THE MINUTES OF THE 680TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 12 APRIL 2019
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:02

Mr. Thomas, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:06 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		
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	x		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	x		
Mark Dodds (Division of Housing & Community Development)	x		
John Mattioni, Esq.	x		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair		x	
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	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
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

The following persons were present:
Justin Detwiler, John Milner Architects
Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect
James Baylor
Wilber Winborne
Celeste Morello
Cliff Eyler
Joe Strampello, Mattioni, Ltd.
Pat Henningsen
Peter A. Lamlein

Jacob Cooper
Johnette Davies, Amtrak
Sue Patterson, Penn Knox Neighborhood Association
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Amelia Riley
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Steven Peitzman
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
J.M. Duffin
Oscar Beisert
Aaron Wunsch
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Michael Caine, Old First Church
Simon Kaufman, Partners for Sacred Places
Gabor Antalics
Anthony Giacobbe
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group
David La Fontaine, Community Ventures
Irwin Trauss, Penn Knox Neighborhood Association
Mark Sandberg
Marc Cam, Action News
William McGurrin
John Brady
Deja Lynn Alvarez
Faye Anderson, All That Philly Jazz
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Arwa Abdelmoula, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Al Fuscaldo, Esq.
Philip Rosenzweig, Esq.
Caitlin McCabe, Philadelphia Inquirer
Robert Tunick
Josh Yeager
Wylie McDermott
Kyle Thorp
Danya Pilgrim
David Ertz, Cope-Linder-Nelson
Venice Whitaker
Craig Shelter, Shelter & Associates
John Turchi, Turchi Inc.
Robert Bowes
Doug Seiler
Robert Kramer
Ian Cope, Nelson
Richard DeMarco, Esq.
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 679TH STATED MEETING, 8 MARCH 2019

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:01:47

Mr. Thomas asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting, the 679th Stated Meeting, held 8 March 2019, and then for a motion to approve the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes of the 679th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 March 2019. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 679th Stated Meeting **MOTION: Approval** **MOVED BY: Turner** **SECONDED BY: Cooperman**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 152-78 W BERKS ST

Name of Resource: Peter Woll & Sons
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: West Berks Community Development LLC
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 152-78 W. Berks Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation G, H, and J.

Under Criteria G and H, the nomination argues the buildings are part of a significant group of buildings that served as the industrial complex of Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, Curled Hair. Under Criterion J, the nomination that Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company,

Curled Hair exemplified the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the industrial age in Kensington in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff acknowledges that the property at 152-78 W. Berks Street, as part of the former Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, shares in the same industrial history as the building across the street at 173 W. Berks Street, but suggests that that industrial history of the manufacturing firm is better memorialized and conveyed by the building at 173 W. Berks Street. The staff recommends that the Historical Commission considering designating only the Berks Street façade with the ghost sign at 152-78 W. Berks Street as a structure and not the entire building and site. The staff questions the value to the public of compelling a private property owner to retain and preserve a non-descript, modest industrial building of low integrity and limited reuse potential in perpetuity.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of 152-78 W. Berks Street to the 17 April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:30

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Mattioni recused because his law firm represents the property owner.

PRESENTERS:

- None.

REASON FOR REQUEST: Mr. Farnham stated that the property owner holds a valid demolition permit, which was applied for and issued before the Historical Commission's notice was sent to the property owner announcing the consideration of this nomination. He stated that the property owner intends to act on that demolition permit in the near future. Mr. Farnham noted that if this matter is continued, it will be moot by the time the Historical Commission takes it up again. He concluded that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction to review, approve, or deny that demolition permit because it was applied for prior to the Historical Commission indicating its interest in considering the property for designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination of 152-78 W. Berks Street to a future meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation with the understanding that the building is subject to an active demolition permit which may render the question of designation moot. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 152-78 W BERKS ST MOTION: Continue review to June CHD meeting 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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni				x	
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	10			1	2

156 W SCHOOL HOUSE LN
Name of Resource: Boxwood
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Teen Challenge Training Center Inc.
Nominator: Penn Knox Neighborhood Association
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 156 W. School House Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that Boxwood reflects the Colonial Revival style of architecture as applied to upper-class suburban residences in late nineteenth-century Philadelphia. The nomination further argues that the "cottage-stable" at the rear of the property represents Gothic Revival cottage motifs popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing in the late 1840s and early 1850s.Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that Boxwood was designed by Mantle Fielding, a prolific and significant architect who influenced the built environment in Northwest Philadelphia at the turn of the twentieth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 156 W. School House Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. However, the staff asserts that the so-called "cottage-stable" at the rear of the property does not reflect the Gothic Revival style and, therefore, does not satisfy Criteria C and D as presented in the nomination. While the building has a cross gable, a typical feature of the Gothic Revival, it does not have any other features characteristic of the style. The building may have served as a barn, potentially for an earlier residence predating Boxwood, and was later updated with a cross gable. The staff recommends that the so-called "cottage-stable" contributes to the site's historical significance but does not exhibit sufficient character-defining features to be considered reflective of or exemplary of the Gothic Revival style.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of 156 W. School House Lane to the April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and the May 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission, not the June and July 2019 meetings as requested by the property owner's attorney.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:05:34

PRESENTERS:

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

REASON FOR REQUEST: The attorney representing the property owner has requested additional time to review the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Sue Patterson of the Penn Knox Neighborhood Association stated that she supports the continuance of the review of the nomination.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination of 156 W. School House Lane to the 19 June 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 156 W SCHOOL HOUSE LN **MOTION: Continue review to June CHD meeting** **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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez, Esq. (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

4619-25 LONGSHORE AVE
Name of Resource: Tacony Club
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Tacony Club
Nominator: Alexander Balloon
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4619-25 Longshore Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the purpose-built Tacony Club building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the clubhouse, constructed in 1908, reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Italian Renaissance Revival style of architecture. The nomination further argues that the clubhouse, commissioned by the Tacony Club, a social and political organization founded in 1887, exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of Northeast Philadelphia and the Tacony neighborhood, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4619-25 Longshore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of 4619-25 Longshore Avenue to the April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:06:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. She stated that all parties are aware of the continuance request and expect to be heard at the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation in April 2019.

