.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historical Commission. No one represented the property. Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Thomas stated that this nomination seeks to designate a portion of the interior and asked whether the organ is included. Ms. Keller replied that the organ and a number of fixtures are included and that the boundary of the nominated space is carefully delineated in the nomination.

Mr. Steinke clarified that the entire organ is not nominated but only portions visible from the Grand Court, which includes the false organ pipe face on the southern end of the Grand Court and the console. The massive works of the organ, he continued, housed behind the Grand Court, are not part of the nomination. He noted that the Historical Commission previously designated the Wanamaker Eagle as an object. If approved today, he added, the Grand Court will be only the third public interior designated by the Commission. He opined that the Preservation Alliance is eager to see that happen, commenting that the Grand Court is one of the most iconic public spaces in the city.

Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Steinke, stating that the Grand Court serves as Philadelphia's interior crossroads. She added that the nomination is extremely well done and the way the boundary is delineated is very helpful and will serve the Commission in the future.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Grand Court of the property at 1301-25 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C,

D, E, H, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DIAMOND STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT BOUNDARY AMENDMENT

Proposed Action: Boundary amendment

Applicant: Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend denial of the proposed historic district boundary amendment.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend the boundary of the Diamond Street Historic District, removing all properties from the district on the south side of Diamond Street between N. Lambert Street and N. Van Pelt Street, at the far southwest corner of the district. All of these properties are currently vacant lots. The Diamond Street Historic District was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1986. At the time of the designation, buildings classified as contributing in the district inventory, which were in very poor condition, stood on these blocks. Not long after the designation of the district, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited these buildings as “imminently dangerous” and the blocks of houses were demolished, resulting in the vacant lots that are present today. In 2001, the staff of the Historical Commission presented a proposal to amend the historic district boundary to account for extensive demolition, but that proposal called for cutting the boundary to 20th Street, which would have removed several historic buildings from the district. No action was taken by the Commission on the proposal, owing to community opposition to amending the district boundary. This current proposal requests the rescission of two vacant blocks only, where the buildings were demolished approximately 20 years ago. Historic preservation standards advise against including non-historic or non-contributing properties on historic district boundaries. Best practices suggest that the boundary should be amended to remove the vacant blocks.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposed historic district boundary amendment to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Cooperman to explain why the Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend denial of the proposed historic district boundary amendment. Ms. Cooperman explained that, from a purely technical standard, preservation best practices would indicate that these properties should be removed from the historic district because they are vacant properties without historic resources on the district boundary. She noted, however, that there was significant community interest in retaining the properties within the district. She stated that the Committee recommended denial, but understood that it was important for the Historical Commission itself to consider the proposal and the community’s concerns about it. Mr. Schaaf stated that, across Diamond Street from the properties proposed for removal from the district, stands a complete row of buildings on one block and two individual buildings on another. Mr. Schaaf urged the Historical Commission to deny the request. He stated that the Preservation Alliance made a compelling argument at the Committee meeting for “doing no harm.” He advocating for keeping the district “whole.” Mr. Schaaf stated that the Church of the Advocate faced these vacant lots. He also stated that there are other potential historic resources to the west that might be included in an expanded district. Mr. Farnham noted that the Church of the Advocate is located a couple of blocks to the east of the properties in question, not near these vacant blocks, and is already included in the district. Other agreed.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the City might be considering building a police station on one or both of these sites. He questioned whether this is the motivation for this proposal. He stated that the historic district would be better protected and its historic character better preserved if the vacant blocks are retained within the historic district and the Historical Commission reviews any new construction on the blocks. Mr. Steinke concluded that the Historical Commission should do no harm. The Historical Commission “should see what comes along” in terms of proposed development and then review it. He stated acknowledged the staff’s position that the Historical Commission’s scant resources should be wisely spent. He asserted that reviewing the new construction on the vacant lots would be a valuable use of those resources.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he is opposed to the district boundary amendment. Mr. Traub claimed that removing the properties would “set a very dangerous precedent, chipping away, whittling away, at existing historic districts.” He asserted that the police station that might be built on these sites must be compatible with the surrounding historic buildings.

