

**THE MINUTES OF THE 679TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 MARCH 2019
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:55

Mr. Thomas, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	x		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	x		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	x*		Arrived at 9:20 am
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	x		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)		x	
Melissa Long (Division of Housing & Community Development)	x		
John Mattioni, Esq.	x		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	x		
Meredith Trego (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	x		
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)	x		
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair	x		
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	x		

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan E. Farnham, Ph.D., Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons were present:

- John Turchi, Turchi, Inc.
- David Ertz, Cope Linder-Nelson
- Alfred Fuscaldo, Esq., Fuscaldo Law Group LLC
- Philip S. Rosenzweig, Esq., Silverang Rosenzweig Haltzman LLC
- Arthur Hagstoz, 709 Sansom Street
- Ross E. Hagstoz, 709 Sansom Street
- Yuhau Wu
- Carl Gansky, 718 Sansom Street
- John Manton
- Bob Quinn, Diplomat Demolition

Steve Masters, Esq., Just Law
Steve Bonitatibus, Bonitatibus Architects
Jeffrey T. Barsky, Barsky Diamonds, 724 Sansom Street
Kimberly Valentine
R. Pupo, 717 Sansom Street
Jonathan Gaby
Emil Gaby
Paramjit Singh, PBR Group, 809 Sansom Street
Michael Tang, 711 Sansom Street
Craig Schelter, Schelter & Associates
Frank Salese, 733 Sansom Street
George N. Bottos, 721 Sansom Street
Howard Katz, 723 Sansom Street
Nick Backos, 719 Sansom Street
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
Sharon Baxter, 138 S. 8th Street
Khyle Baxter, 138 S. 8th Street
Matthew N. McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Adam Lampl, Toll Brothers
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Lauletta Birnbaum LLC
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Bill O'Brien, Esq., Manayunk Law
Brandi Levine, St. David's
Father Frank Wallner, St. David's
Steven Peitzman
Yolanda Rodriguez, Toll Brothers
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joseph J. Menkevich
John Buffington, Historical Society of Frankford
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
J.M. Duffin
Melissa Weber, St. David's
Tamra Dann, SEPTA
Anthony M. Santaniello, City of Philadelphia Streets Department
Oscar Beisert
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Brett Peanasky, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
Sean McCauley, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 678TH STATED MEETING, 8 FEBRUARY 2019

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:01:07

Mr. Thomas asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting, the 678th Stated Meeting, held 8 February 2019. Ms. Trego commented that David Schaaf's name had been listed as the representative of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission in attendance at the preceding meeting instead of her, and she requested that the minutes be corrected.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the corrected minutes of the 678th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 February 2019. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 678th Stated Meeting					
MOTION: Approval with corrections					
MOVED BY: Turner					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards					x
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10				2

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 106-08 AND 110 GRAPE ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Daniel R. Neducsin

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1835 and 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk, no classifications, 12/14/1983

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage at 106-08 Grape Street and a three-story residential building at 110 Grape Street. The application includes architectural plans for a new building to be constructed on the cleared site, but they appear to be included for information only and not for review for approval. The building permit application included with the application describes the work as demolition only and does not mention any new construction.

The application is titled "Application to demolish a contributing structure within the Main Street Manayunk Historic District due to financial hardship by the Manayunk Development Corporation ("MDC"), a non-profit charitable organization." The application includes a cover letter that asserts that 106-08 Grape Street is classified as non-contributing in the historic district and 110 Grape Street is classified as contributing. The cover letter references a report from a historic preservation consultant that concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street lacks historical significance and integrity. The cover letter references an engineer's report that concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street is severely deteriorated and suffers from structural defects. The cover letter explains that the MDC, a 501(c)(3) charitable entity, seeks to develop the site as office, meeting, and retail space. The cover letter concludes that "Considering the building's weak contributing stature, its severe deterioration and the community benefit of the proposed redevelopment, the Commission is urged to allow demolition of 110 Grape Street."

In addition to the cover letter, building permit application, preservation consultant's report, and engineer's report, the application includes plans for the new building, the bylaws of the MDC, and an affidavit from the current owner, Daniel R. Neducsin. The index states that the application also includes a zoning permit for the new development, but it instead includes a second copy of the bylaws of the MDC at the tab reserved for the zoning permit.

Owing to fact that the application is presented as a financial hardship application, the staff of the Historical Commission has reviewed it to determine whether it includes the requisite information for a hardship application as enumerated in Section 9.2.a.1-6 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations. 9.2.a. In addition to the standard submission documents required by Section 6.7 of the Rules & Regulations, an applicant claiming financial hardship shall submit, by affidavit, the following information for the entire property:

1. amount paid for the property, date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, whether business or familial, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current owner, Daniel R. Neducsin, purchased the property from Clifford LeBlang for \$65,000 on 25 April 1991. The seller and buyer had no business or familial relationship.
2. assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according to the most recent

- assessment;
- a. The affidavit states that the current assessed value is \$207,900.
 3. financial information for the previous two (2) years which shall include, at a minimum, annual gross income from the property, itemized operating and maintenance expenses, real estate taxes, annual debt service, annual cash flow, the amount of depreciation taken for federal income tax purposes, and other federal income tax deductions produced;
 - a. The affidavit states that the property has been vacant and unoccupied since its purchase in 1991. The property has produced no income. The property has been depreciated for federal income tax purposes, but the affidavit does not provide the amount of the depreciation. The real estate taxes for 2018 were \$2,564.43 and for 2019 are \$2,910.18.
 4. all appraisals obtained by the owner in connection with the purchase or financing of the property, or during the ownership of the property;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current owner has never obtained an appraisal for the property.
 5. all listings of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any; and,
 - a. The affidavit provides a summary of the marketing of the property and offers received.
 6. any consideration by the owner as to profitable uses and adaptive uses for the property.
 - a. The affidavit provides no information about any consideration by the owner as to profitable uses and adaptive uses for the property.

The application includes an affidavit providing the information required in Section 9.2.a. and the staff has concluded that the application provides sufficient information to begin the review process. However, while the staff has determined that the application meets the minimum requirements for review, it notes that the application is deficient in several ways and suggests that it may need to be supplemented and/or amended.

Section 9.2.b of the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to “require the [property] owner to conduct, at the owner’s expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.” Typically, financial hardship applications provide detailed analyses of potential reuses of the subject buildings that include architectural plans for several potential reuses, construction costs analyses to implement those plans, and 10-year pro forma financial analyses to demonstrate whether those plans will produce a reasonable rate of return and are therefore financially feasible. Section 9.2.b.1-5 of the Rules & Regulations details the minimum additional evaluations and studies the Historical Commission may request. In a case like this one, the Historical Commission would typically expect detailed analyses of potential reuses such as residential, retail, and office.

The application makes some assumptions about the Main Street Manayunk Historic District and classifications of properties in it that are incorrect and may have significant bearing on this case. The Main Street Manayunk Historic District was created by City Council, not the Historical Commission, in 1983, before the Historical Commission had the legal authority to create historic districts. The Main Street Manayunk Historic District is therefore subject to the regulatory framework laid out in Chapter 8 of the City’s Property Maintenance Code, not Section 14-1000, the City’s historic preservation ordinance. Section 18 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations does authorize the Historical Commission to apply the Rules & Regulations to

reviews for Main Street Manayunk properties where the Rules & Regulations do not conflict with the Property Maintenance Code, and the Rules & Regulations do reflect the provisions of the preservation ordinance including the hardship provision, but the Property Maintenance Code, not the preservation ordinance, provides the primary regulatory rubric. The distinction is worth noting and may have implications for the review. For example, the provisions in the Property Maintenance Code do not address demolition or financial hardship, leaving the Historical Commission to devise an appropriate hardship process for Manayunk, which may or may not follow the hardship process in the preservation ordinance. Also, the Historical Commission did not officially adopt the inventory from the National Register nomination for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District; the classifications in that inventory cannot be applied as though they are classifications in an inventory adopted by the Historical Commission. Therefore, the arguments in the application regarding the contributing or non-contributing classification of the property may not have much validity because they are predicated on the National Register inventory, which may be informative, but is not definitive. The Historical Commission must determine whether either of the properties “contributes” to the historic district.

The inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District classifies properties as follows:

- A. Significant Building/Structure
- B. Contributing Building/Structure
- C. Linking Building/Structure – Appropriate scale and materials although later or altered
- D. Intrusion

The inventory also states that “All categories except for ‘D’ are considered ‘contributing’ and eligible for tax credits.” The property at 106-08 Grape Street is classified as a “D” or Intrusion. The property at 110 Grape Street is classified as a “B” or Contributing building.

The application contends that the Manayunk Development Corporation, a non-profit charitable organization, is suffering a financial hardship, owing to the circumstances of the properties on Grape Street. However, as is acknowledged in the application, the Manayunk Development Corporation does not own the property outright; it has a lease-to-buy agreement with Neducusin Properties.

This is not the first application to the Historical Commission proposing to demolish the buildings at 106-08 and 110 Grape Street. In February 2008, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application proposing to demolish the buildings at 106-08 and 110 Grape Street and construct a four-story building. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission reviewed it.

In April 2008, the Historical reviewed an in-concept application proposing to demolish the buildings at 106-08 and 110 Grape Street and construct a four-story building. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the building at 106-08 Grape Street in concept, but denied the demolition of the building at 110 Grape Street and the construction of the four-story building.

In July 2008, the Historical Commission denied an application for final approval proposing to demolish the buildings and construct a four-story building in their place.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish buildings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code provides the following standards for the review of building permit applications for properties in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District.

PM-804.2 Historic area standards: Standards within the designated historic area shall be as set forth in Sections PM-804.2.1 through PM-804.2.7 in addition to the requirements of Sections PM-804.1 through PM-804.1.4.2.

PM-804.2.1 Permit: No building or portion of the exterior thereof within the historic district shall hereafter be constructed, altered, repaired, demolished, or partially demolished unless a permit has first been obtained from the code official.

PM-804.2.2 Approval: All applications for such permits shall be forwarded by the code official to the Historical Commission for review and approval, before issuance of the permit. No permit shall be issued unless the proposed work has been approved by the Historical Commission staff as preserving the historical character of the district.

PM-804.2.3 Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed. Deteriorated features shall be repaired where possible. Replacement material where necessary shall duplicate the original as closely as possible.

PM-804.2.4 Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.

PM-804.2.5 Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.

PM-804.2.6 Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.

PM-804.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to apply the provisions of the Rules & Regulations to Main Street Manayunk properties.

For properties located in the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District, placed under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission by Chapter 7 [now 8] of the Philadelphia Property Maintenance Code, and not designated as historic pursuant Section 14-2007 [now 14-1000] of the Philadelphia Code, the Commission, its committees, and staff shall apply these Rules & Regulations except where they conflict with Chapter 7 [now 8] of the Philadelphia Property Maintenance Code.

Section 9.4 of the Rules & Regulations provides the standards for reviewing financial hardship applications proposing demolition.

To substantiate a claim of financial hardship to justify a demolition, the applicant must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed. The applicant has an affirmative obligation in good faith to attempt the sale of the property, to seek tenants for it, and to explore potential reuses for it.

Section 10 of the Rules & Regulations provides guidance for reviewing applications claiming financial hardship submitted by non-profit organizations. It states that the Historical Commission:

recognizes that the provisions of [the preservation ordinance] and other sections of these Rules & Regulations may not all have applicability to a property owned and used by a non-profit organization. No single set of measures can encompass the highly variegated types and contexts of buildings held by non-profit organizations. The economics of a building in the middle of a college campus may differ from that of a church, hospital, museum, or child care center.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission:

- acknowledge that Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code does not provide a mechanism for reviewing this application proposing demolition;
- invoke Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations and apply the “financial hardship” provisions of the Rules & Regulations to this application even though it was designated under Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code;
- concur with the classifications provided by the inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District that the property at 106-08 Grape Street is Non-contributing and the property at 110 Grape Street is Contributing, even though that inventory was not adopted by the Historical Commission and is not binding on the Historical Commission;
- decline to take the poor condition of the building at 110 Grape Street into account when determining whether the building can or cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted because the current owner has owned the property since 1991 and has had a responsibility over the past 28 years under the Property Maintenance Code as well as Section 13.2 of the Rules & Regulations to keep the building in good repair;
- apply Section 9.2.b of the Rules & Regulations and “require the [property] owner to conduct, at the owner’s expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.” The Historical Commission should require the property owner to provide detailed analyses of potential reuses of the 110 Grape Street property for fee-simple single-family residential, rental residential, retail, and office that include architectural plans for the suggested potential reuses, construction costs analyses to implement those plans, and 10-year pro forma financial analyses to demonstrate whether those plans will produce a reasonable rate of return and are therefore financially feasible.
- denial, pursuant Section 9 of the Rules & Regulations, unless and until the property owner and/or equitable owner demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission:

- apply Section 9.2.b of the Rules & Regulations and “require the [property] owner to conduct, at the owner’s expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Historical Commission, to determine whether the building ... has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.” The Historical Commission should require the property owner to provide detailed analyses of potential reuses of the 110 Grape Street property for fee-simple single-family residential, rental residential, retail, and office that include architectural plans for the suggested potential reuses, construction costs analyses to implement those plans, and 10-year pro forma financial

analyses to demonstrate whether those plans will produce a reasonable rate of return and are therefore financially feasible; and,

- deny the application, pursuant Section 9 of the Rules & Regulations, unless and until the property owner and/or equitable owner demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:22

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Mattioni recused owing to his involvement with a non-profit associated with the applicant.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the application had been scheduled for review by the Committee on Financial Hardship, but the Committee’s meeting was cancelled to allow the applicant sufficient time to supplement the application. He suggested that the Historical Commission table the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow for the supplement.
- Attorney William O’Brien stated that he represents the Manayunk Development, which has a lease-to-buy agreement for the property. He explained that his client intends to supplement the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 106-08 and 110 GRAPE ST					
MOTION: Table application for a period not to exceed six months					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards					x
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni				x	
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	9			1	2

ADDRESS: JEWELERS' ROW HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Jewelers' Row Historic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The proposed district is located on Sansom Street primarily between S. 7th and S. 8th Street, and along a portion of S. 8th Street between Chestnut and Walnut Streets. The nomination contends that the proposed district, which is composed of 57 buildings constructed between 1800 and 2015, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H and J.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination states that as the site of Carstairs Row, Printers' Row, and Jewelers' Row, the district has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of Philadelphia and exemplifies the community's cultural, economic, and historical heritage. In support of Criteria C and D, the nomination asserts that the architectural resources of Jewelers' Row span more than two hundred years and include significant examples of multiple building types and architectural styles important to Philadelphia's history, including (but not limited to) Federal rowhouses, Victorian and early 20th-century commercial lofts, and Depression-era and postwar commercial fronts. The district includes surviving works by a number of architects whose careers have significantly influenced the architectural development of the City, including Thomas Carstairs, Collins & Autenrieth, Theophilus P. Chandler, Frank T. Watson, Louis Magaziner, and possibly even Frank Furness, supporting an argument for Criterion E. Furthermore, under Criteria H and G, the nomination contends that owing to its unique location along a block of Sansom Street offset from Center City's otherwise regular grid and distinguished by an iconic and distinctive streetscape, the district represents an established and familiar visual feature of Philadelphia and constitutes a distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural and architectural motif.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Jewelers' Row Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H and J. The staff proposes updating 113-15 S. 8th Street as a non-contributing addition to 731 Sansom Street. The staff also proposes that all buildings be categorized as Significant, Contributing or Non-Contributing without separate determinations for façades and storefronts.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of the Jewelers' Row Historic District to the April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and the June 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission, not the June and August 2019 meetings as requested by the property owners' attorney.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:03:33

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Long recused because her husband works at Ballard Spahr, a law firm representing one of the property owners.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, represented the nomination. Mr. Steinke stated that they do not object to a continuance but would prefer that it be a shorter one rather than a continuance for an extended length of time.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented 28 of the property owners, who own 35 out of 57 properties in the nomination, and requested the continuance on their behalf.
- Attorney Matt McClure represented the owner of 712-14 Sansom Street and stated his client is in support of the continuance request proffered by Mr. Phillips.
- Attorney Brett Peanasky represented Toll Brothers, which, through subsidiaries, is the equitable owner of 702-10 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street. Mr. Peanasky stated that his firm submitted a letter to the Historical Commission stating that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the properties because they have valid demolition permits that have been upheld by the Commonwealth Court. He noted they are in favor of a continuance.