REASON FOR REQUEST: The attorney representing the equitable owner requested the continuance at the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation in March 2019.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to continue the review of the nomination of 4619-25 Longshore Avenue to the 17 April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 4619-25 Longshore Ave MOTION: Continue review to April CHD meeting 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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2019

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:07:50

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 238 S. 4th Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA, 238 S 4TH ST **MOTION: Adoption of the recommendations of the Architectural Committee** **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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 5250 WAYNE AVE

Proposal: Convert church into residences; replace windows; construct ADA ramp
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 5250 Wayne Avenue LLC
Applicant: Raymond F. Rola, Raymond F. Rola Architect
History: 1910; Methodist Episcopal Church of the Advocate; Wilson, Harris & Richards, architects
Individual Designation: 1/13/2017
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The church located at 5250 Wayne Avenue, historically known as Methodist Episcopal Church of the Advocate, was designated in 2017. At the time of its designation, the property's ownership was tenuous and the congregation had not been active for several decades. The

Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued numerous violations for the property, including Imminently Dangerous violations for cracked, bulging, and collapsed walls. The Department addressed the falling and dangerous condition at the bell tower in 2017 by removing the stone ornamentation and parapet from the top of the structure. However, the building remains in poor condition and with numerous outstanding violations.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert church to multi-family residential building with twenty-four units, gym, and meeting room.
- Construct ADA ramp at side of building.
- Repair leaded glass windows.
- Replace leaded glass windows with fixed and operable aluminum windows.
- Clean and repair stone façade.
- Repair slate roof.
- Replace gutters and downspouts.
- Install condensing units at side 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 shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided*.
  The proposed conversion of the church to residential units allows for the retention and preservation of the building's exterior envelope. The condensing units and ADA ramp will be as inconspicuous as possible and will be reversible.

- *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 existing leaded glass windows are highly deteriorated and require repair or replacement. In certain instances, the application proposes to retain and repair the windows. In other locations, the application proposes to provide functionality to the residential units by installing aluminum windows behind the wood tracery. Supplemental window details provided by the applicant for the Historical Commission's review helped to provide more information, which had been recommended by the Architectural Committee.

- *Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.*
  The historic masonry will be cleaned using an appropriate chemical cleaner and in a manner that will not cause damage.

- *Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
  The ADA ramp, proposed at the southeast elevation, would provide barrier-free access with minimal impact to the historic resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that window shop drawings show that the proposed windows replicate the existing molding profiles and are installed in a compatible manner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 7, and the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, not final as was requested, provided:

- the window details are resolved;
- the use of lead tape is explored to replicate the pattern of the existing leaded glass;
- the air conditioner units that are located on the ground are pulled back from the street and that their visibility is minimized to the greatest extent possible;
- the mezzanine level is pulled back in the interior from the exterior walls so as not to interfere with the windows;
- no railings or anything visually obtrusive is installed at the basement-level windows; and,
- no rooftop mechanical equipment is visible from the public right-of-way.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:09:19

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Ray Rola represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The large window at the front elevation was a significant feature of the building and needed to be treated with more attention to detail than was initially proposed.
- The proposed repair and replacement of the other windows and the retention of the wood tracery would have a very positive impact on the building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposal satisfies Standard 2 by retaining the building's envelope, and by keeping the condenser units and ADA ramp reversible and inconspicuous;
- The wood tracery will be repaired and retained; details for sensitive window replacement will be reviewed and approved by staff; the leaded glass at the large Type A window at the front elevation would either be repaired or replaced with true leaded glass, therefore satisfying Standard 6.
- The historic masonry will be cleaned using an appropriate chemical cleaner and in a manner that will not cause damage, with samples to be reviewed and approved in the field by staff, therefore satisfying Standard 7.
- The ADA ramp, proposed at the southeast elevation, will provide barrier-free access with minimal impact to the historic resource, therefore satisfying the Accessibility Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to approve the application, provided real leaded glass is retained and/or installed in the large arched window over the main entrance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 7, and the Accessibility Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 5250 WAYNE AVE MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Lippert SECONDED BY: Mattioni				
VOTE				
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain/Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x			
Cooperman	x			
Edwards	x			
Hartner (DPP)	x			
Lippert (L&I)	x			
Dodds (DHCD)	x			
Mattioni	x			
McCoubrey				x
Sánchez (Council)	x			
Trego (PCPC)	x			
Stanford (Commerce)				x
Turner, Vice Chair	x			
Washington	x			
Total	11			2

ADDRESS: 2301-23 PINE ST
Proposal: Remove garden shed; construct pavillion and pergola; install gate
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: City of Philadelphia, Fitler Square/ Fitler Square Improvement Assoc. Inc
Applicant: Evan Litvin, LO Design Company, LLC
History: 1896; Fitler Square
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:
Named for former nineteenth-century Philadelphia Mayor Edwin H. Fitler, Fitler Square was dedicated soon after his death in 1896. The square is bounded by Panama Street to the north, Pine Street to the south, 23rd Street to the east, and 24th Street to the west. Currently, a small brick storage shed is located on a pathway at the north end of the square. This application responds to the need to replace the storage shed following storm damage that rendered it unusable.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Remove non-historic storage shed.
- Construct stone- and wood-clad pavilion.
- Construct wood pergola structure with stone site wall, stone bench, and granite pavers.
- Install gate along Panama Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
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 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 pavilion and pergola are compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and do not create an adverse impact on the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

- *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 pavilion and pergola would have minimal impact on the square if removed in the future.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the following comments:

- other materials in lieu of the schist are explored, including limestone or brick;
- the wall along Panama Street is opened more to lessen its solidity;
- the structures in general are lightened in appearance to maintain the openness of the park; and
- the applicants provide evidence to show that the hairpin fence has no historical significance.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:35:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architects Evan Litvin and Lea Litvin and Fitler Square Improvement Association member Amelia Riley represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor David Traub noted that he has lived in the Fitler Square neighborhood since 1964. He commented that the proposed design is nice and that he understands the need for storage space. He remarked that the proposed changes are significant relative to the size of the square. He stated for the record that the existing brick shed was designed by renowned architect Norman Rice, whose home and office across the square was recently demolished. Mr. Traub added that, although the plan was presented at the general membership meeting of the Fitler Square Improvement Association, the meeting was the only time the design was presented to the public. In talking to neighbors around the square, he opined, they have no knowledge of the plan and have not seen it. He argued that, procedurally, things have been turned upside down and should have been presented to the full community prior to the Historical Commission. He contended that people who are not members of the association, such as new people in the neighborhood or renters, should have a say. He concluded that he does not oppose the project. It was noted that the Historical Commission cannot require applicants to hold public meetings.
- Neighbor Jacob Cooper supported the application. He noted that the presentation at the Fitler Square Improvement Association was advertised and he attended.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The design of the bench and paving could allow skateboarders to skate under the pergola.
- The wall of the pergola structure could serve as a climbing wall.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed pavilion and pergola are compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and do not create an adverse impact on the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, satisfying Standard 9.
- The pavilion and pergola would minimally impact the square if removed in the future, satisfying Standard 10.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 2301-23 PINE ST **MOTION: Approval** **MOVED BY: Lippert** **SECONDED BY: Trego**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 5164 RIDGE AVE
Proposal: Remove slate roof; install asphalt shingle roof
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 5164 Ridge Ave LLC
Applicant: Simon Ojeda, PQ Construction & Remodeling
History: 1877; St. Timothy's Working Men's Club and Institute; Charles M. Burns (attributed)
Individual Designation: 3/7/1974
District Designation: Ridge Avenue Thematic Historic District, Significant, 10/12/2018
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:
The building at 5164 Ridge Avenue was constructed in 1877 as the St. Timothy's Working Men's Club and Institute. The Club closed in 1912. The building historically had a prominent

corner tower, shown in the historic image in this application, which was removed prior to historic designation. The building was individually designated in 1974, and was included in the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District inventory in 2018. The current owner purchased the property in 2018, after the building had suffered from many years of deferred maintenance. Shortly after purchasing the property, the owner contacted the Historical Commission's staff to inquire how to submit an application to repair the roof, owing to the failing condition of the existing slate. This application proposes a full removal of the existing slate roof and replacement with a shingle asphalt roof, owing to the cost of real slate replacement. The proposed Belmont shingle is advertised as "replicating the authentic appearance of natural slate." The staff encouraged the property owner to obtain two or three quotes for re-roofing, to include asphalt shingles, real slate, and synthetic slate. This application includes a quote of $24,200 for re-roofing using the Belmont asphalt shingles, and a quote of $57,200 for re-roofing using slate. The roofing contractor conveyed to the staff that the quote for using a synthetic slate would be comparable in cost to the real slate quote. The cost for re-roofing using real or synthetic slate are cost-prohibitive for the owner, especially when combined with the larger scope of work that the new owner is confronting in bringing this building back into use and into compliance with building code requirements. While one might suggest that a financial hardship or unnecessary hardship application is required to review this proposal, the staff notes that Standard 6, the most applicable of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in this case, recommends replacing deteriorated materials with the same material "where possible." The staff contends that it is not possible to use the same material, owing to the enormous cost. The staff proposes that this application can be approved in compliance with the Standards without a hardship application or finding.

According to the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #29, slate roofs have a lifespan of 60 to 125 years. Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission Rules & Regulations states that "the staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials." The staff suggests that, although the existing tower may be a character-defining feature of the building today, it is not original to the building and therefore should not be held to the above standards. The staff suggests that the remainder of the roof, although visible owing to the location of this building on a prominent corner along Ridge Avenue, is a candidate for replacement with asphalt shingles which are the approximate shape and color of slate.

The staff requests review of this application and guidance for future applications that propose replacement of slate with asphalt, where replacement with slate is cost-prohibitive given the overall condition of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove existing slate on entire roof.
- Install CertainTeed Belmont Luxury Shingles to entire roof.

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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
- *Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations: "The staff shall review and may approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Commission permit applications proposing:…the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials."*
- *Section 6.11.e of the Commission's Rules & Regulations: "The Architectural Committee shall review and may approval without referral to the Commission application that are subject to staff approval but which the staff has declined to approve. If the Committee declines to approve such an application, it shall formulate an advisory recommendation for approval, denial, or deferral, with or without conditions and qualifications; and refer the application with recommendation to the Commission for review at the next meeting. The Architectural Committee approval or recommendation shall be confirmed in writing to the applicant."*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval for the replacement of the slate roof with CertainTeed Belmont Luxury Shingles or equivalent, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6 and Sections 6.10.c and 6.11.e of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:00:40

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Contractor Anner Rodriguez represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- The supplemented application provides additional information regarding the roofing proposal.
- The severity of deterioration of the existing slate roof requires replacement.
- The cost for re-roofing using real slate is cost-prohibitive for the owner, especially when combined with the larger scope of work that the new owner is confronting in bringing this building back into use and into compliance with building code requirements.
- The staff can review the details, including copper flashing and hips, and the shape of asphalt shingles to approximate the existing shapes.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Standard 6, the most applicable of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in this case, recommends replacing deteriorated materials with the same material "where possible." In this case, it is not possible to use the same material, owing to the enormous cost.
- Section 6.10.c.4 of the Commission Rules & Regulations allows for the staff to review and approve without referral to the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission "permit applications proposing the replacement of slate roofing materials, with the exception of mansards, turrets, and other character-defining features, provided the severity of deterioration requires replacement and the substitute materials closely approximate the color and shape of the historic slate roofing materials." The existing tower may be a character-defining feature of the building today, but it is not original to the building and therefore should not be held to the above standards. The remainder of the roof, although visible owing to the location of this building on a prominent corner along Ridge Avenue, is a candidate for replacement with asphalt shingles which are the approximate shape and color of slate.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details including the roofing shingles and flashing, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and Sections 6.10.c and 6.11.e of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 5164 RIDGE AVE
MOTION: Approval
MOVED BY: Trego
SECONDED BY: Lippert

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 238 S 4TH ST
Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct rear additions; add dormers
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Andrew Hohns and Leah Popowich
Applicant: Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects
History: 1765; Shippen-Wistar House; Mutual Assurance Co., 1912
Individual Designation: 6/26/1956, 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:
The Shippen Wistar House, at the corner of 4th and Locust Streets, dates to the middle of the eighteenth century and has undergone significant alterations over many years, specifically to the rear and interior of the building. Originally, the main block of the house had two-story additions at the rear. The first addition was a piazza with stair which extended into a kitchen. The property was altered circa 1830, at which time the stair was relocated to the main block. The staff believes that the existing dormers were added at this time, as the taller building next door was constructed in 1830 and would have blocked the light into the attic from the south, which was previously gained through a window on this side. By the late 1800s, the rear additions were replaced or expanded into Italianate-style rowhouses. The Mutual Assurance Company purchased the buildings for office use and demolished the rear additions and houses in the 1920s, leaving only the main, original house. The building was then connected internally to the adjacent building via doorways cut through the party wall on each floor. Much of the current exterior appearance of the building reflects the work done in the 1920s.