Mr. Thomas stated that he wanted to offer his opinion of the proposal. He noted that buildings stood at the sites at the time of designation. He observed that streets are “two-sided” and concluded that any new construction at the sites should be sensitive to the historic district. Streetscape and compatibility are very important. The new construction should be compatible.

Mr. Farnham stated that some explanation of the genesis of this proposal is needed. He stated that no person or agency associated with the City requested or suggested that the staff of the Historical Commission propose an amendment to this district. He stated that the Department of Public Property, which would construct any police that would be built here, did not request that the Historical Commission amend the district. Mr. Farnham observed that the City is considering constructing a police station on the western of the two blocks proposed for removal from the district, or for the block to the west of and outside the district. Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission’s staff presented a similar proposal to amend the district in 2001. That proposal was acted upon by the Commission. During the intervening 20 years, the parcels have remained vacant. The staff therefore decided to propose again to remove the blocks with no buildings on them from the district. The parcels have not had any productive use for two decades. Mr. Farnham then disagreed with Mr. Traub, who had stated that approving this proposal would set an adverse precedent. He noted that the Commission has amended district boundaries to remove properties without historic resources several times in the past. It did so fairly recently on North Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. Mr. Farnham asserted that approving this proposal and removing these vacant lots from the historic district would not set any precedent because any such precedent has already been set. A precedent can only be set once. The precedent has already been set. Mr. Farnham added that any police station built in this area would be subject to a public review by the Art Commission, which reviews all City-funded construction to ensure that it is aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. The community could participate in a review of any proposed police station through the Art Commission, regardless of the area’s designation status. Mr. Thomas countered that a private development could be constructed on the vacant lots; it would not be subject to Art Commission review. He stated that he is reluctant to approve the boundary amendment. Mr. Traub interjected that the vacant lots should be retained within the Historical Commission’s control.

Pastor Dr. Miriam J. Burnett and Valorie Pearson of Jones Tabernacle Church addressed the Historical Commission. Ms. Burnett stated that her church is concerned about new construction across the street and would like it to be compatible with the historic church building.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the proposed historic district boundary amendment. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 3. Commissioners Dodd, Fink, and Mattioni dissented.

WAYNE JUNCTION HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Wayne Junction Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J, and that the historic district boundary should be revised to exclude the parking lot and Building 8 at 130 Berkley Street, at the Germantown Avenue side of the property, and that the formerly separate parcel at Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street, formerly known as 4521 Wayne Avenue, and now consolidated with 130 Berkley Street, be considered an undeveloped site that is non-contributing to the historic district.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate an eight-property historic district at Wayne Junction and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the distinctive industrial area, centered on the Wayne Junction train station, is significant under Criteria for Designation G and J. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the buildings are part of a distinctive industrial area which should be preserved for its ties to Philadelphia's manufacturing history. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that Wayne Junction is an intact industrial area that exemplifies the economic heritage of the neighborhood and the City of Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Chantry displayed a revised boundary to reflect the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

Craig Deutsch, of Harman Deutsch Architecture, and Kim Valentine, representing the Original Glorious Church of God in Christ Apostolic Faith – The Church of Philadelphia, located at 147-53 Berkley Street, expressed their concern of the designation of the one-story red brick building formerly part of the Arguto Oilless Bearing Company and known as 149 Berkley Street. Mr. Deutsch distributed photographs and stated that the building is subject to an imminently dangerous violation from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He also distributed a copy of a structural engineering report, dated 24 May 2018. He explained that the property owner is in the process of attempting to demolish the building. He described the building as being in very unsafe condition. He acknowledged that the building has a historic nature that is described in the nomination. He stated that the building has taken on vegetation and is at a point where it could collapse and hurt someone. He stated that the church still operates in the building next door to this building. He stated that a historic designation would delay the process of demolition. Ms. Valentine commented that they are not proposing that the building at 147 Berkley Street be excluded from the historic designation, and that they support the Commission in its designation of that building. She stated that the building at 149 Berkley Street, however, should be demolished and that they are in the process of collecting all documents required by the City to submit for a demolition permit. She stated that one requirement is that a structural engineer

assess the building and issue a report. She distributed an additional copy of that report to the Commissioners. She read from the report: "it is in imminent danger of collapse; demolition would be the only way to make the building safe. Therefore we recommend that the building be demolished as soon as possible." She explained that their concern is that someone could get hurt, and also the liability which would come from that. She commented that, as a non-profit organization, free publicity of the good work that is being done is always welcome, but this would not be the type of publicity that is desired. She reiterated that they are concerned about someone getting hurt and so they are trying to do the right thing.