REASON FOR REQUEST: Mr. Phillips stated that they have retained a consultant, architectural historian Dr. George Thomas, who is preparing a responsive report to the nomination. He stated they are requesting a continuance until August 2019, owing to their desire for a comprehensive assessment of the nomination and proposed Criteria for Designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Barry Sable, owner 735 Sansom Street, spoke in favor of the continuance.
- Ross E. Hagstoz, owner 709 Sansom Street, spoke in favor of the continuance.
- Jeffrey Barsky, owner 724 Sansom Street, spoke about the current state of the Jewelers’ Row community and his opposition to the nomination.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to grant a continuance until the August 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission for a status update on the consultant’s report and potential scheduling of the review by the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Jewelers’ Row Historic District					
MOTION: Grant continuance until August 2019					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: Hartner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)				x	
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10			1	1

ADDRESS: 204 S 12TH ST

Name of Resource: Minton Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: South 12th Street Owner LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street that corresponds to Parcel Number 002S15-0050. The overall property at 204 S. 12th Street is comprised of several smaller parcels that have been consolidated into one property with one tax account. Several buildings that have been interconnected internally stand on the property. The building in question was constructed in the early nineteenth century and subsequently modified several times. Only the front façade of the building facing S. 12th Street is visible to the public. The side and rear facades are party walls abutting adjacent buildings.

The nomination contends that the building is significant for its association with Henry Minton, a prominent African-American caterer, and his family. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Minton owned the property from 1853 to his death in 1883. He resided at the property and operated a restaurant and catering business out of it. His family continued to own it until 1893. The nomination defines the period of significance from 1853 to 1893. The nomination provides a lengthy biography of Minton and his offspring.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff acknowledges that Henry Minton is an important figure in Philadelphia's history and certainly worthy of commemoration but recommends that the portion of the property in question at 204 S. 12th Street does not satisfy Criteria for Designation A and J, owing to the altered state of the building. The only publicly accessible façade of the building lacks integrity; it was constructed after Henry Minton's death and after the Minton family's ownership of the property. The publicly accessible portion of the property has no association with the Mintons. Criterion A authorizes the Historical Commission to designate a property if it "is associated with the life of a person significant in the past." Owing to the new façade, this property is not associated with the Mintons. Criterion J authorizes the Historical Commission to designate a property if it "exemplifies the ... heritage of the community." Owing to the new façade, the only publicly accessible façade of the building, this property cannot exemplify the heritage of the community as that heritage and community are defined in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 204 S 12th Street, known as the Minton Residence, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:38:00

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Long recused owing to her husband's employment with the law firm representing the property owner.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

REASON FOR REQUEST: The attorney recently retained to represent the property owner is seeking additional time to allow for review of the nomination and preparation of materials for submission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue consideration for designation to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 204 S 12th Street, Minton Residence					
MOTION: Continue consideration for designation to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)				x	
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10			1	1

ADDRESS: 204 S 12TH ST

Name of Resource: Camac Baths

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: South 12th Street Owner LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street that appears to correspond to Parcel Numbers 002S15-0035, 0247, and 0248. The boundaries of the proposed designation depicted on Page 2 and Page 15 of the nomination are not consistent, but it appears that the nomination seeks to designate what now might be described as three structures, one at the southeast corner of Chancellor and Camac Streets, one to the east on Chancellor, and one to the south on Camac. The nomination refers to the building at the corner as the 1907 Building; the building to the east as 1204-06 Chancellor Street and Building 2; and the building to the south as 201-03 S. Camac Street. The tax parcel at 204 S. 12th Street, which includes most of the block bounded by S. 12th, St. James, Camac, and Chancellor Streets, is comprised of several smaller parcels that have been consolidated into one property with buildings that have been interconnected internally.

The nomination contends that the buildings are significant for their associations with the Camac Baths, a bathhouse that first catered to a Jewish clientele and then to a gay and bisexual clientele. The nomination also contends that the older structures at 1204-06 Chancellor Street and 201-03 S. Camac Street housed various clubs at times, and therefore participate in the

history of the area as a neighborhood of clubhouses. The nomination contends that the grouping of three structures satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that that the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street proposed for designation does not retain sufficient integrity and therefore does not satisfy Criteria for Designation A, G, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building known as the 1907 building in the nomination, which is part of the larger property at 204 S. 12th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J, but that the buildings known as 1204-06 Chancellor Street or Building 2, and 201-03 S. Camac Street in the nomination do not retain sufficient integrity to satisfy the Criteria.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:38:00

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Long recused owing to her husband's employment with the law firm representing the property owner.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

REASON FOR REQUEST: The attorney recently retained to represent the property owner is seeking additional time to allow for review of the nomination and preparation of materials for submission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue consideration for designation to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 204 S 12th Street, Camac Baths					
MOTION: Continue consideration for designation to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)				x	
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10			1	1

ADDRESS: 200 S 12TH ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 200 South 12th Street Owner LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 200 S. 12th Street, a four-story commercial and residential building at the southwest corner of 12th and Chancellor Streets. The building was constructed in the late 1890s.

The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion for Designation C: it reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style; and Criterion D: it embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen. The nomination asserts that the building is “a distinctive example of the Commercial Style,” is “a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival style, and “emulat[es] the external characteristics of the Chicago School.” The staff contends that the building does not characterize any “distinctive architectural style” or embody “distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 200 S. 12th Street characterizes a “distinctive architectural style” or embodies “distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style” and therefore fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 200 S. 12th Street characterizes a “distinctive architectural style” or embodies “distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style” and therefore fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:38:00

RECUSALS:

- Ms. Long recused owing to her husband’s employment with the law firm representing the property owner.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.

REASON FOR REQUEST: The attorney recently retained to represent the property owner is seeking additional time to allow for review of the nomination and preparation of materials for submission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue consideration for designation to the April meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 200 S 12th Street					
MOTION: Continue consideration for designation to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)				x	
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10			1	1

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 FEBRUARY 2019

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

**147-53 BERKLEY ST
6341 RIDGE AVE**

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:39:18

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 147-53 Berkley Street and 6341 Ridge Avenue. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA, 147-53 Berkley Street, 6341 Ridge Avenue				
MOTION: Adoption of the recommendations of the Architectural Committee				
MOVED BY: McCoubrey				
SECONDED BY: Mattioni				
VOTE				
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain/Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x			
Cooperman	x			
Edwards	x			
Hartner (DPP)	x			
Lippert (L&I)				x
Long (DHCD)	x			
Mattioni	x			
McCoubrey	x			
Trego (PCPC)	x			
Stanford (Commerce)	x			
Turner, Vice Chair	x			
Washington	x			
Total	11			1

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 147-53 BERKLEY ST

Proposal: Remove one-story rear section; brace front façade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: The Original Church of God in Christ Inc.
Applicant: Joshua Strickler, Diplomat Demolition
History: 1910; Arguto Oilless Bearing Company; Mellor & Meigs, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Wayne Junction Historic District, Contributing, 7/13/2018
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