SCOPE OF WORK
- Construct two-story brick addition with cedar shake roof and one-story kitchen addition with Boral siding and lead-coated copper roof.
- Construct additional dormers on front and rear roof.
- Install new cedar shake roof on main house.
- Restore windows, doors, and shutters on main house.
- Install wood and metal fence and wood arbor within existing garden at rear.

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 and preserves the main house, and reintroduces a spatial relationship at the rear that historically existed.

- *Standard 3: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken*.
    - The proposed brick rear addition is not attempting to reconstruct the historic rear ell exactly; however, the addition uses materials and a façade design which may too closely resemble an original rear addition. The proposed construction of an additional dormer on both the front and rear roofs, while creating symmetry found

on numerous historic buildings nearby, does not appear to have been a condition found on this particular building at any point in the past. The staff notes that an existing attic window on the north side of the building allows for light into the space.

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
    - The proposed project restores the historic materials, features, and finishes of the facades of the main house.

- *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 proposed additions will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property. Although the proposed rear ell has a very historic look, it will be sufficiently differentiated from the old. Both proposed rear additions will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of additional dormers; approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all but the projecting balcony, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1249-53 S 19TH ST
Proposal: Demolish building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 19th Street Baptist Church
Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design
History: 1874; 19th Street Baptist Church; Furness & Hewitt, architects
Individual Designation: 7/5/1984
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:
The property at 1249-53 S. 19th Street is located at the southeast corner of Titan and S. 19th Streets. Constructed in 1874 by the architectural firm of Furness & Hewitt, this Gothic Revival, green-serpentine stone church and school complex was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1984.

The applicant is proposing the complete demolition of the church and school building, seemingly in response to several open violations including partially collapsed roof and wall, resulting in an unsafe structure determination by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The materials provided in the application include four photographs of the overall structures and two of the

interior of the sanctuary. There is no engineer's report or cover letter explaining the existing conditions or scope of work.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Complete demolition of church and school 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*. *foreclosed.*
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
    - The proposed complete demolition of the buildings fails to retain the historic character, distinctive materials, features, spaces, spatial relationships, finishes, construction techniques, or examples of craftsmanship that characterize this complex.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against 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.*
    - The applicants have not demonstrated that the existing building cannot be reasonably adapted, that the sale is impracticable, or that all other potential uses of the property have been foreclosed upon. The applicants have not demonstrated that the issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest. While abating unsafe and imminently dangerous conditions are in the public interest, the proposed demolition may not be *necessary* in the public interest. The unsafe condition may be able to be abated through repair.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5, and Section 14-1005(6)(d), the prohibition against demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:08:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Reverend Windborne and James Baylor represented the application.

- Attorney Leonard Reuter

DISCUSSION: Mr. Reuter explained that the City has taken the owners to court to compel them to make repairs. The City is not seeking to have this very important building demolished but is rather concerned with keeping it safe and repaired. He said that the court has continued the case to allow the property owners to make repairs. Reverend Windborne said that they are seeking to demolish the building and have been directed to submit a financial hardship application. He noted that they were directed to work with the staff to assist them in the preparation of that application. Mr. Mattioni cautioned them that a hardship exemption is not automatic and that they may have to look to other remedies.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub expressed a concern that allowing too long a continuance might expose the church to another winter without repair.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The application cannot be reviewed in its current form because it is incomplete. It offers no necessity in the public interest or financial hardship argument to justify the demolition.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- A continuance is appropriate to allow the owners to supplement the application with information about necessity in the public interest or the infeasibility of reuse.

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

ITEM: 1249-53 S 19TH ST **MOTION: Table application for a period not to exceed six months** **MOVED BY: Mattioni** **SECONDED BY: Turner**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1524-38 GERMANTOWN AVE
Proposal: Rehabilitate buildings; construct additions
Review Requested: In Concept
Owner: TR-GRETZ LP
Applicant: Anthony Tsirantonakis, T + Associates
History: 1885; Gretz Brewery; 1894-96; 1900; 1901; 1903; 1905; c. 1944
Individual Designation: 11/9/2018
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:
This in-concept application proposes the adaptive reuse of the former Gretz Brewery complex, which was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in November 2018. At the time of designation, the Commission voted to consider "Building 12" at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street as non-contributing, so that it may be approved for demolition to allow for greater flexibility with the plans for redevelopment. Also at the time of designation, the developer briefly showed preliminary plans to the Commission for redevelopment of the site, to demonstrate that plans for reuse of the property had been in the works for some time prior to the proposed historic designation. Several members of the staff toured the complex with the developer and architect in late 2018 and can confirm that the buildings have suffered from years of deferred maintenance and exposure to the elements. Several buildings in the complex are lacking roofs.

SCOPE OF WORK
- Demolish non-contributing "Building 12" at corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street.
- Construct new mixed-use buildings on vacant lot created by demolition of "Building 12" and on existing vacant lot at corner of Germantown Avenue and W. Oxford Street.
- Construct overbuilds and additions on existing historic buildings.
- Rehabilitate historic facades and iconic chimney with "Gretz beer" signage.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *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 historic facades and chimney, which are the highly visible portions of the complex that convey the historic materials and features.

- *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 historic street-facing facades. The interior of the complex, which is not visible from the street, is not a distinctive feature, and is in disrepair, and therefore does not require repair nor replacement in kind.

- *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.*
    - The proposed project includes overbuilds with setbacks on historic facades, in an attempt to minimize the massing on the historic structures. Overall, the new construction portions of the complex may not strictly satisfy preservation standards, but should be considered owing to the poor condition of the complex, in addition to the plans having been developed prior to notice of proposed historic designation.