Mr. Farnham stated that it is the understanding of the staff that the building was cited by the Department of Licenses & Inspections as unsafe. He asked if Ms. Valentine had a copy of a violation citing the building as imminently dangerous, and asked if the designation had changed in the prior day or two. Ms. Valentine responded that the Department of Licenses & Inspections visited the site in April 2018 and kept the violation as unsafe, and that the building had been cited as unsafe several years prior. She explained that the inspector was only looking at the front of the building, which does not give a true picture, although there is brick buckling at the front corner. She stated that she then contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections and that inspector Gene Stallworth visited the site on 21 May 2018 so that he could be let inside. She stated that Mr. Stallworth verbally communicated to her that the building is imminently dangerous, and that he would speak to his management and recommend that it be upgraded from unsafe to imminently dangerous. She explained that she asked Mr. Stallworth if she could email him about their conversation and have him respond and confirm it in writing, which she did but she never received a response from Mr. Stallworth with that confirmation. She stated that she believes that the citation has not been officially upgraded to imminently dangerous, but that she had a structural engineer evaluate the building as part of this process. Mr. Deutsch agreed, and directed the Commission's attention to the structural engineering report, which shows that the building has no roof remaining. He described the building as having three masonry walls that are unsupported, with vegetation growing out of them.

Mr. Farnham stated that it is the staff's understanding that the building does not pose a threat to the public, can therefore be repaired, and has not been upgraded to imminently dangerous, even if the engineer claims that it is. Ms. Cooperman noted that it is clear from the Pictometry view in the nomination that there is no roof on this building. Mr. Deutsch agreed, and noted that the photograph of the façade included in the nomination shows the buckling of the brick. Ms. Valentine added that a tree is now growing from the side wall. Ms. Valentine asked Mr. Farnham if he stated earlier that it is the Commission's understanding that the building is not imminently dangerous or unsafe to the public. Mr. Farnham responded that he did not state that the building is not unsafe, but that it is the staff's understanding that the Department of Licenses & Inspections has officially declared the building unsafe but not imminently dangerous. Ms. Valentine asked if this is true, even if the engineer has determined otherwise. Mr. Farnham responded that it is up to the Department of Licenses & Inspections to evaluate the engineer's claims regarding the condition of the building, and for the Department of Licenses & Inspections to make the ultimate decision from the City's perspective as to whether or not the building poses a danger to the public. He reiterated that he was only stating that his understanding is that, as of this moment, the Department of Licenses & Inspections has not upgraded the violation to imminently dangerous, and has indicated that the building could be safely repaired. Ms. Valentine asked why it would be necessary then to have a structural engineer evaluate the building and produce a report, if it is up to the City in the end. She asked who would be liable if something were to happen prior to repair, if the City were to decide that the building could be repaired but no engineer or architect would want to touch it. She asked again who would be

liable if someone got hurt. Mr. Farnham responded that he cannot answer those questions because he is neither a representative of the Department of Licenses & Inspections nor is he an attorney. Ms. Valentine asked who could answer her questions and put it in writing. Mr. Fink, the representative of the Department of Licenses & Inspections on the Historical Commission, stated that the building code and the administrative code require that a property owner engage the services of a licensed design professional to undertake the repairs. He stated that the violation notice requires the property owner to do that. He explained that plans that need to be developed to undertake the repairs would need to be sealed by a registered professional. He explained that he is not an attorney, but as to the question of liability, a property owner always has an obligation to protect the public. He stated that temporary measures could be put in place, such as partial closure of the footway or temporary shoring. He stated that measures such as those should be considered by the engineer as a means of protecting the public, and that making recommendations for temporary measures is one of the things that is asked of the engineer as part of their evaluation of the building. Ms. Valentine responded that in this case the engineer stated that there is nothing that can be done, and that the building should be demolished. Mr. Fink responded that that may be the engineer's recommendation, but that is not always the only course of action. He continued that there can be means of repairing a structure, and that is not a choice that the Department of Licenses & Inspections makes, but the Department asks that as part of any evaluation of a building, an engineer evaluate both long-term and short-term measures that are options for protecting the public.