A one-story brick building that is Contributing to the Wayne Junction Historic District stands on 149 Berkley Street, part of a larger property at 147-53 Berkley Street. The building consists of a

headhouse along Berkley Street, with a character-defining Arguto Oilless Bearing Company sign, and a rear production shed which runs back approximately 170 feet, the majority of which is not visible from the public right-of-way. The building is in very poor condition and is missing most of its roof structure. The owner sought the Historical Commission's approval in 2018 to demolish the building in its entirety, to comply an Unsafe violation issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The Commission denied the complete demolition application in October 2018, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibition against demolition. During that review, several Commissioners suggested that the headhouse is the significant portion of the building, and that the rear, which is severely deteriorated and not highly visible from the public right-of-way, may be a candidate for removal. The staff recently approved a make-safe permit application for masonry repair and restoration work to the headhouse, the scope of which satisfies preservation standards.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Retain and brace front façade and approximately 14 feet of masonry return at west side wall and visible masonry return at east side wall. Bracing of façade to be done from interior.
- Remove remainder of building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The proposed project retains the main headhouse, which is the highly visible portion of the building that conveys the historic character of the building, and which maintains the industrial streetscape along Berkley Street.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The proposed project retains the main headhouse, which is the highly visible portion of the building that conveys the historic materials and features of the building.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The proposed project retains the main headhouse. The rear production shed is not a distinctive feature, and is in disrepair, and therefore does not require repair nor replacement in kind.
- *14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building,*

structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

- 14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish: *The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.*
 - The proposed removal of all parts remaining of the structure except for the front façade and portion of the side walls can be considered an alteration, instead of a demolition in the legal sense, because it involves a section of a building that has little historic character and is not highly visible to the public.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, as an alteration to a site where the historically significant section of the building is being retained, and provided a bracing plan is submitted for staff review, which is prepared by a licensed structural engineer and which shows that the bracing will cause no further damage to the remaining walls, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6, and the Commission's comments from its 12 October 2018 meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, as an alteration to a site where the historically significant section of the building is being retained, and with the understanding that the new supporting structure includes a cap to protect the historic brick, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6, and the Commission's comments from its 12 October 2018 meeting, provided:

- a bracing plan is submitted for staff review, which is prepared by a licensed structural engineer and which shows that the bracing will cause no further damage to the remaining walls,
- all extant architectural features of the head house are retained, and
- the water tower is retained until a plan for the site is developed.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 223 S 6TH ST

Proposal: Remove rear wing; construct mid-rise residential building with link to historic building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary & John J. Turchi, Jr.

Applicant: David Ertz, Cope Linder Architects

History: 1957, Edward Brumbaugh, architect, for Mayor Richardson Dilworth

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to construct a mid-rise residential building at the rear of an historic building that faces Washington Square. Architect Edward Brumbaugh designed the now-historic building for Mayor Richardson Dilworth in 1957. Mayor Dilworth constructed his house on Washington Square in a neo-Colonial style to demonstrate his commitment to the redevelopment of the historic Society Hill neighborhood. The property is classified as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District, owing to its connection to Dilworth.

The site is bounded by S. 6th Street and Washington Square at the west, S. Randolph Street at the east, the Athenaeum of Philadelphia at the north, and the former J.B. Lippincott Publishing Co. building at the south.

The application proposes removing the rear ell of the historic house, leaving the main block, and constructing an 12-story, 150-foot tall, residential building at the rear. The main block would be restored. The new building would include 20 parking spaces in the basement, accessed from S. Randolph Street. The new building would connect to the rear of the historic building at the first through third floors. The main entrance to the new building would be linked to 6th Street by a walkway running along the north of the historic house. The new building would share a party wall with the Athenaeum. A walkway running along the south of the historic house would link 6th Street to Randolph Street and separate the new building from the Lippincott building to the south. The new building would be clad with a grey, zinc panel system, with pre-cast concrete panels as an alternate. It would have balconies with glass railings. All four facades would be fenestrated. The building would be set back about 50 feet from 6th Street and 22 feet from Randolph Street. The building would step back at the east and west at the 9th floor.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar project in 2007 that included the removal of the service wing or rear ell and the construction of a 16-story residential building. Unlike the current project, which sets the addition back behind the historic house, the 2007 addition cantilevered out over the historic house. At that time the Historical Commission found that the removal of the service wing or rear ell was an alteration, not a demolition in the eyes of the preservation ordinance and did not require a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest for an approval. Neighbors appealed the 2007 decision. The complex litigation, which took eight years to work through the courts, centered on whether the Board of License & Inspection should defer to the Historical Commission on the interpretation of the Commission's ordinance and Rules & Regulations. In 2015, the Commonwealth Court upheld the Historical Commission's approval, deciding that the Historical Commission was due deference and had based its decision to approve the removal of the service wing as an alteration, not a demolition in the legal sense, on sufficient evidence, and throwing out the appeal. Setting an important precedent, the Commonwealth Court decided that the Historical Commission, which includes members with specific types of expertise, is owed deference by reviewing bodies like the Board of License & Inspection Review, which does not include experts in architecture, history, and historic preservation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear ell or service wing;
- Construct 12-story addition with basement parking; and,
- Restore the main block of the historic house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The City's historic preservation ordinance and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines provide guidance for reviewing this application.

- Sections 14-203(15), 14-203(88), and 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the historic preservation ordinance, define demolition and alteration and place restrictions on the approvals of applications proposing demolition.
 - Section 14-203(15): Alter or Alteration: a change in the appearance of a building, structure, site, or object which is not otherwise covered by the definition of demolition, or any other change for which a permit is required under The Philadelphia Code of General Ordinances.

- Section 14-203(88): Demolition or Demolish: The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object.
- Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
- The current application proposes to remove the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block. Virtually the same sections of the building were proposed for removal in 2007 and approved as an alteration.
 - The proposed razing or destruction of the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block is not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) because the sections proposed for removal are not significant, character-defining, or essential sections of the historic building. They can be removed without impairing the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment. The proposed razing or destruction of the rear ell or service wing of the building as well as some sections of the rear wall of the main block is an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) and therefore does not trigger the restrictions mandated in Section 14-1005(6)(d). The Historical Commission does not need to find necessity in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted before approving this application.
 - The Historical Commission determined in 2007 and the Commonwealth Court agreed on appeal that the removal of the rear ell and other portions of this building did not constitute a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) and was justifiably approved as an alteration.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The staff will review all restoration details for the historic house to ensure that the work complies with Standard 6.
- *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.*
 - The Historical Commission already determined and the Commonwealth Court agreed that the project approved in 2007 satisfied the Historical Commission's review criteria including Standard 9. From the perspective of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the current application is an improvement over the project approved in 2007.
 - The removal of the rear ell or service wing will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property because the rear ell is a secondary feature that does not characterize the property.

- The proposed building will be differentiated from the old. The proposed building partakes of a contemporary architectural vocabulary, differentiating it from the 1950s Colonial Revival building.
- The proposed building will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
 - Washington Square is surrounded by several tall buildings. The proposed 12-story building with set-backs at the upper floors is compatible with this environment. The size (height, breadth, and depth of the building) and massing (general shape and form of the building) of the building are appropriate. The currently proposed building is shorter than, set back more, and does not cantilever like the approved 2007 building.
 - The materials and features are compatible with the context. The proposed mid-rise is designed to recede, rightfully giving the historic building the position of prominence. The sloped section at the top of the mid-rise acknowledges the nearby historic buildings without imitating them.
 - The scale (the dimensional relationships of the building and its features to its surroundings including humans) and proportions (the dimensional relationships of the building's features to one another) of the new building are appropriate.
 - The main block of the historic building will be used for active purposes, lobby at the first floor and living at the second and third floors.
- *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.*
 - The Historical Commission already determined and the Commonwealth Court agreed that the project approved in 2007 satisfied the Historical Commission's review criteria including Standard 10. The 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 will be unimpaired. The rear ell or service wing is not part of the essential form of the building and may be removed without violating Standard 10. The construction of the mid-rise addition will not impair the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review the restoration details of the main block, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10, Sections 14-203(15), 14-203(88), and 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, and the Historical Commission's approval of 9 November 2007.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review the restoration details of the main block, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10, Sections 14-203(15), 14-203(88), and 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, and the Historical Commission's approval of 9 November 2007.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:41:20

PRESENTERS:

- Before presenting the application to the Historical Commission, Mr. Farnham directed the Commissioners to letters to the Historical Commission from Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association and attorney Richard DeMarco requesting that the Historical Commission delay the review of the application to the end of this meeting or to a later meeting. Mr. Farnham observed that neither represent the property

owner. He noted that the owner and his team are present. When asked, Mr. Farnham responded that Mr. DeMarco's letter had been received the previous evening, after the close of business.

