

**THE MINUTES OF THE 672ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 AUGUST 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
Kelly Edwards, MUP
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, Ph.D., Commerce Department
Betty Turner, M.A.
Kimberly Washington, Esq.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Frank Swift
Claire Donato, RA, MBTA
Rich Thom
Eliz Thom
Morris Adjmi, MA
Andy Kaplin, Revolution Development
Marc Kaplin, Revolution Development
Dan Greenberg, NBLM
Nick Chelko, MA
Ian Cope, CLA/Nelson
Peter Gold
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Patrick Grossi, PAGP
Janet Kalter
Joe Schiavo
Neil Frauenglass, Elfreth's Alley Association
Joseph DeVitis
Francis Purcell
Albert D. Malmfelt

Lisa Ruff
Amy Lambert
Susan Babbitt
Greta Greenberger
Alan Greenberger

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Dodds, Edwards, Hartner, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Schaaf, and Turner joined him. Ms. Stanford joined the meeting at 9:15. Ms. Washington joined the meeting at 9:25.

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

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes of the 671st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 July 2018. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF JUSTIN DETWILER TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Farnham explained that Dan McCoubrey had nominated Justin Detwiler to fill the empty spot on the Architectural Committee. He noted that the spot has been vacant since Dominique Hawkins resigned from the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham pointed out that Mr. Detwiler's had been included in the meeting materials. He noted that Mr. Detwiler is a distinguished preservation architect with considerable experience.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to appoint Justin Detwiler to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JULY 2018

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the Consent Agenda, which included applications for 3500 Reservoir Drive, 618, 620, and 622 N. 16th Street, and 404 S. 6th Street. He asked if anyone on the Commission or in the audience had comments on the requests. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 3500 Reservoir Drive, 618, 620, and 622 N. 16th Street, and 404 S. 6th Street. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 3500 RESERVOIR DR

Proposal: Reconstruct parapet wall; extend terrace for accessibility; alter windows and doors; install retaining walls and mechanical equipment

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Fairmount Park Commission

Applicant: Claire Donato, Mark B. Thompson Associates LLC

History: 1899, James H. Windrim, architect, Smith Memorial Playground

Individual Designation: 5/5/1977

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the revised design, with the recommendation to eliminate the sidelites of the restroom doors, with the staff review details, particularly of the door and window color.

OVERVIEW: This application, for the fourth phase of work to Smith Memorial Playground and Playhouse, proposes rehabilitation, restoration, and alterations to the terrace and lower levels of the property. While the masonry and window restoration work could be approved at the staff level, other aspects of the proposal exceed the staff's authority to review. The application proposes to alter window and door openings at the lower level to provide light and access to a new nature preschool space, and to extend the north terrace to create ADA accessibility. On the south elevation of the lower level, the application proposes to replace three central sets of sliding wood doors with full-lite steel doors and divided-lite windows, and to cut two new doors from windows at either end of the elevation. The existing sliding doors would be relocated to the interior of the Smithville Playroom (040) space. On the east elevation, the application proposes to modify the grade and construct a brick retaining wall to allow for the installation of two new restroom entrances, cut down from existing window openings. On the west elevation, the application proposes to cut one new entrance from an existing window, and to install mechanical equipment and louvers, which would be concealed behind a painted metal equipment enclosure. On the north elevation, the application proposes to extend the terrace approximately 17 feet beyond the existing walkway to allow re-grading along one side for ADA accessibility to the terrace. The existing granite step would be relocated to the end of the extended walkway. A new 12 inch metal safety railing in a matte dark bronze finish will be installed on top of reconstructed parapet walls around the terrace.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 618, 620, AND 622 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct three, three-story rowhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corp.

Applicant: Daniel Greenberg, North Broad Living Management Company

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the sizes of the windows at the first and third stories of the east elevation are modified to be longer and wider where possible; that the windows at the rear are adjusted to align with the tops of the sliding glass doors of the balconies; and that the flower boxes are removed, with the staff to review all details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three, three-story rowhouses on three lots within the Spring Garden Historic District. Historically, two of the lots were vacant, and the third was reclassified from a contributing structure to a non-contributing structure by the Historical Commission in May 2018. The non-contributing structure was subsequently demolished.