Ken Weinstein, president of Philly Office Retail, explained that Philly Office Retail renovates vacant commercial buildings and finds reuses for those buildings. He stated that he is in support overall of the proposed historic district. He stated that he owns several of the properties which are proposed for inclusion, and even more properties directly around those properties. He commented that his company has plans to renovate and restore all of these properties and find appropriate adaptive reuses. He stated that his company owns 212-20 Roberts Avenue, the former Max Levy Autograph complex, which they plan on converting into 32 apartments; 137-45 Berkley Street, which they plan on converting into offices, a brewpub, and a barbeque restaurant; 133 Berkley Street, a vacant lot, for which they plan on putting a new Wayne Junction diner and parking; 113-29 Berkley Street, the former Moore Push-Pin building, which is already listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and for which they are under agreement of sale and for which they plan on converting into offices; 4530 Wayne Avenue, which they plan on converting into a community park; 4530 Germantown Avenue, which has multiple tenants; 4555 Germantown Avenue, which is a vacant church and for which they plan on a storefront and apartments conversion; 4701 Germantown Avenue, which they plan on converting into 10,000 square feet of office space; and 4811 Germantown Avenue, an eight-acre campus which is completed and is 100% occupied. He commented that he believes that these historic buildings are significant and add to the fabric of the community, and that removal of any of the historic buildings would be a shame and would detract from the neighborhood and Philly Office Retail's plans to revitalize the neighborhood. He commented that he appreciates the consideration in the nomination regarding windows and doors and having some flexibility, a reference to page four of the nomination which states that "the character-defining features of the contributing buildings in the Wayne Junction historic district include massing, scale, façade rhythm, proportions, and exterior cladding materials." He explained that adaptive reuse projects often require flexibility in terms of replacement materials such as windows, and offered the warehouse windows at the rear of 137 Berkley Street as an example, where he will need some consideration owing to a restaurant not being able to have warehouse windows. Mr. Weinstein stated that he strongly disagrees with previous assertions made about 147-53 Berkley Street. He explained that, as next-door neighbors, Philly Office Retail has filed in

court for conservatorship of the property. He asserted that the property owner has left the building vacant and deteriorating for decades and he believes it is time for it to be occupied. He noted that he has not received permission to look inside so he cannot comment on the interior, but from everything he has seen on the exterior, the building can absolutely be saved and renovated. He commented that his company has worked on much worse properties in the past, so he is confident that it can be saved and reoccupied. He commented that his discussions with the Department of Licenses & Inspections are consistent with Mr. Farnham's earlier comments that the building is unsafe but not imminently dangerous, and that he was told that there is no intention of changing that designation.

Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the Alliance is in support of the historic district, including all of the properties proposed for inclusion. He commented that there is such robust development activity finally taking root in this neighborhood after several decades of decline. He commented that it is a remarkably intact and compact district centered on a recently-restored train station where virtually every SEPTA train passes through. He commented that there is a great opportunity for this community to revitalize.

David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that Save Our Sites supports the designation of the historic district. He commented that Wayne Junction serves as a gateway to Germantown Avenue.

Joel Spivak read an excerpt from a letter of support from the Society for Industrial Archeology, Oliver Evans Chapter/Delaware Valley:

The Oliver Evans Chapter of the Society for Industrial Archeology (OESIA) is endorsing the designation of the Wayne Junction Historic District. The Chapter, organized in 1984, is the Delaware Valley affiliate of the national Society for Industrial Archeology. The group promotes the study, interpretation, and preservation of historically significant evidence of past industrial sites, artifacts and technology. By promoting a forum for discussion and exchange of information, usually at the National Historic Landmark Fairmount Water Works, OESIA advances an appreciation of the value of preserving Philadelphia's industrial heritage.... OESIA, therefore, enthusiastically supports the Historical Commission's designation of Wayne Junction as a Historic District. We thank you for your consideration of this request.