- *Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations (also known as the "Transition Rule"): The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.*
    - At the time that the letters were sent to the property owner notifying of the proposed historic designation, plans for a mixed-use adaptive reuse of the complex had been developed. Those plans were in line with the application subject to this in-concept review. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission may take into account development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation when reviewing plans for this site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, with the recommendation that massing of new construction on historic buildings be reduced where possible, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided the overbuilds are set back more on the historic buildings; the bright white color, corner building, and Redner Street façade designs are modified as per the Committee's comments; and the architect works with the staff on the window and storefront details, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9, and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:23:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Anthony Tsirantonakis and owner Tony Rufo of TR-Gretz LP represented the application.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained that the architects had worked with the staff and incorporated all of the Architecture Committee suggestions into their revised drawings. Mr. Tsirantonakis explained that they had worked diligently with all of the stakeholders to make a successful project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the application.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the application and noted that, with the help of the market, even an industrial complex in very poor condition can be adaptively reused.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The architect implemented the Architectural Committee's recommendations including revising the corner building to reflect the older building that had stood on the site, revised the setback of the overbuilds from 8 feet to 10 feet, changed the color of the overbuilds to reflect the terra cotta, revised and showed the Redner Street façade and attempted to make the chimney more prominent.
- The architect should continue to work with the staff on the windows, doors and storefronts as he prepares an application for final approval.
- At the time that the letters were sent to the property owner notifying of the proposed historic designation, plans for a mixed-use adaptive reuse of the complex had been developed. Those plans were in line with the application subject to this in-concept review. The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission may take into account development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation when reviewing plans for this site.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application satisfies Standards 5, 6, and 9.
- Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, the transition rule, should be applied.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the revised application in concept as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 12 April 2019, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1524-38 GERMANTOWN AVE MOTION: Approval in concept 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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 12 MARCH 2019

Emily Cooperman, Chair

ADDRESS: 153 N 4TH ST, PART OF THE PROPERTY AT 322-40 RACE ST

Proposed Action: Reclassification
Property Owner: Elders + Deacons, the Minister Trustees
Applicant: Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the building at 153 N. 4th Street as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. It is currently listed as contributing to the district.

The lot at 153 N. 4th Street is not a tax parcel; it is part of the larger tax parcel known as 322-40 Race Street, which includes the Old First Reformed United Church of Christ building facing Race Street and two rowhouses facing N. 4th Street. Despite being a single tax parcel, the property has three entries in the historic district's inventory. The church building is classified as significant. The rowhouse at 151 N. 4th Street, which was constructed about 1760, is classified as significant. The rowhouse in question at 153 N. 4th Street, which was constructed in 1974, is classified as contributing. The rowhouse in question is Neo-Georgian in style, but is not a reconstruction of a building that stood on the site. The history of the building is fully documented in the applicant's submission.

When the Historical Commission designated the Old City Historic District on 12 December 2003, it debated the endpoint of the period of significance, ultimately setting it 1929. At the end of the review, the Historical Commission voted "to approve the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation to designate the Old City Historic District with the following two amendments: that the boundary between Front and S. 2nd Streets be extended south from Ionic to Walnut Street; and that date of significance be established at 1676 to 1929 with the stipulation that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as 'non-contributing' unless already individually designated." The building at 153 N. 4th Street was constructed in 1974, 45 years after the end of the period of

significance, and has never been individually designated. According to the Historical Commission's decision to designate the district, the building at 153 N. 4th Street should have been listed as non-contributing, but was instead wrongly classified as contributing. The Historical Commission made a clerical error when it failed to classify 153 N. 4th Street as non-contributing in the district inventory, as required by the Commission's designation action.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission correct the Old City Historic District inventory entry for 153 N. 4th Street and reclassify the building as non-contributing to the district, pursuant to the rule established by the Historical Commission when designating the district on 12 December 2003, "that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as 'non-contributing' unless already individually designated."

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission correct the Old City Historic District inventory entry for 153 N. 4th Street and reclassify the building as non-contributing to the district, pursuant to the rule established by the Historical Commission when designating the district on 12 December 2003, "that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as 'non-contributing' unless already individually designated."

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 1:33:56

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Cindy Hamilton of Heritage Consulting Group represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he assumed that this building is in a row of buildings and therefore "potentially contributes" to that row of buildings. He stated that the demolition of this building would "interrupt the flow of urban fabric along the street." Mr. Farnham responded that this building is not part of a row; it is adjacent to one other building, an eighteenth-century rowhouse. He added that the history and context of the building proposed for reclassification is documented in a very thorough manner in the applicant's submission materials, which are available to the public. He suggested that, if Mr. Traub wishes to offer meaningful comments, he should review the application materials in advance and not simply react to a single photograph projected on the screen at the meeting. Mr. Traub replied that the presentation should provide more context photographs. Mr. Mattioni informed him that the applicant's submission provides numerous photographs and other information about the context. Mr. Farnham stated that all applications materials are provided to all interested parties including Mr. Traub via email and are available on the Historical Commission's website. He stated that the presentations offered at the Historical Commission's meetings cannot be encyclopedic.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building in question was constructed about 1974.
- The Historical Commission had established the period of significance for the Old City Historic District as 1676 to 1929 at the time of the designation of the historic district in 2003.

- The Historical Commission determined at the time of designation in 2003 that it would list all buildings built after 1929 as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District unless already individually designated.
- The building in question has never been individually designated.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission committed a clerical error when it adopted the Old City Historic District inventory with the building in question classified as contributing because it was constructed about 1974, well after 1929, and was never individually designated.
- The inventory should be amended to list building in question as non-contributing.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to reclassify the c. 1974 house at 153 N. 4th Street, part of the larger property at 322 Race Street, from contributing to non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 153 N 4TH ST, PART OF THE PROPERTY AT 322 RACE ST
MOTION: Reclassify from contributing to non-contributing
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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST
Name of Resource: Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church and Rectory
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front Street as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The proposed designation includes both the Church of the Immaculate Conception, constructed in 1870-71, and its rectory, the northwestern portion of which was constructed in the early 1880s, and the southeastern portion of which was constructed in 1909. The proposed designation includes two parcels, but the nominated buildings do not fully conform to the boundaries of the parcels. Portions of the rectory stand on both parcels. The nomination contends that the properties

satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. The nomination argues that the church, designed by significant ecclesiastical architect Edwin Forrest Durang, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Lombard Romanesque style, satisfying Criteria D and E. The rectory addition was designed by George I. Lovatt, Sr., also a significant architect with a broad Archdiocesan portfolio, satisfying Criterion E. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the properties represent the development of the Northern Liberties community, which expanded in response to a significant influx of Irish immigrants to Philadelphia in the mid-nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front Street satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J, and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:41:24