This application proposes to place the entrances to each of the three buildings on North Street and provide driveway access at the rears of the properties from North 16th Street. The fronts of the buildings would consist of a red brick veneer with a modest cast stone base, clad wood two-over-two windows, a two-story projecting wood bay, and roof decks. The rears of the properties would be 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: 404 S 6TH ST

Proposal: Construct fourth-story addition with roof deck; reconstruct side wall; modify window and door openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dania Hallak

Applicant: Tina Geary, inHabit

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the mansard-style roof of the addition is replaced with vertical walls; all windows in the historic structure are wood; mockups demonstrate that the deck will be inconspicuous and mechanical equipment invisible from the public right-of-way; and any stucco is real stucco, not dryvit or EFIS, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a fourth floor and deck to this three-story house. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application in March 2018 and voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting. The withdrawn application proposed a fourth-floor addition

covering the entire building as well as a roof deck at the fifth-floor level. The Committee rejected the proposal, asserting that the addition with deck added too much height to the building. The Committee suggested a partial fourth-floor addition with a smaller deck at the fourth-floor level. At the same time, one staff member suggested that a mansard-style addition might be appropriate.

The current application combines the Architectural Committee and staff advice and proposes a fourth-floor addition with a mansard roof set back 11 feet from the front façade with a roof deck at the fourth-floor level set back five feet from the two street facades. The mansard would cantilever out slightly at the rear to accommodate an elevator.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 152, 154, 156, 158, 160, 162 AND 164 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Renovate building; demolish non-contributing buildings; construct 19-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 160-164 N 2nd Street Associates L.P.

Applicant: Marc Kaplin

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a nineteen-story structure comprised of a six-story base with setback tower. The proposed site is located at the corner of 2nd and Race Streets, just south of the Ben Franklin Bridge, and consists of seven contiguous parcels containing one contributing building located at 152 N. 2nd Street, three non-contributing buildings, and three vacant lots. The new building will contain ground-level commercial space with a hotel and condominiums above. The contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street will be rehabilitated as the hotel lobby. In addition to general maintenance, work to the contributing building will include restoring the altered parapet, installing new windows to match existing, and replacing the non-historic storefront and awning with a recessed hotel entrance and projecting marquee. The design of the adjacent six-story base reflects the industrial character of Old City through the use of tapestry-patterned red brick and the size and rhythm of its fenestration. Garage access to below-grade parking will be incorporated at the ground story along Race Street. The proposed tower will extend to a height of 212 feet and will consist of an exposed structural concrete frame, articulated metal spandrels, and a series of floor-to-ceiling windows. The tower will contain a substantial setback along Race Street and a small setback along N. 2nd Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developers Marc Kaplin and Andrew Kaplin and architects Morris Adjmi and Nicholas Chelko represented the application.

Marc Kaplin recounted a failed attempt to reclassify 152 N. 2nd Street from contributing to non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. His new approach, he asserted, is to incorporate the

structure into his development plans. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Kaplin to confirm that he has requested a review in concept from the Commission. Mr. Kaplin confirmed that the application is in concept. He then began a presentation, stating that he would like to add to the history and narrative of Old City. He showed an aerial photograph of the neighborhood, which he described as showing a series of large buildings located within the district. He suggested that the historical context extends beyond its typical portrayal as a low, Colonial-era neighborhood. He showed an image of the circa 1940s waterfront and identified whole-block warehouse buildings along the river. He noted the Jayne Building, Philadelphia's first skyscraper, and Whitman Chocolate Factory, which extended 160 feet and once stood between 4th and 5th Streets and Race Street, among others in Old City and Society Hill. Mr. Kaplin then read a description of the Jayne Building: "The building's style accents its verticality, ending at the top with windows reminiscent of the Doge's Palace in Venice. The Jayne Building was wantonly demolished in 1956, another loss due to the city's obsession with the Colonial style during the 1950s." He mentioned the U.S. Custom House and the Lafayette Building, adding that there was no dearth of tall buildings in the Old City and Society Hill area. He then expressed his hope that the images of tall buildings will "level the playing field" through demonstrating the actual appearance of historic Old City.