Ed Grusheski, President

Allison Weiss, representing the SoLo/Germantown Civic Association and Wayne Avenue Merchant Association, commented that she has been waiting since 2011 for the Commission to review this nomination. She commented that the Commission at last has an opportunity to review and designate the historic district. She commented that she does not know why Wayne Mills was suddenly excluded from the historic district, because those buildings have an important presence on both Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street. She commented that she has been trying for decades to find the owner of the property at 147-53 Berkley Street, to have the owner do something with the building to restore it. She commented that it is a very important property, and that she is pleased that Mr. Weinstein took the initiative to file for conservatorship. She explained that the most recent conservatorship hearing was postponed until late August 2018, but that at the hearing that decided the postponement, it was stated that the building was not imminently dangerous but rather was unsafe and could therefore be stabilized. She commented that Mr. Weinstein is willing to do just that. Ms. Chantry clarified that the historic mill

buildings at 130 Berkley Street, known as Wayne Mills, are still included in the historic district, but that the large parking lot on the Germantown Avenue side of the lot is proposed for exclusion, and that the formerly separate parcel at Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street, formerly known as 4521 Wayne Avenue, and now consolidated with 130 Berkley Street, is considered an undeveloped site that is non-contributing to the historic district. Ms. Chantry further explained that the latter site is considered an intrusion in the National Register Historic District, and that a non-contributing building stood on the site until recently. Ms. Weiss responded that a new building could conceivably be constructed on that site and the new construction should preserve the character of the historic district.

Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society of Philadelphia, commented that he is in support of the proposed historic district. He commented that the nomination has been pending for many years. He opined that if the district had been designated years earlier, the former Van Straaten and Havey building at 133 Berkley Street, which the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited as imminently dangerous in 2012, may not have been demolished. He commented that the building discussed earlier at 147-53 Berkley Street is owned by a non-profit that has neglected the building for decades, and now there is someone who is trying to at least stabilize it through conservatorship. He opined that if the property owner is very concerned about safety, the owner would have bracing on the façade or would have done something to maintain the building. He asked the Commission to decline any further exclusions from the historic district. He suggested that perhaps the rear of the building could be considered for exclusion.

Steven Peitzman, a resident of Germantown, commented that the district includes a remarkable surviving cluster of buildings that represent Germantown's industrial past, and he strongly supports the proposed historic designation. He noted that he is a former customer of the original Wayne Junction diner.

Roger Kern, Senior Business Services Manager for the Philadelphia Department of Commerce, commented that his organization strongly supports the designation of the historic district. He commented that he sees it as a key link to the ongoing revitalization of this section of Germantown and Nicetown.

Mr. Thomas commented that it is also important to understand the social significance of this area, and explained that he has receipts from the Wayne Junction Trust Company which relate to his family's migration from Poland to Philadelphia. He also noted that there is an historic postcard of the train station which claims that more trains stop there than any other station in the world. He commented that revitalization of the area will be a wonderful catalyst for other communities that surround it.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Wayne Junction Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, provided the historic district boundary is revised to exclude the parking lot and Building 8 at 130 Berkley Street, at the Germantown Avenue side of the property, and that the formerly separate parcel at Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street, formerly known as 4521 Wayne Avenue, and now consolidated with 130 Berkley Street, is considered an undeveloped site that is non-contributing to the historic district. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

SATTERLEE HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Satterlee Heights Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate an eight-property historic district on the south side of the 4300 block of Osage Avenue in the Spruce Hill neighborhood of West Philadelphia and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the proposed district, which is composed of four sets of twins constructed between 1871 and 1881 as part of the Satterlee Heights development, is one of the first large-scale, multi-block development projects in the area. The nomination contends that this block is unique in the context of nineteenth-century development in West Philadelphia, and as an intact block of twins set on large lots. The nomination further argues that the twins are excellent examples of the Second Empire style of architecture and reflect the environment in an era characterized by that distinctive style.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination on behalf of the Keeping Society of Philadelphia and the University City Historical Society.