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner and took no position on the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The Church of the Immaculate Conception was constructed in 1870-71.
- The northwestern portion of the rectory was constructed in the early 1880s, and the southeastern portion of which was constructed in 1909.
- The church was designed by significant ecclesiastical architect Edwin Forrest Durang.
- The rectory addition was designed by George I. Lovatt, Sr., also a significant architect with a broad Archdiocesan portfolio.
- The properties represent the development of the Northern Liberties community, which expanded in response to a significant influx of Irish immigrants to Philadelphia in the mid-nineteenth century.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The properties satisfy Criterion E as the works of significant architects.
- The properties satisfy Criterion J as representative of the development of the community.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination properties at 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front Street satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST MOTION: Designate, Criteria E, J 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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1045-49 SARAH ST
Name of Resource: Otis Elevator Company Boiler and Engine House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Antal Group Inc.
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1045-29 Sarah Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former boiler and engine house of the Otis Elevator Company, built in 1904, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the property is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works and the Otis Elevator Company. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the building is representative of industrial power plant design of the early twentieth century. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the building is part of the earliest, extent, coherent industrial complexes in Fishtown, but does not propose to designate the complex as a district. Many of the other properties associated with the former Morse and Otis Elevator Companies were individually designated in 2015 and 2016.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1045-49 Sarah Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but not Criterion G.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:43:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

- Owner Gabor Antalics represented the property. He requested that the nomination be remanded to the Committee on Historic Designation at its 19 June 2019 meeting.
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to remand the nomination of 1045-49 Sarah Street to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its 19 June 2019 meeting. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1045-49 SARAH ST **MOTION: Remand to June 2019 CHD meeting** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Mattioni**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 10800 KNIGHTS RD
Name of Resources: Saint Michel/Drexel House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Frankford Hospital
Nominator: Celeste Morello
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of a larger property at 10800 Knights Road, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the 1870 mansion satisfies Criterion for Designation A. The nomination argues that the Addison Hutton-designed mansion is associated with the Drexel family, including Francis A. Drexel and his daughter, Philadelphia's only native-born saint, Katharine Mary Drexel. Saint Katharine Drexel founded the first religious order for Roman Catholic nuns here, known as the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament. Several later additions to the main building are included within the proposed boundary but are considered non-contributing for the purposes of the historic designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:46:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Peter Lamlein, an expert in northeast Philadelphia history, spoke about the history of this area and voiced his support for the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found and concluded that:

- The building is associated with the Drexel family, including Francis A. Drexel and his daughter, Philadelphia's only native-born saint, Katharine Mary Drexel, satisfying Criterion A.
- The mansion was designed by Addison Hutton, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 10800 KNIGHTS RD, SAINT MICHEL/DREXEL HOUSE **MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, E** **MOVED BY: Turner** **SECONDED BY: Cooperman**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 10800 KNIGHTS RD
Name of Resources: Chapel of the True Cross
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Frankford Hospital
Nominator: Celeste Morello
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Chapel of the True Cross, part of a larger property at 10800 Knights Road, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former shrine, opened in 1933 as part of the Drexel Estate, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the shrine is associated with the Drexel family, as it was commissioned by Louise Drexel Morrell, the daughter of Francis A. Drexel, and was intended as a public pilgrimage site for praying over a sacred relic, a piece of the True Cross upon which Jesus Christ died. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the Chapel of the True Cross is the work of architect George I. Lovatt, Sr., who was commissioned to design numerous Catholic churches in Philadelphia and South Central Pennsylvania and who served as Philadelphia's City Architect under Mayors Joseph S. Clark Jr. and Richardson Dilworth.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Chapel of the True Cross, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Chapel of the True Cross, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:52:05

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- Peter Lamlein, an expert in northeast Philadelphia history, spoke about the history of this building and voiced his support for the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- George Lovatt is one of the most prolific ecclesiastical architects and should be recognized as significant.

The Historical Commission concluded that:
- The shrine is associated with the Drexel family, as it was commissioned by Louise Drexel Morrell, the daughter of Francis A. Drexel, and was intended as a public pilgrimage site for praying over a sacred relic, a piece of the True Cross upon which Jesus Christ died, satisfying Criterion A.

- The building is the work of architect George I. Lovatt, Sr., who was commissioned to design numerous Catholic churches in Philadelphia and south-central Pennsylvania, satisfying Criterion E.
- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the emergence of a Modernistic influence on a classical design, satisfying Criterion C.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the Chapel of the True Cross, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 10800 KNIGHTS RD, CHAPEL OF THE TRUE CROSS **MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, E** **MOVED BY: Turner** **SECONDED BY: Lippert**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 173 W BERKS STREET
Name of Resource: Peter Woll & Sons
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Brett S. Freedman and Joanne E. Freedman
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 173 W. Berks Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation G, H, and J.

Under Criteria G and H, the nomination argues the building is part of a significant group of buildings that served as the industrial complex of Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company. Under Criterion J, the nomination that Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company exemplified the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the industrial age in Kensington in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 173 W. Berks Street satisfies Criteria for Designation H and J, but not Criterion G.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 173 W. Berks Street satisfies Criteria for Designation H and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:59:26

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found and concluded that:

- The property is not part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area and does not need to be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif. The property does not satisfy Criterion G.
- The building is significant as part of the industrial complex of Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, representing an established and familiar visual feature of the community, satisfying Criterion H.
- The building is significant due to its connection to the Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, which exemplified the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the industrial age in Kensington in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 173 W. Berks Street satisfies Criteria for Designation H and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Mattioni abstained.

ITEM: 173 W BERKS ST **MOTION: Designate, Criteria H, J** **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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni			x		
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				

Total	10		1		2

ADDRESS: 3819-31 CHESTNUT STREET
Name of Resource: St. Leonard's Court
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3819-31 Chestnut Street, known as St. Leonard's Court, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. According to the nomination, "the former St. Leonard's Academy is a complex of historic structures constructed and/or annexed by the Society of the Holy Child Jesus between 1867 and 1924 for use as a Catholic convent and parochial school." Originally from a prominent Philadelphia family, Cornelia (Peacock) Connelly converted to Catholicism and helped found a new religious order called the Society of the Holy Child Jesus in Derby, England. An American mission was eventually opened in Philadelphia, where Mother Connelly ultimately selected a site at 39th and Chestnut. The nomination suggests that, "As the Academy campus expanded into the twentieth century, it incorporated and preserved a small slice of a Chestnut Street corridor once lined with large and generously-spaced homes constructed in the first decades after the Civil War."