Mr. Kaplin described Denise Scott Brown's epic eight-volume study of Old City published in 1979, which was funded by the City when the neighborhood was zoned industrial. He offered numerous quotes from the report, including:

Old City has been evolving for three centuries.... As each wave of new activities displaced some previous activities, the area was enriched and its character altered.... This continual flux has given Old City its particular flavor.

Mr. Kaplin showed a map created by the report authors and added that Denise Scott Brown and her colleagues sought to organize Old City into subsections, which the report indicates are all varied and should be treated differently. On the map, he pointed out 2nd and Race Streets, stating that it is the confluence of two subsections. He then showed the Bridge Overlay District more recently created to allow the development of The Bridge building that stands on the northwest corner of the intersection. He contended that Ms. Scott Brown treated Race Street as a corridor and read from her report:

The northern portion of this street, 140 to 160 N. 2nd and 153 to 167 N. 2nd) is characterized by small narrow structures (approximately 16' wide by 40' deep) which have not lent themselves to efficient reuse for wholesaling operations. These older structures (1789s-1850s) are poorly utilized and a few have been demolished for parking or open storage.

Mr. Kaplin discussed the history of the current proposal, including his agreement to purchase the group of properties from Frank Swift. He reiterated his past attempt to reclassify the property at 152 N. 2nd Street. After the reclassification was denied by the Historical Commission, Mr. Kaplin stated that he sought the right architect and offered several more quotes from Ms. Scott Brown's report to illustrate the importance of finding the right designer:

Our approach is: almost anything goes if it is good in itself and if it is sympathetic to the whole....One excellent way of achieving aesthetic excellence is to employ excellent designers."

He asked Mr. Adjmi and Mr. Chelko to introduce themselves and speak about their design.

Mr. Adjmi explained that his office is based in New York and that he has completed numerous projects in historic districts there. Half of his work, he continued, is adaptive reuse or additions to historic buildings. He showed several projects from his portfolio, adding that his approach has been influenced by context and history. For the current proposal, Mr. Adjmi described his approach to the design, stating that it is an amalgamation of a restoration at 152 N. 2nd Street and the creation of a base building and a setback tower. He presented his design and renderings showing different views of the proposed building. The height of the base, he continued, relates to the scale of the street and surrounding buildings. He contended that the setback tower relates to the Benjamin Franklin Bridge and the city beyond. Mr. Adjmi explained that the work to 152 N. 2nd Street would involve the restoration of the parapet, cleaning and repointing brick, replacing windows in kind, and restoring and repainting the storefront where an entrance for the hotel would be created through the installation of a marquee. He further noted that the design consists of abstract references stemming from design guidelines published by the Preservation Alliance. Those references, he continued, include ideas, materials, and scale found throughout the district, which have been abstractly alluded to in the base of the building. He added that he used the idea of “intentional opposition” for the tower, which is set back above the industrial base. He then showed examples of existing masonry buildings with punched windows located within the district. He described the fenestration pattern of the base building as well as the large metal factory-style windows. He added that the materials would further consist of red brick with matching mortar set in a tapestry pattern. Mr. Adjmi then showed floor plans of the proposed building and explained the division of space between commercial, hotel, and residential uses.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. Marc Kaplin stated that he understood the purpose of the review was to allow a discussion between the applicants and the Commission members. Mr. Thomas stated that the purpose is to have a general discussion and that the Commission members would like to hear from the public before making comments.