The Commissioners discussed the nomination and the cited Criteria for Designation. Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Satterlee Heights Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 739 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Type of Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: George & Karen Rosskam

Applicant: Joel Spivak

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a rooftop deck at 739 S. 2nd Street, located at the corner of S. 2nd and Pemberton Streets. There is an existing, visible deck over the

garage on Pemberton Street. There is also a small deck off of a room at the top story that is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The staff visited the site to view a mock up of the first proposal, and saw that the railings of the proposed deck would be highly visible from both S. 2nd and Pemberton Streets. This revised application shows the deck reduced in size from the previous mock up; however, the railings would remain highly visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner George Rosskam and architect Joel Spivak represented the application.

Mr. Rosskam said that they had presented before the Architectural Committee in May, and had taken their comments into consideration. He stated that they had looked at their initial design, which had the deck facing S. 2nd Street, and which was visible from S. 2nd and Monroe Streets. He explained that with the new design, they reduced the size of the deck, repositioned it at the southern-most edge of the roof, pulled it further east and lowered it by two feet. Mr. Rosskam directed the members of the Historical Commission to the photographs in their packets and informed them that, with the new design, the deck was no longer visible from S. 2nd and Monroe Streets. He added that the deck was also no longer visible from Pemberton Street; however, the handrail of the stair leading up to the deck was slightly visible.

Mr. Rosskam directed the members of the Historical Commission to a diagram in their packets that showed the 45' x 24' section of Pemberton Street where the hand rail would be visible from the right of way. He told them that the photograph labeled #5 in their packets was a mock up intended to show what the visibility of the hand rail would look like. Mr. Rosskam added that there were three trees on the street that would further obscure a view of the handrail from the right of way. He explained that he and his wife had also checked to see how visible any lighting on the deck would be from the street, and he said that their test proved that light was not visible from any place on Pemberton Street. Mr. Rosskam said that with the new design, they had achieved making the deck invisible from the right of way and the stair handrail minimally visible, making the proposed deck as inconspicuous as they thought possible.

Mr. Rosskam explained that he and his wife wanted the new deck because of the view it would provide of the skyline of Philadelphia. He said that they also felt that the deck would increase the value of their house, adding that a local realtor named Mike McCann had told him that the roof deck would increase his property's value by \$40,000 to \$60,000. He said that a recent valuation of his house had gone up 100%, or approximately \$475,000.

Mr. Rosskam closed by saying that he hoped that the members of the Historical Commission would agree that they had done a good job in complying with the comments from the Architectural Committee. He said that they had made the deck as inconspicuous as they could, with only a small bit of the handrail visible from the street. He asked that any comments about the material or construction of the handrail be shared and that they would comply with any recommendations offered.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. McCoubrey if the Architectural Committee had made any recommendations about the material of the handrail. Mr. McCoubrey replied that the Architectural Committee's main concern was the erection of a deck on the roof of the main block of an individually designated house. He stated that there were already two decks on the property, and there was a rear ell, which could perhaps offer an opportunity to increase deck

space there. Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed deck was almost more like a widow's walk, measuring 8.5'x6', so it was a lot of work to do for a fairly minimal result. He acknowledged that the applicant had mentioned that the view of the skyline was something that they could not get if they built up at other places on the property. Mr. McCoubrey stated that given the importance of the end elevation of this house with its special, character-defining double chimney, having a visible handrail at a roof deck would not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, or the Historical Commission's Roofs Guidelines.

Mr. Roskam replied that they had been respectful to the comments from the Architectural Committee in their revised design. He reiterated that the deck itself would not be visible at all from S. 2nd Street. Mr. Roskam explained that the idea to use the existing second deck as the landing for the stairs leading to the proposed new roof deck came directly from a recommendation made by the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Thomas commented that it was very unusual for a deck located at the very top of a building to be approved, saying that typically they would be located at the rear ell or some other location where there was no visibility.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Dodds dissented.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:55 a.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 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

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

Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.

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.