The nomination contends that the campus satisfies Criterion A, owing to its "close association with Connelly and her highly significant educational mission." The nomination also argues that the buildings reflect the post-Civil War environment of West Philadelphia as an intact collection of stately nineteenth-century brownstones, therefore satisfying Criterion C. Finally, under Criterion J, the nomination suggests that the St. Leonard's campus possesses a long history as a "noteworthy civic institution in the community."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 3819-31 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 3819-31 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:01:30

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, and consultant Ben Leech represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- David Traub, Save Our Sites, supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The current property owners have been excellent stewards of the site.
- The buildings of St. Leonard's Court help tell the story of Chestnut Street when it was a grand boulevard.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination supports that St. Leonard's Court satisfies Criterion A due to its association with Cornelia (Peacock) Connelly.
- The nomination demonstrates that the buildings reflect the post-Civil War environment of West Philadelphia as an intact collection of stately nineteenth-century brownstones, therefore satisfying Criterion C.
- The nomination shows that the St. Leonard's campus possesses a long history as a "noteworthy civic institution in the community," therefore satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 3819-31 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 3819-31 CHESTNUT ST **MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, J** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Mattioni**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez, Esq. (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 4100 CHESTNUT STREET
Name of Resource: Philadelphia Passenger Railway Co. Car House & Stable
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 4100 Chestnut Street Partners LP
Nominator: University City Historical Society
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4100 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that the building, originally

constructed as two distinct structures that served the Philadelphia City Passenger Railway Company, represents one of the earliest and most successful passenger railway companies that helped galvanize development in West Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4100 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4100 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:08:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Elizabeth Stegner of the University City Historical Society and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found and concluded that:

- The property housed one of the earliest and most successful passenger railway companies in Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion A.
- The Philadelphia Passenger Railway Company helped galvanize development in West Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the property at 4100 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 4100 CHESTNUT ST **MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, J** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Lippert**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)	x				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1 N 30TH ST
Name of Resource: 30th Street Station Interior
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: AMTRAK
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate portions of the interior of 30th Street Station, located at 1 N. 30th Street, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building's interior satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the public interiors stand as a landmark in the Pennsylvania Railroad's history and its influence on both the development of Philadelphia and its twentieth-century railroad networks. Under Criteria C, D, and E, the nomination contends that the interiors are a major work of the nationally influential firm of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White and are reflective of the firm's mastery of Beaux Arts and Art Deco design principles in the pivotal early decades of Modernism in the United States. The nomination further suggests that 30th Street Station's interiors offer one of the city's most iconic and trafficked public spaces, satisfying Criterion H.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the identified portions of the public interior of 30th Street Station satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination, as amended by Amtrak, demonstrates that portions of 30 Street Station's public interior, located at 1 N. 30th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:11:04

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Johnette Davies of Amtrak represented the property owner.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and consultant Ben Leech represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- Amtrak's comments added to the strength of the nomination and should be appended to the nomination.

The Historical Commission concluded that:
- The interiors represent the Pennsylvania Railroad's history and its influence on both Philadelphia and the company's railroad networks, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The interiors reflect masterful Beaux Arts and Art Deco design principles, satisfying Criteria C and D.

- The interiors are a major work of renowned firm Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, satisfying Criterion E.
- The interiors stand as one of the city's most iconic and trafficked public spaces, satisfying Criterion H.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that portions of 30 Street Station's interior, located at 1 N. 30th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, J, and to designate it as historic, with a Period of Significance to extend from 1933 to 1955 and with amendments to the nomination provided by Amtrak on 6 March 2019, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1 N 30TH ST INTERIOR **MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, D, E, H, J; Period of Significance 1933 to 1955** **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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	11				2

OLD BUSINESS

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."

The nomination classifies the porch as a Colonial Revival feature and cites the portico at the Bourse Building to corroborate the claim; the Bourse Building is clearly not a Colonial Revival building. The nomination cites the pilasters at the porch as Colonial Revival features; they are not uniquely Colonial Revival. The nomination wrongly points to the symmetry of the façade as a Colonial Revival feature; all styles that spring from Classical architecture feature symmetrical main facades. The nomination asserts that the double-hung windows are Colonial Revival features; such windows are not unique to the Colonial Revival but are common to many architectural styles. The nomination cites the "decorative pendants" as Colonial Revival features; they are not typical of the Colonial Revival but are common to many styles based on Classical and Renaissance precedents. The nomination claims that the cornice evidences the Colonial Revival style; the cornice is not Colonial Revival in style. The two features of the building that might rightly be labeled Colonial Revival, the watertable and the dark or glazed headers on the first-floor north façade, are not mentioned in the nomination.

The nomination also claims that the building exhibits distinctive features of the so-called Chicago or Commercial style. However, any such similarities with that so-called style are merely superficial. The nomination acknowledges that the subject building of four stories is not as tall as the six to 20 stories that typify buildings of this style. The nomination claims that the flat roof is evidence that this building is of that style; the flat roof is in no way indicative of this particular style. The nomination claims that the building's masonry walls are indicative of the style; the claim is untenable. The nomination claims that the bays with triple double-hung windows are evidence of the style; Chicago style windows, one of the hallmarks of the style, are not double hungs, but are tripartite windows with a larger fixed central window flanked by two narrower casement windows. The nomination claims that the cornice is evidence of this style; the wide, wood, bracketed cornice is stylistically unrelated to the cornices of Chicago style buildings. The nomination notes that Chicago style buildings have steel skeleton structures and claims that the structural system of this building is unknown; the 1916 Sanborn map indicates that this building has masonry, load-bearing walls, not a steel skeleton, the hallmark of the Chicago style. Finally, the nomination notes that buildings of this style typically include ground-floor storefronts; this building does not.