Old City resident Joe Schiavo stated that the supplemental material suggests that much more substantial buildings previously existed in Old City; he acknowledged that there were more substantial buildings in Old City. For the most part, he continued, those buildings referenced were 10 or 12 stories, and very few were located in the immediate area of the proposed building. Philadelphia changed, and the neighborhood showed a tendency to support less industry, he elaborated. Mr. Schiavo argued that those buildings that were part of Old City’s earlier history have prevailed, and they are generally four to six stories in height, though many have fewer stories. He then distributed a spreadsheet that itemizes all the properties with N. 2nd Street addresses located between Arch and Race Streets, and properties with Race Street addresses located between Front and 3rd Streets. These addresses, he continued, are the context, since this proposed building would be located at the intersection of 2nd and Race Streets. He stated that the project is being referred to as a corridor project, with the main corridor being Race Street. He clarified that he focused on the Race and 2nd Street addresses, though other smaller streets, such as Quarry Street, Bread Street, and Elfret’s Alley, provide context. He explained how he created the spreadsheet, noting that he included the number of floors for each address. The average number of floors for the addresses included in the spreadsheet comes to 4.6, he asserted. He opposed the argument that Old City has taller, more substantial buildings and can sustain a building of this scale. He contended that the type of building proposed could not be sustained within the context of Old City today. He observed that some of the structures referred to are structures that began with 10 to 12 stories. Mr. Schiavo distributed a photograph to the Commission members and described the 12-story building at

108 Arch Street, explaining that the building was constructed before the height overlay was enacted but that it greatly illustrates the need for the 65-foot height limit in that it dwarfs the adjacent historic structures. He argued that it is easy to belittle overlays of any type and suggest that they are small-minded. Overlays, he claimed, enable cities to make a “one-zoning-code-fits-all” method fit particular areas of the cities. He asserted that city’s enact dozens of overlays, because they work for particular neighborhoods. The overlay in Old City, he clarified, does not apply to the entirety of the district. The structures on Market Street and south of Market Street, he commented, are not included in the overlay district, nor are the areas east of I-95. The overlay, he continued, is specific to the area that needed the protections, and it endured the process of creating Philadelphia’s new zoning code that went into effect in 2012. He argued that the overlay is not antiquated but rather was fully vetted at the time the new zoning code was created in 2012. He remarked that he appreciates the references to the 1979 study, adding that certain predictions within the study came to fruition while others did not. He noted that Old City did not continue to sustain industrial uses, and those buildings have since been put to other use or were demolished. The district, he elaborated, retains buildings with some commercial, though those are not the type of commercial uses anticipated by the study. The study, he continued, did not anticipate the increase in residential units within the district and instead underestimated the number by approximately 50%. He acknowledged that the study is valuable but argued that it is not gospel and asked that the Commission look at the direction of Old City today and to consider what it can sustain and what it can endure. He contended that the district cannot endure structures of the proposed scale if it is to maintain its historic character. Mr. Schiavo stated the proposed building is out of scale for the district. He questioned why the developer would contend that the height limit stifles creativity, arguing that others have creatively worked within the limits. He noted that every year many projects within Philadelphia work within the boundaries of the code and do not require an exception. He called it problematic for an individual who views a project that does not exceed the code as a missed opportunity. That individual, he continued, will have issues utilizing the existing regulations and creating a good project. He concluded that the shortcoming of that individual should not compromise the history of the district.

Mr. Thomas asserted that the present meeting is a meeting of the Historical Commission. He stated that, although the Commission considers other factors, its purview is based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Commission, he continued, has not convened to discuss the zoning ordinance, but is considering whether the current application satisfies Standard 9. He asked the staff to read the standard.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the historic district was an important factor in determining the 65-foot height limit, and that the height limit and historic district are connected. Mr. Thomas agreed, but added that the Architectural Committee made its recommendation based on Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham recited Standard 9 from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. He added that the City’s historic preservation ordinance also lists review criteria that are to be applied when reviewing a project. Especially pertinent, he continued, is the criterion at Section 14-1005 (6)(e)(.4), which reads:

In making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed alterations, demolition, or construction, the Historical Commission shall consider the following: The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the

character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape.

Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Thomas that the Commission is not applying the zoning code to this proposal and noted that the 65-foot height limit is part of that zoning code. He noted that the height limit may reflect concerns about preserving historic character.