- Developer John Turchi, attorneys Alfred Fuscaldo and Phil Rosenzweig, architect David Ertz, and consultant Craig Schelter represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni represented the Society Hill Civic Association.
- Attorney Steve Masters represented One and Two Independence Place.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco represented the Society Hill Civic Association.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Masters requested a continuance or an additional meeting because he has not had time to prepare for today's review; he explained that the attorney who had represented his clients withdrew at the last minute. Mr. Fuscaldo objected to the request.
- Mr. DeMarco requested that the Historical Commission continue the matter. Mr. Fuscaldo objected to the request. Mr. Thomas, the chair of the Historical Commission, opined that Mr. DeMarco's request was received very late, the evening before the meeting. Mr. Mattioni agreed and stated that the late requests for continuances place an undue burden on the property owner. He added that this matter has been under review for many years. He stated that he finds it "very disturbing" to have to consider a continuance request at this point in the process. He added that the objectors should have retained their legal counsel in advance of this review to allow for sufficient time for preparation. The property owner should not be penalized because an attorney for an objector withdrew at the last minute.
- Mr. DeMarco contended that his is not a late request. He pointed to the 28 February 2019 letter from the Society Hill Civic Association, which requested that the Historical Commission consider this matter at the end of today's meeting or at a subsequent meeting. Mr. DeMarco stated that he "is fine with the applicant going forward today, but want to make it clear that this Commission would making, I think, a grave error." He asserted that the Historical Commission must hear the live testimony of his expert. He claimed that he has "a due process right" to have his expert testify live before the Historical Commission. He acknowledged that his letter requesting a continuance was late, but contended that the Society Hill Civic Association letter of February 28, which requested that the Historical Commission consider this matter at the end of today's meeting or at a subsequent meeting, was issued in a timely manner. He asserted that Society Hill Civic Association, as the registered community organization and a long-time litigant in this matter, is "entitled to its day." He claimed that, owing to the Turchi decisions, the Historical Commission is owed deference. He claimed that, if he cannot present his case now, he will not be able to present it at the Board of License & Inspection Review. He claimed that he has very little notice of this review. He claimed that the previous reviews in 2006 and 2007 lasted for months with numerous meetings. He claimed that "we only got official notice a few weeks ago from the email from the Commission." He stated that they had "actual" notice about five weeks ago. He asserted that they moved as quickly as they could. He again asserted that the Historical Commission must allow his expert to present live testimony on the matter at a later review. He noted that the property owner's consultants will have had time to review his expert's report, which is dated 6 March 2019, at a later meeting. Mr. DeMarco then claimed that the Local Agency Law

- allows and even requires that the opponents be able to have a transcribed hearing. He claimed that the law says “shall. It doesn’t say may or could.” He stated that he made a request for a transcribed hearing. He acknowledged that it was a “late request.” He stated that he should be allowed to have a court reporter present. He again asserted that “we have the right to a due process hearing at this level.” Mr. Mattioni disagreed with Mr. DeMarco and read from Mr. Boni’s 28 February 2019 letter: “We would like to add that we request that this matter be given more than the usual amount of time on the Commission’s agenda either by scheduling a separate Commission meeting or at least by putting this property at the end of the regular agenda. This matter should be given the attention it deserves including allowing time for public comment without the added pressure of causing other applicants to wait.” Mr. Mattioni asserted that that is not a request for a continuance, but instead a request for sufficient time. Mr. Mattioni concluded that Mr. DeMarco has been given the requisite notice of the review and has an opportunity to present his case this morning.
- Mr. Fuscaldo responded to Mr. DeMarco, stating that “the Society Hill Civic Association has engaged in a course of conduct in this proceeding which shouldn’t be tolerated or abided by this Commission.” He stated that the 28 February letter was essentially a legal brief that was sent directly to the chair of the Commission without copying his counsel. He stated that the letter does not request a continuance, as Mr. DeMarco claimed, but merely requests that the matter be given sufficient time today or at a later meeting. He also stated that the opponents dumped hundreds of pages of documents on the Commission at the last moment, in clear violation of the Commission’s rules. It was an attempt to delay the proceedings. Mr. Fuscaldo then noted that Mr. DeMarco sent his letter at 6:14 p.m. last night because he has not had enough time to prepare. Mr. Fuscaldo reported that the zoning permit for this project was issued on 18 December 2018, putting the neighbors on notice. The Society Hill Civic Association has known since 18 December 2018 that this application would eventually be submitted to the Historical Commission. He reported that Mr. DeMarco appealed that zoning permit on 17 January 2019. He reported that Mr. Boni attended the Architectural Committee meeting on 19 February 2019. He concluded that the opponents have had plenty of notice but are not prepared. He stated that his team is prepared to move forward today. He noted that the 28 February letter makes no mention of preservation consultant Robert Powers or his lack of availability for today’s meeting. Mr. Fuscaldo asked the Historical Commission to proceed with the review today.
 - Mr. Boni, who represents the Society Hill Civic Association, observed that the Historical Commission’s chair at the time of the review in 2006 gave each side, the applicant and the opponents, equal time to present their cases. Mr. Boni stated that he does not object to moving forward today with the review, but would like equal time to present his case. Mr. Boni stated that they were unaware that Mr. Powers would be unavailable today. He stated that Mr. Powers is their only expert. Mr. Boni also explained that he has sought to have a three-dimensional model of the house built, but has been unsuccessful in that endeavor. He stated that he would like to have a chance to show a model of the house to the Historical Commission. Mr. Boni added that he has some objections to the memorandum that the staff sent to the Historical Commission and “that’s going to take some time to point out and unwind.” He stated that the Commission is entitled to accuracy. Mr. Boni stated again that he does not object to moving forward today, provided the Historical Commission extends the review over to a second day. He stated that Mr. Powers will be available for the April meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Mattioni observed that the request that Mr.

- Boni is making today is not the request that he made in his 28 February letter. Mr. Mattioni stated that he made the effort to read all of the additional materials that he and Mr. DeMarco provided at the last minute and is prepared to move forward today. Mr. Mattioni concluded that the opponents “are trying to abuse us.” Mr. DeMarco interjected that “that’s outrageous.” Mr. Thomas directed Mr. DeMarco to refrain from interrupting. Mr. Mattioni observed again that Mr. Boni’s timely letter of 28 February requested that the Historical Commission give the matter sufficient time at today’s hearing. He stated that he has reviewed the materials and is willing to give the matter all of the time it needs today. He suggested that the Historical Commission proceed with the review. He stated that he is willing to stay until midnight.
- Mr. DeMarco asserted that his clients “need a due process hearing.” He contended that Mr. Mattioni has not read the Local Agency Law. He claimed that this law requires the Historical Commission to allow live testimony from his expert and to allow Ms. Fuscaldo to cross-examine him. Mr. DeMarco insisted that the Historical Commission allow Mr. Powers to present live testimony. He stated that the City will object to Mr. Powers testifying on appeal if he is not allowed to testify before the Historical Commission. He asked rhetorically why the Historical Commission would want to create an incomplete record without the live testimony of Mr. Powers. Mr. DeMarco objected to the fact that he only had three or four weeks of advance notice about today’s meeting. Mr. DeMarco stated that he wants a court reporter present at the review and will pay for that court reporter. Mr. DeMarco stated that Title 2, Section 553 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes states that the proceedings “shall” be stenographically recorded. Mr. Fuscaldo corrected him, observing that the law says “may,” not “shall.” Mr. Fuscaldo reported that the law states that the agency may stenographically record testimony. If it does not, a party may make a stenographic recording at its cost. Mr. Fuscaldo observed that Mr. DeMarco could have arranged to have today’s proceedings recorded by a stenographer, but he did not. The Historical Commission is not obligated to provide a stenographer; Mr. DeMarco could have brought a stenographer, but he did not. Mr. Mattioni noted that he has read the Local Agency Law, more than once.
 - Mr. Masters stated that for due process there must be notice and opportunity to be heard. He stated that his expert, Mr. Powers, is unavailable today and therefore his clients do not have an opportunity to be heard. He stated that there would be no prejudice to the applicant resulting from a delay because this application was only submitted several weeks ago. He claimed that a recent case “was kicking around for two years.” He stated that he will appeal and prevail if the Commission moves forward and denies him his basic constitutional rights.
 - Mr. Rosenzweig stated that due process is a very well detailed set of rights. Simply because the opponents of the application are unprepared for today’s review does not mean that the Historical Commission would violate their due process rights if it proceeded. The opponents were not denied notice. They had notice. They were not denied an opportunity to present their positions. They have an opportunity today. They are simply unprepared. He reminded the Historical Commission that the applicant also has due process rights. He stated that the applicant is here today and is ready to proceed. He stated that the applicant would be significantly prejudiced if this review does not take place today; that prejudice could not be repaired. Mr. Rosenzweig stated that the 28 February letter from Mr. Boni to the chair of the Historical Commission is a possible major ethical violation. He stated that he is investigating the propriety of the letter. He noted that Mr. Boni is an attorney and the communication with the chair is wholly improper because Mr. Boni, who has served as the Society Hill Civic Association lawyer for years in the underlying litigation,