Mr. Thomas summarized that the Commission is not looking at a number, but is considering the pertinent factors, which, as Mr. McCoubrey noted, may have led to the specific height limit. He added that, if the Commission finds that a building meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the ordinance's requirements in terms of size, scale, appropriateness, and respect for other buildings, then it does not need to be bound to the zoning limit.

Mr. Schiavo apologized for his comments focused on zoning, adding that he typically acknowledges that the Historical Commission does not enforce Philadelphia's zoning code. As area residents follow the project through the process, he continued, they sometimes find that the processes are interwoven, although sometimes they proceed in silos. He reiterated that he does understand that the Historical Commission does not pay deference to the zoning code.

Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission can consider the height limit under the zoning code, particularly in a historic district and noted that the streetscape can be impacted.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that Save Our Sites strenuously opposed the reclassification of 152 N. 2nd Street at a previous Historical Commission meeting. Reclassification, he added, would have led to the building's demolition. He commended the applicants for retaining the building and incorporating it into the design of the new complex as an entryway to the hotel. He called it a fine model for future uses of historic buildings. He opined that he hopes the design will evolve in the spirit of creating compatibility and harmony with the historic district in terms of materials and scale.

Joseph DeVitis, president of the executive board of The National Old City, commented that the proposal is out of character with the existing streetscape. He called the 19-story tower the "elephant in the room." He stated that The National's two six-story buildings are the tallest in the immediate area, but they stand at only 82 to 85 feet. He claimed that Councilman Squilla created the ordinance to allow construction of The Bridge due to an economic hardship. Mr. DeVitis contended that the exception was never intended to be applied to other streets or buildings.

Old City resident Peter Gold read an op-ed he authored earlier in the year, in which he identifies rampant new construction as altering the identity of Old City, which he refers to as a gem to preserve. He commended the applicants for consulting with the Historical Commission, although he argued that the height of the proposed design is out of character.

Francis Purcell, an Elfreth's Alley resident, noted that several other projects have exceeded the 65-foot level. He recounted comments overheard from tourists, including those questioning how The National could be allowed to be constructed next to such a historic gem. He remarked that he would like to see a building at the proposed site, but a 19-story tower in this neighborhood would be visually overwhelming. Coming into the neighborhood, he continued, and seeing The Bridge building covering the Ben Franklin Bridge and seeing towers hiding church towers is too

much. He asked that the 65-foot height limit be imposed. At age 52, he continued, he is starting to not recognize his neighborhood.

Mr. Thomas reiterated that the Historical Commission takes the context into consideration, but will not impose a zoning restriction at this site. Deciding whether a zoning variance is appropriate at this site is the task of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, not the Historical Commission, which bases its reviews on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance appreciates the incorporation of 152 N. 2nd Street as an entrance to the hotel, the contextual design of the base building which is appropriate for the industrial context of Old City, and that a progressive architect versed in historic architecture was selected to design the building. After a careful internal review, he continued, the Alliance found the height of the residential tower to be inappropriate for the Old City Historic District. The appropriate context, he continued, is the group of buildings to the south, as well as those immediately to the east and west, but not the building to the north. He noted that the building to the north, The Bridge, was allowed to be constructed through the adoption of an overlay and that the property consisted of an undeveloped, non-contributing parcel within the district. He clarified that the Historical Commission did not have full jurisdiction over the building that was constructed and explained that the Commission does have full jurisdiction over the current proposal and can guide the design in a way that would be more appropriate.

Mr. Thomas elaborated that the Historical Commission only exercises review and comment jurisdiction over properties that were undeveloped at the time of a historic district's creation, meaning that they were vacant without historic resources. In those cases, he continued, the Commission comments on the application, and the applicant can choose to, but is not required to, incorporate the Commission's comments. In this case, he added, the Historical Commission maintains full jurisdiction.

Mr. Grossi stated that he believes an exciting project that can satisfy all parties can occur at this site, but he reiterated that the dramatic height of the building as currently proposed is out of context.

Janet Kalter commented on the inappropriateness of the building in the neighborhood, adding that it is both out of context and out of scale.

Neil Frauenglass of the Elfreth's Alley Association identified the height of the tower as the primary issue, adding that it is out of context. He then stated that the project is incredibly exciting for Old City and that development is needed at that corner, but he opined that the right type of development would be required. He remarked that the project architects have the right level of creativity to make this project work. The previous designs they showed in historic districts, he continued, featured buildings that did not exceed the height of the adjacent buildings. The building in SoHo, he added, was slightly lower. In looking at the design for 2nd and Race Streets, he argued, there are no references by the architects to show that they completed a building of this scale that another city has approved. Mr. Frauenglass stated that the tower is double the height of the building's base.

Albert D. Malmfelt, an Elfreth's Alley resident, stated that, as a 34-year Old City resident, he has seen the neighborhood develop considerably. He noted that during his time as a resident, he has seen the art scene burgeon, a number of hair salons open, the Arden Theatre open, and

the neighborhood become generally very active. All the galleries, salons, restaurants, and theater are at ground level, he argued. The proposal, he contended, is out of character in size, scale, and spatial relationship to the current cityscape. He called it incompatible with the environment that has developed in Old City. Residents, he added, would argue strenuously against an exception being made for the proposed building. An exception, he continued, was made for The Bridge with differing opinions about whether that was acceptable. He argued that, if another exception is made, this type of construction will no longer be singular, and more requests will soon be made for a third building and a fourth building of this scale until the conversation is no longer about exceptions. Allowing such a building, he asserted, will change the fundamental character of the neighborhood.

Richard Thom, a local preservation architect, stated that he has a long history in Old City, including helping to write several overlays for the Old City District. The last, he noted, was in 2002 and led to the 65-foot height limit. He stated that he and others suggested to then-Councilman Frank DiCicco that the neighborhood needed some level of control over the type of development that would be suitable for the historic district. He contended that it had to be compatible with the neighborhood, perhaps not architecturally, but through scale and amenities and not have a negative impact on the historic district. He corrected Mr. McCoubrey's earlier statement by explaining that, at the time the overlay was enacted, the neighborhood was a National Register District. Mr. Thom added that he knows Denise Scott Brown very well and that, when she wrote the report, Mr. Thom did not anticipate how much change would result in the neighborhood from historic tax credits. He explained that it turned the commercial and industrial buildings into predominantly residential buildings, which had an enormous impact on converting the neighborhood to smaller-scale residential buildings. He claimed that in 2002, the Councilman embraced the idea of the height limit. The push to create residential units, he argued, was not intended to also be a push to have large-scale projects enter the neighborhood. Those types of projects, he added, have a negative impact on the area. He claimed that, when the height limit was negotiated with City Council, the Councilman asked for some compromise, and the residents responded by agreeing to consider projects between 65 and 100 feet. He observed that the overwhelming number of buildings in the district, including new construction, remain within that range. At the time the height limit was enacted, he continued, a list of buildings and their heights was developed and only a very small percentage exceeded the limit. Designation to the Philadelphia Register occurred one year later, he stated, and Old City Civic Association looked to the Historical Commission to maintain the character of the district. He contended that the civic association had done its part to limit the scale of buildings but that it looked to the Commission to help guide redevelopment through design standards and design guidance. He asked that the Commission continue that guidance again today.