cannot play both roles, as a member of a committee of the Association and as the association's attorney. He concluded that the Society Hill Civic Association is again attempting to perpetually delay this process. He added that, in light of the years of litigation and the resulting court opinions, the issues before the Historical Commission are actually very narrow. He stated that the Turchi's rights have been delayed for more than a decade. Mr. Rosenzweig stated that Mr. Boni's 28 February letter "was as impropriety as it comes."

- Mr. Thomas announced that the Historical Commission would recess into executive session to be advised by its attorney.
- After its executive session, the Historical Commission reconvened in open session. Mr. Thomas announced that the Historical Commission would continue with the review of the application for 223 S. 6th Street at the end of the meeting, after considering the other matters on the agenda.

ADDRESS: 6341 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct one-story frame addition at side

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KenCrest Services

Applicant: Joseph Hoban, KenCrest Services

History: 1796; Levering-Jones House-Washington Tavern; Remodeled in 1907 by W. Ross Haggart. Front porch removed; Door surround added

Individual Designation: 11/27/1962

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District, Significant, 10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

The early Federal style building is situated on a large parcel at the corner of Ridge Avenue and Gates Street. Classified as significant in the Ridge Avenue Historic District, the property was individually designated in 1962.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 600-square-foot one-story addition with porch at northwest side of building.
- Create new opening to porch through historic masonry wall.
- Seal historic opening.
- Demolish portion of rear garage and renovate structure.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

The proposed addition does not adversely impact any character-defining features of the property. However, due to its location, the addition would be visible from the public rights-of-way. The proposed addition largely complies with this standard.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be*

differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. The proposed addition minimally impacts the historic materials of the existing building and is compatible in its massing, size, scale and architectural features. The addition is differentiated from the old in its frame construction, but is compatible in its incorporation of stucco, six-over-six double-hung windows, wood doors, and wood cornice. The proposed addition complies with this standard.

- *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.*
The proposed frame addition will abut the existing masonry walls of the historic structure and will allow the overall integrity of the historic building to remain unimpaired if the addition is removed in the future. The proposed addition complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, with the following suggestions:

- The pitch of the roof should either have a steeper pitch to allow for the application of shingles or a shallower pitch to reduce visibility, and a black instead of white membrane should be considered; and
- The window locations and details should be reconsidered to better reflect the character of the historic building.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2321 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct two, five-story buildings.

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: BRIT EMET, LLC

Applicant: Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1915; Dropsie University / Mikveh Israel; Levy Abraham, architect

Individual Designation: 11/30/1971

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 2321 N. Broad Street presently includes one two-story building and landscaped courtyard that was historically part of Dropsie College. Historic aerial photographs show the landscaped courtyard existed in the 1940s and may date to the building's original construction in 1915.

This in-concept application proposes to construct two new buildings on the site. Each building is proposed as five stories and together will include a total of 56 apartments (one-bedroom units). The two new buildings are positioned at the front of the property along N. Broad Street and are separated from each other by a reconfigured 68-foot courtyard between them. The courtyard allows for a view of the historic building at the rear of the property.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier application for 2321 N. Broad Street at the 23 October 2018 meeting. The proposal at that time was for a single, nine-story building with 120 apartments. The Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. At the October meeting, Committee members inquired if the owner and architect had explored options for a more modestly sized building on the site. The applicant withdrew their applicant prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct two new, 5-story buildings at the front of property facing N. Broad Street. Buildings are proposed to contain 56, 1-bedroom apartments and will be approximately 50 feet tall.
- Reconfigure historic courtyard to a 68-foot wide private garden in between the new buildings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval in concept based on proposed massing, size, scale, and location of new buildings, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the in-concept application based on the proposed massing, size, scale, and location of new buildings and requests further consideration of the following:

- reduce the amount of glass on fifth floor façade;
- minimize elevator and stair roof penetrations;
- conceal the rooftop mechanical equipment; and,
- articulate the windows to reflect the details and scale of the windows of the neighborhood buildings.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:17:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Rich Villa represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised design is improved as it does not block the view of the historic building from N. Broad Street.
- From the N. Broad Street sidewalk the entire façade of the historic building is visible at the rear of the property due to the two buildings angling back.
- The revised design enables the new buildings and original building with courtyard to be read as an ensemble.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The in-concept application should be approved with the understanding that the Architectural Committee’s comments will be incorporated into the final application.
- The application will return to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission for final review

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application in-concept, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2321 N BROAD ST					
MOTION: Approval in-concept with applicant to return for final review					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 1728 MARLTON AVE

Proposal: Construct new three-story building with six residential units

Review Requested: Review and comment

Owner: 1213 N 41 LLC

Applicant: German Yakubov

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1728 Marlton Avenue is a non-contributing vacant lot in the Parkside Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct new three-story multi-family residence.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this site. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - Generally speaking, the design of the proposed new construction project reflects the size, scale, proportion and massing of the architecture of the Parkside Historic District. The proposed materials, however, do not. Vinyl siding is proposed for the prominent bay window at the front façade, and vinyl windows are proposed throughout. A brick veneer is proposed for the front façade; however, it would be helpful to know if the intent is to match the thin, tan-colored brick that is seen throughout the district. The front windows at the third story are square-topped rather than curved like the majority of the houses on the block, and no decorative brick mold is proposed. The front façade also lacks the circular window at the top which is another design feature seen at most of the other houses in the row.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired*
 - Because this proposed new construction is being considered on a vacant parcel, no historic fabric will be impaired by the project.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed design is generally compatible with the historic district, but the windows, window bay and siding should be made of wood rather than vinyl; the brick veneer should match the tan brick seen throughout the district; the windows at the third story should be curved; and decorative brick window surrounds should be added to the design of the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that it would be helpful if the applicant incorporated the Committee's suggestions into revised plans and then

worked with the staff to ensure that the design details and materials were more compatible with those seen throughout the historic district.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01: 21:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No representative of the application was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- It would be helpful for the applicant to incorporate the comments of the Architectural Committee into revised plans to ensure that the new construction is more compatible with the architecture seen in the Parkside Historic District

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The applicant should work with staff to ensure that the design details of the new construction more accurately reflect those seen throughout the Parkside Historic District

ACTION: See below at 1728 Memorial Avenue.