Marc Kaplin stated that he has a significant amount of material with him, including the City Council's Rules Committee discussion when Mr. Thom presented the 65-foot overlay. He disagreed in part with Mr. Thom's characterization of that discussion between Mr. DiCicco and Mr. Thom about considering buildings between 65 and 100 feet in height, stating that that discussion cannot be found in the recorded material. He further disagreed with Mr. McCoubrey's characterization that the 65-foot height limit was enacted owing to the historic context. He claimed that an *Inquirer* article written at the time states that Mr. Thom chased Mr. DiCicco around for four months before he could get the Councilman to review the proposal. He then stated that the overlay was a continuation of the bill Mr. Thom and Mr. Schiavo had earlier had enacted to eliminate restaurants and other entertainment. He contended that the overlay had nothing to do with history. Mr. Kaplin's interpretation was that residents did not want Old City to change. He then argued that Philadelphia is improving, adding that what contributes most to

that improvement is the tall buildings. He offered numerous examples of recent construction throughout the city and asserted that those buildings make history. History, he continued, is supposed to live with the future and not be inhibited by a 65-foot height limit. He argued that the limit stopped good architecture.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Kaplin to conclude his statements rather than correct what Mr. Thom stated or opine on the catalyst for the 65-foot height limit. He added that the Commission considers height in the district, but that he wants to get to the issue of context.

Mr. Kaplin asked Mr. Adjmi to explain the project's various massing studies. Mr. Adjmi stated that he completed numerous projects and that the historic preservation review process often improves the design. He asked for feedback from the Commission, so he and his team can incorporate those comments in their path forward. He stated that he did not believe building height could be limited by what is built around it, elaborating that that was never the case in historic districts as they were developing. He commented that the examples of his work showcase only a few projects but that many of his other projects exceeded the height of adjacent buildings.

Mr. McCoubrey reported on the Architectural Committee's discussion of the proposal. He agreed with Mr. Thomas's comment that the 65-foot limit is not a set rule for the Commission and that the Committee evaluates the character and quality of the district as a whole, not just those buildings immediately adjacent to the proposed site. He added that the Committee found that, in this particular instance, there may be opportunities to explore an exception to the 65-foot limit. However, he continued, the Committee uniformly found this structure would negatively impact the district owing to its height and, ultimately, its visibility. He argued that there would be visibility across Race Street, where at least nine stories would be visible regardless of the setback. From Quarry Street, he continued, the entire tower would be visible for half the block. He stated that the Committee asked the applicant to explore ways to obtain the density without as much visible height and mass.

Mr. Thomas compared the incorporation of 152 N. 2nd Street as the hotel entrance to a similar concept implemented at 10 Rittenhouse, opining that the historic structure gave that building quite a bit of character. The base, he continued, is very much in the context of Old City in its height, materials, and is an attractive building on its own. He stated that in his opinion, the goal would be to achieve density without as much height, noting that the height of the tower presents a difficult problem. He referred to the Society Hill Historic District and noted that, during the neighborhood's revitalization, the Society Hill Towers were constructed, which are of a much larger scale than the historic buildings of the district. He then suggested that the tower be shortened, noting that the base and entrance work well. He concluded that the issue is one of the overall height and how to allow the building to fit into the context of the Old City Historic District.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Society Hill Towers are set off from their immediate surroundings and are not directly juxtaposed to the smaller-scale buildings, which allows them to read as monumental, sculptural objects within a void. She elaborated that they remain separate from even the new, smaller-scale construction of the 1950s and 1960s, as well as the adaptively reused buildings. She explained that there is a difference in how one experiences the mass and viewshed of those buildings as compared to the proposed building at 2nd and Race Streets. She expressed her appreciation for Mr. Kaplin's presentation of historic buildings, but clarified that the mid- to late-nineteenth-century commercial buildings, including the Jayne

Building and part of the commercial corridor that still exists on Chestnut Street, are situated in a different context. She contended that the applicants established a legitimate case for there being individually large buildings within the area. The question, she contended, is to determine the overall proportional relationship to the building's immediate context and how it reads in the context of the historic fabric rather than the new construction immediately to the north.

Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants received feedback through the discussion and asked whether the Commission must take action. Mr. Farnham explained that there is nothing before the Commission to approve or deny, but that it may formally adopt its comments if it chooses. Mr. Thomas encouraged the applicants to consider the comments and to return to the Commission at a future meeting. Mr. Kaplin responded that he and his team heard the remarks of the Commission and public and will develop a path forward. He asked that the Commission understand his attitude and his proposal to create an architecturally exceptional building that is also contextual. He argued that creating a hotel is extremely difficult economically and contextually without an external economic driver.