ADDRESS: 1728 MEMORIAL AVE

Proposal: Construct new three-story building with six residential units

Review Requested: Review and comment

Owner: 1213 N 41 LLC

Applicant: German Yakubov

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/11/2009

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 1728 Memorial Avenue is a non-contributing vacant lot in the Parkside Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct new three-story multi-family residence.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this site. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*

- Generally speaking, the design of the proposed new construction project reflects the size, scale, proportion and massing of the architecture of the Parkside Historic District. The proposed materials, however, do not. Vinyl siding is proposed for the prominent bay window at the front façade, and vinyl windows are proposed throughout. A brick veneer is proposed for the front façade, however it would be helpful to know if the intent is to match the thin, tan-colored brick that is seen throughout the district. The front windows at the third story are square-topped rather than curved like the majority of the houses on the block, and no decorative brick mold is proposed. The front façade also lacks the circular window at the top which is another design feature seen at most of the other houses in the row.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired*
 - Because this proposed new construction is being considered on a vacant parcel, no historic fabric will be impaired by the project.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed design is generally compatible with the historic district, but the windows, window bay and siding should be made of wood rather than vinyl; the brick veneer should match the tan brick seen throughout the district; the windows at the third story should be curved; and decorative brick window surrounds should be added to the design of the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that it would be helpful if the applicant incorporated the Committee’s suggestions into revised plans and then worked with the staff to ensure that the design details and materials were more compatible with those seen throughout the historic district.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:21:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No representative of the application was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- It would be helpful for the applicant to incorporate the comments of the Architectural Committee into revised plans to ensure that the new construction is more compatible with the architecture seen in the Parkside Historic District

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The applicant should work with staff to ensure that the design details of the new construction more accurately reflect those seen throughout the Parkside Historic District

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the comments of the Architectural Committee for 1728 Marlton Avenue and 1728 Memorial Avenue. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1728 MARLTON AVE and 1728 MEMORIAL AVE					
MOTION: Adopt comments of the Architectural Committee					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 13 FEBRUARY 2019

Emily Cooperman, Chair

SOCIETY HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT INVENTORY AMENDMENT

Proposed Action: Amendment

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

OVERVIEW: The Philadelphia Historical Commission, the City of Philadelphia’s historic preservation agency, designated the Society Hill Historic District on 10 March 1999 and has been regulating it for historic preservation purposes since that time. The Historical Commission found that the historic district satisfies several Criteria for Designation, including Criterion I, the archaeology criterion. While regulating the district, the Historical Commission has realized that a small number of properties in the district were incorrectly classified in the historic district’s inventory of properties. The Historical Commission recently requested that its staff propose an amendment to the historic district’s inventory of properties to correct the faulty classifications.

The staff of the Historical Commission proposes to amend the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District to remove conflicts from several entries. In 28 instances, the inventory classifies sites as Non-contributing, but also notes that they have “Archaeological Potential.” By definition, Non-contributing indicates that the site in question has no historical significance including archaeological significance. The staff proposes to remove the conflicts, either by reclassifying the sites as Contributing or Significant when the site has undergone no or limited ground disturbance since designation; or by retaining the Non-contributing classification and removing the claim of archaeological potential when the site has incurred significant ground disturbance since designation. In many cases, the sites classified as Non-contributing are not, in fact, stand-alone properties with property tax accounts, but are merely parts of larger properties. In those

cases, the staff proposes to collapse the entries for the parts of the properties into the larger properties, which were already classified as Contributing or Significant. In all cases, it has been assumed that the original assertion of archaeological potential made at the time of the designation of the historic district was correct. No sites have been newly evaluated for their archaeological potential as part of this exercise; the conclusions reached at the time of the designation of the historic district have been accepted at face value.

If implemented as proposed, the amendment would reclassify 15 properties from Non-contributing to Contributing with archaeological potential; consolidate 10 inventory entries into entries for other parts of the tax parcels that are already classified as Contributing or Significant; and remove the archaeological potential note from the inventory entries for three Non-contributing properties where significant ground disturbance has occurred since designation. Although the amendment only involves 28 sites, those sites are owned by 139 entities, all of whom have been notified of this proposed amendment. Several of the sites, primarily parking lots shared by townhouse developments, have multiple property owners. The attached pages provide descriptions of each of the 28 amendments with mark-ups of the proposed revisions to the associated inventory pages.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adoption of the proposed revisions to the Society Hill Historic District Inventory to remove the conflicts between “Non-contributing” and “Archaeological Potential.”

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend the adoption of the proposed amendments except Amendments 2, 5, and 19. Those sites should be reclassified as contributing unless architectural plans demonstrate that the recent construction destroyed all archaeological potential. The Committee also recommended that, in the future, the Historical Commission consider reevaluating all sites in the Society Hill Historic District for archaeological potential.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:23:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the amendment to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Joseph Menkevich spoke in support of the amendment.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Notice of the proposed amendment was provided to the 139 property owners impacted by the amendment.
- The Society Hill Historic District was designated under several Criteria for Designation including Criterion I, the archaeology criteria.
- Classifications of properties as “Non-contributing” and as having “Archaeological Potential” are inherently in conflict and should be corrected.
- Sites where new construction has occurred since designation should be classified as Contributing unless a site has been excavated to 25 feet below grade or more.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The amendments should be adopted as proposed by the staff with two exceptions:

- Amendment Number 2, 600-02 Addison Street, should be classified as Contributing because the basement depth below grade is 14 feet as shown in the approved construction plans.
- Amendment Number 5, 512-14 and 516 S. Front Street, should be classified as Contributing because the basement depth below grade is 11 feet, 6 inches as shown in the approved construction plans.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the proposed amendments to the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District excepting:

- Amendment Number 2, 600-02 Addison Street, which should be classified as Contributing because the basement depth below grade is 14 feet as shown in the approved construction plans; and,
- Amendment Number 5, 512-14 and 516 S. Front Street, which should be classified as Contributing because the basement depth below grade is 11 feet, 6 inches as shown in the approved construction plans.

Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: SOCIETY HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT AMENDMENT					
MOTION: Adopt amendments with two exceptions					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Long					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

2036-40 CECIL B MOORE AVE

Name of Resource: McDowell Memorial Presbyterian Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the Macedonia Free Will Baptist Church

Nominator: Amy Lambert

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church property, which features building campaigns from the 1870s and 1893, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the 1893 McDowell Memorial Presbyterian Church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Richardsonian Romanesque style, and is representative of the national trend towards theatrical, auditorium-plan churches in the late nineteenth century. Under Criterion E, the

nomination contends that the 1870s chapel is significant as the work of significant local architect Henry Augustus Sims, and that the 1893 sanctuary is significant for its stained-glass windows, many of which were designed by the preeminent Tiffany Studios.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:29:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- No one represented the nominator.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The 1893 church is significant under Criteria C and D for embodying distinguishing characteristics of the Richardsonian Romanesque style, and is representative of the national trends towards theatrical, auditorium-plan churches in the late nineteenth century.
- The 1870s chapel is significant as the work of important local architect Henry Augustus Sims, and the 1893 sanctuary is significant for its Tiffany stained-glass windows, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 2036-40 Cecil B. Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2036-40 CECIL B MOORE AVENUE					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D and E					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

2224 and 2226 W TIOGA ST

Name of Resource: Conkling-Armstrong House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Gabriel Crowley; Naomi Turner Riley

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street, known as the Conkling-Armstrong House, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the twin building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F. Under Criteria A and F, the nomination asserts that the buildings, which were developed as terra cotta materials demonstration houses showcasing a multitude of terra cotta architectural elements, are unique. The nomination contends that the Chateausque style buildings satisfy Criteria C and D. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the buildings are significant for their association with architect Edgar V. Seeler.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:31:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owners.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke spoke in support of designating the properties.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites expressed support for the nomination, adding that it was good to see a nomination for a property in an underrepresented part of the city.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The large homes in the Nicetown-Tioga area were constructed during the development of a railroad suburb.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Conkling-Armstrong Terra Cotta Company is a nationally significant building supplier, satisfying Criterion A.
- The buildings represent an eclectic collection of architectural styles, though they largely reflect the Chateausque style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The buildings showcase the design of renowned Philadelphia architect Edgar V. Seeler, satisfying Criterion E.
- The buildings were developed as terra cotta materials demonstration houses for the Conkling-Armstrong Terra Cotta Company and showcased the company’s range in manufacturing terra cotta building elements, satisfying Criterion F.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the properties at 2224 and 2226 W Tioga Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2224 and 2226 W TIOGA STREET					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, D, E, and F					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

6626 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Pelham Pharmacy, Clement B. Lowe Drugstore & Dwelling

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Hebron Tabernacle of America

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the former pharmacy, constructed between 1904 and 1905 for druggist Dr. Clement B. Lowe, stands as a rare commercial building in the planned Pelham development. The building was designed by architect David Knickerbacker Boyd, a prolific Philadelphia-based architect who designed numerous residential buildings for builders Wendell & Smith in the northern and western areas of the City and whose work and publications significantly influenced the architectural and economic development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, satisfying Criterion E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:35:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Nominators Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of a designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- 6626 Germantown Avenue stands as a rare commercial building in the planned Pelham development, satisfying Criterion J.
- The building was designed by prolific Philadelphia-based architect David Knickerbacker Boyd, whose work and publications significantly influenced the architectural and economic development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 6626 GERMANTOWN AVENUE					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria E and J					
MOVED BY: Turner					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

150 DUPONT ST

Name of Resource: St. David’s Protestant Episcopal Church of Manayunk

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. David’s PE Church

Nominator: Joe Menkevich

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 150 Dupont Street, including the Church (1880-81) and Parish & Sunday School (1876-77), and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that 150 Dupont Street has significant interest and value as part of the development and heritage of Manayunk in the City of Philadelphia. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that 150 Dupont Street is reflective of an environment in an era characterized by Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival style. Both buildings are an embodiment of two distinguishable architecture styles, the Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival church building and the High-Victorian Gothic Parish & Sunday-School building, satisfying Criterion D. Satisfying Criterion H, the site is an established and familiar visual feature of the Manayunk neighborhood. Satisfying Criterion I, the site, which was largely settled in the early nineteenth century, containing a church-yard as a burial ground, has an extremely high potential for discovery of significant archaeological resources and artifacts. For its historic connections to immigrant mill workers, mill-owners, the Masonic Lodge, aid of Ireland during famine, St. David’s P. E. Church has a place in the development of the Manayunk section of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J as it exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social historical heritage of the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 Dupont Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the

property at 150 Dupont Street as defined in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, H, I, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:37:00

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Thomas recused himself because he has a business relationship with attorney Bill O' Brien.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Joseph Menkevich and John Manton represented the nomination.
- Attorney Melissa Weber represented the Diocese of Pennsylvania, St. David's PE Church, and the Church Foundation.
- Attorney Bill O' Brien represented the owners of the Parish & Sunday School Building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Sean McCauley, an advisor on real estate to the Episcopal Bishop of Pennsylvania spoke in opposition of the designation.
- Father Frank Wallner, a part-time priest at St. David's PE Church spoke in opposition of the designation.
- Brandy Levine, a parishioner and a member of the vestry, spoke for herself and parishioners at St. David's PE Church spoke in opposition of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The sale of the Parish & Sunday School building does not void or alter the proposed nomination, as the subdivision of the 150 Dupont Street occurred after the nomination was certified and the notice sent to the property owner.
- The project currently underway at the Parish & Sunday School building is focused on the interior and has not altered its exterior historic character in any way as to disqualify it from designation.
- At the 13 February 2019 meeting, the Committee on Historic Designation determined that the nomination did not meet Criterion A because, although 150 Dupont Street was important historically to Manayunk and its immigrant community, it did not have significant interest and value as part of the development and heritage of the overall City of Philadelphia.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church building at 150 Dupont Street is reflective of an environment in an era characterized by Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival style, satisfying Criterion C.
- Both buildings are an embodiment of two distinguishable architecture styles, the Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival church building and the High-Victorian Gothic Parish & Sunday-School building, satisfying Criterion D.
- The church building at 150 Dupont Street is an established and familiar visual feature of the Manayunk neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.
- The property at 150 Dupont Street, which was largely settled in the early nineteenth century, containing a church-yard as a burial ground, has an extremely high potential

- for discovery of significant archaeological resources and artifacts, satisfying Criterion I.
- For its historic connections to immigrant mill workers, mill-owners, the Masonic Lodge, and aid of Ireland during famine, St. David’s P. E. Church has a place in the development of the Manayunk section of Philadelphia as it exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social historical heritage of the community, satisfying Criterion I.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 150 Dupont Street, including the portion now known as 141 Krams Avenue, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, H, I, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Washington dissented.

ITEM: 150 DUPONT STREET					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, H, I and J					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair				x	
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington		x			
Total	9	1		1	1

OLD BUSINESS

CAST IRON SUBWAY ENTRANCES THEMATIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation
 Nominator: Nicholas Baker
 Number of properties: 52
 Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, SEPTA, PATCO
 Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the cast iron subway entrances located along the Market Street Subway/Elevated, Broad Street Subway, Ridge Avenue/8th Street Subway, Subway-Surface Lines, and PATCO Speedline as part of the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the proposed district, which is comprised of 52 cast iron subway entrances erected between 1928 and 1955, is significant under Criterion A, because it reflects the development of modern mass transit in Philadelphia. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the varying aesthetic and architectural designs of each entrance reflect the spirit of prevailing styles during the time of construction. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues

that each cast iron subway entrance stands as a defining visual characteristic within the neighborhood streetscape and city. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that, collectively, the entrances represent the city's commitment to sustaining growth through significant investment in public transportation infrastructure at a time of an optimistic belief in public service and the importance of the public realm.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:18:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Nicholas Baker, a nominator, represented the nomination.
- A representative from SEPTA was present but declined to comment.
- Anthony Santaniello of the Streets Department, a nominator, stated that the Streets Department fully supports the nomination of the thematic district.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The entrances, constructed between 1928 and 1955 reflect the development of modern mass transit in Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion A.
- The various designs of the entrances, which evolved from the 1920s to the 1950s, reflected the spirit of prevailing styles during the time of construction, satisfying Criterion C.
- Each entrance provides a defining visual feature within the neighborhood streetscape and city, satisfying Criterion H.
- The entrances represent the city's investment in public transportation infrastructure and a commitment to sustaining growth, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CAST IRON SUBWAY ENTRANCES THEMATIC DISTRICT					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, H and J					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 223 S 6TH ST

Proposal: Remove rear wing; construct mid-rise residential building with link to historic building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mary & John J. Turchi, Jr.

Applicant: David Ertz, Cope Linder Architects

History: 1957, Edward Brumbaugh, architect, for Mayor Richardson Dilworth

Individual Designation: None

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:22:35

DISCUSSION:

The Historical Commission restarted the discussion of the application for 223 S. 6th Street, which it had suspended earlier.

- Mr. Fuscaldo asked the Historical Commission to continue the matter to a special meeting because two of his consultants need to leave for the airport for flights. He noted that Mr. Schelter is flying to Boston to be with his wife, who is in the hospital. Mr. Ertz is flying to Nebraska for a funeral. He stated that his team had anticipated that their matter would have been concluded in the morning, but, owing to the delay, are unable to stay for the restarted review. He requested that the Historical Commission schedule a special meeting, rather than waiting an entire month for the next monthly meeting. Mr. Fuscaldo submitted a letter for the record.
- Mr. Schelter stated that he was prepared to move forward with the review earlier today, but the opposing parties were not. He reported that his wife is being treated for pancreatic cancer and he will be unavailable at times when she is undergoing chemotherapy. He stated that the delaying tactics of the opposition are unconscionable.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the application for 223 S. 6th Street to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 223 S 6TH ST					
MOTION: Continue to the April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)					x
Long (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)	x				
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:32:00

Upon completing the discussions of the matters on the agenda, Mr. Thomas requested a motion to adjourn. On behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association, Paul Boni thanked the Historical Commission’s staff for its work to prepare the Society Hill Historic District amendment related to archaeology.

ACTION: At 12:02 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment				
MOTION: To adjourn				
MOVED BY: Mattioni				
SECONDED BY: Long				
VOTE				
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	x			
Cooperman	x			
Edwards	x			
Hartner (DPP)	x			
Lippert (L&I)				x
Long (DHCD)	x			
Mattioni	x			
McCoubrey	x			
Trego (PCPC)	x			
Stanford (Commerce)	x			
Turner, Vice Chair	x			
Washington	x			
Total	11			1

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission’s website, www.phila.gov/historical, under “Current Applications.”