Mr. Thomas explained that each local historic district is very different. He offered the example of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District in Center City. There, he observed, new development continues. He encouraged the applicants to consider how developers in that district have maintained the scale of the historic fabric. He noted that the district is comprised largely of three- and four-story buildings, although towers were constructed in the 1920s, which has left a mixed scale. He suggested that the applicants look at examples to determine how to develop the density needed while respecting the context.

Mr. Traub began to conduct a loud, private conversation in the audience. Despite several warnings from the chair, Mr. Traub continued to disrupt the meeting. Mr. Mattioni arose from his seat and advised Mr. Traub to stop disrupting the meeting. Mr. Traub eventually left the meeting room, allowing the Commission to continue with its business.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

CROWN CAN CO., 956 E. ERIE AVENUE

Nominator: Powers & Co., Inc.

Owner: 956 Erie Partners, LLC

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 956 E. Erie Avenue, known as the Crown Can Company Building. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the nomination, the Crown Can Company is a former can manufacturing facility located along E. Erie Avenue in the Juanita Park neighborhood in North Philadelphia. The site occupies approximately 18 acres and contains four contributing resources, including three brick buildings and one structure. The nomination states that the building is significant under Criterion A in the area of Industry as one of the largest beer can factories in the United States from 1936 through the 1950s. The company's in-house research and development team developed both the seamless beer can and the first commercial aerosol can in the United States. The Crown Can Company is also significant under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a major industrial work in the Moderne Style by architect Lucius Read White. The period of significance begins in 1936, with the construction of the majority of the complex, and ends in 1957 when operations were relocated to a new facility in Northeast Philadelphia and production at the E. Erie Avenue plant was phased out.

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

The Commission members agreed that the building satisfies Criterion A in the area of Industry as one of the largest beer can factories in the United States from 1936 through the 1950s and is also significant under Criteria C in the area of Architecture as a major industrial work in the Moderne Style by architect Lucius Read White.

Ms. Cooperman commented that this group of buildings has been overlooked in the past and she is pleased that 956 E. Erie Avenue is now being recognized with a listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Commission supported the National Register nomination for 956 E. Erie Avenue.

WILLIAM BROWN CO. HOSIERY MILL, 3400-3412 J STREET

Nominator: Heritage Consulting Group

Owner: Gary Diamond

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 3400-3412 J Street, known as the William Brown Hosiery Company. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the nomination, the William Brown Hosiery Company is located at the north section of the Kensington neighborhood, approximately 6 miles from Center City Philadelphia. The former hosiery mill complex contains two buildings. Building 1, constructed in 1903 (with a 1923 addition), is a timber frame three-story brick clad building that includes a one-story boiler room and two brick smokestacks. Building 2 was constructed in 1936 and is a reinforced concrete

three-story building in painted brick. The nomination states that the building is significant under Criterion A in the area of Industry as an important example of a hosiery mill that operated from 1909, when the William Brown Hosiery Company occupied the building, to 1935 when the company vacated the site. As an important contributor to the textile industry in the Kensington neighborhood of Philadelphia, the company was innovative as one of the first full-size manufacturing mills to produce full-fashioned hosiery and for its early involvement in organized labor unions that helped define and stabilize the hosiery industry in Philadelphia.

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

The Commission agreed that the building satisfies Criterion A in the area of Industry as an important example of a hosiery mill that contributed to the textile industry in the Kensington neighborhood of Philadelphia, was innovative as one of the first full-size manufacturing mills to produce full-fashioned hosiery, and for its early involvement in organized labor unions that helped define and stabilize the hosiery industry in Philadelphia.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the architectural description of Building 1 as a “heavy timber-framed building clad in brick” should technically be described as a “masonry bearing wall building with a heavy timber frame.”

The Commission supported the National Register nomination for 3400-3412 J Street.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF, JULY 2018

Mr. Farnham summarized the Historical Commission’s activities for the first half of 2018.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:52 a.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.