The building is neither Colonial Revival nor Chicago or Commercial style. It features some aspects of the Italian Renaissance style including the recessed front porch with columns, the broad bracketed eaves, and the cartouches and swags, but it is not a "distinctive" example of the style. At best, it is an unremarkable, vernacular version of the Italian Renaissance style, but more likely should be considered an eclectic assemblage of vaguely Classical motifs. The staff suggests that the building might qualify as a Contributing resource in a historic district but does not rise to the level of meriting individual designation, an assessment that is echoed by a Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey Form for the building.

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 adopt the staff recommendation and 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: 00:00:00 in stand-alone recording

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert and James Duffin represented the nomination.
- Attorneys Matt McClure and David Gest and preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton represented the property owner and opposed the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission will be reviewing three nominations for properties on the same block under common ownership. Two nominations propose to designate portions of the larger property at 204 S. 12th Street. The third proposes to designate the adjacent property at 200 S. 12th Street. He noted that the Historical Commission received some correspondence regarding the nominations overnight. The correspondence received since the close of business yesterday afternoon has not been provided to the Commission because the staff does not have the capacity to receive it, review it, log it, photocopy it, and disseminate it prior to the start of the 9:00 a.m. meeting. He suggested that the Commission consider adopting a rule setting time limits for the submission of materials from the public. He noted that all correspondence received before the close of business yesterday has been distributed to the Commissioners. Mr. Farnham presented the nomination for 200 S. 12th Street to the Historical Commission.
- The Commissioners, nominators, and property owner's attorney discussed the order and manner that the nominations would be reviewed. The nominators stated that they intended to respond to the property owner's presentation. Mr. McClure objected, stating that the owner was not the catalyst for the reviews; the nominators submitted the nominations that initiated the reviews and should be required to present their cases for designation, to which the property owner could respond. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that the burden was on the nominators. Mr. Thomas also decided that the Historical Commission would review the nominations sequentially, not simultaneously, and vote on separate motions for each of the three nominations. He noted, however, that Mr. McClure could make one statement that covers all three nominations. Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission would proceed with the nomination for 200 S. 12th Street.
- Mr. Beisert asked why Mr. McClure's written response to the nominations was not "published online." Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission is under no obligation to provide documents related to reviews on its website. It does so as a courtesy as it has capacity. He noted that none of the documents received in response to these nominations, whether for or against designation, were placed on the website because the staff did not have the capacity to post them online. He noted that none of the documents related to the S. 6th Street application, which will be reviewed next, were placed on the website, also because of capacity limitations. He explained that all documents are available to the public in the Historical Commission's offices. The Commission makes as much as it can available on the website as a courtesy, but it has limitations. If an interested party wants to ensure that he access to all materials, that party has an obligation to contact the Historical Commission and inquire about the submission of new materials.
- Mr. Beisert stated that he had no comments to offer about the merits of the nomination for 200 S. 12th Street.

- Mr. Thomas stated that the nomination may be incomplete because it does not include any information about social history. He asked if the nomination could be updated. Mr. Mattioni responded that retaining jurisdiction over the property while rewriting the nomination would be inappropriate and would violate the property owner's rights. He asserted that the nominator could submit a new nomination and a new review could be held with new notice, but the Historical Commission should not retain jurisdiction while the current nomination is modified. Mr. McClure agreed with Mr. Mattioni, contending that the retention of jurisdiction during a major revision to the nomination, without a finding that the current nomination provides a basis for jurisdiction, would violate his client's rights.
- Mr. McClure introduced Ms. Hamilton, a preservation consultant. Ms. Hamilton stated that the nomination refers to the building as a commercial office building, but, in fact, it was built as a residential building. Ms. Hamilton stated that the building at 200 S. 12th Street is not an example of the so-called Commercial style, as the nomination claims. She showed images of Commercial style buildings and explained why the building in question is not of that style. Ms. Hamilton stated that the building at 200 S. 12th Street is not an example of the Chicago style. She showed images of Chicago style buildings and explained why the building in question is not of that style. Ms. Hamilton stated that the building at 200 S. 12th Street is not an example of the Colonial Revival style. She showed images of Colonial Revival style buildings and explained why the building in question is not of that style. She concluded that the building does not characterize any particular style. It is a vernacular building. She stated that she concurs with the staff recommendation.
- Mr. Duffin stated that this building has been deemed historic within the context of the National Register Historic District and the proposed local Washington Square West Historic District. Mr. McClure responded that those nominations related to designation within the context of historic districts, whereas this is a nomination for individual designation. Buildings eligible for individual designation must be exemplary. This one is not and does not merit individual designation. Ms. Cooperman stated that a vernacular building could exemplify a vernacular building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the building at 200 S. 12th Street is a typical vernacular building of a type that is seen all over the city. It is "very handsome" and should be saved because it could contribute to a future historic district in the area.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia disagreed with the Committee on Historic Designation and asserted that the building reflects the Colonial Revival style and therefore should be designated. He added that the building reflects the neighborhoods conversion from residential to commercial. He stated that it is classified as contributing in the proposed but not implemented Washington Square West Historic District. Ms. Cooperman noted that Jeff Cohen, an architectural historian on the Committee on Historic Designation, had concluded that this building was not an example of the Colonial Revival or Chicago styles. Mr. Thomas added that it may be eligible for inclusion in a historic district but may not be eligible for individual designation.
- Stephen Peitzman stated that the building should be designated regardless of its architectural style.
- Deja Lynn Alvarez identified herself as a member of the LBGTQ community and stated that this area is part of the Gayborhood. She stated that the Camac Baths is

important in gay history. Mr. Thomas observed that the Historical Commission is discussing 200 S. 12th Street, not the Camac Baths. Ms. Alvarez stated that, in addition to the baths, a bar, the 12th Street Gym, and a mural on the block are all important to the LBGTQ community. Mr. Thomas again noted that the gym and mural are not located at the property being discussed.

- Venise Whitaker spoke in favor of designation of the building, owing to its role in her life in the 1990s. She stated that "it is part of me." She explained that she worked as a bartender in the building, would dance on the bar, and was impregnated in the restroom. Mr. Thomas noted that the nomination submitted by the Keeping Society only addresses the building's architectural style, not its social history.
- Gabriel Gottlieb stated that every building on the block has historical significance to the LBGTQ community. He stated that the area is historically significant. He advocated for the designation of a historic district related to the LGBTQ community.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The building does not characterize the Colonial Revival or Chicago styles of architecture.
- The nomination only makes claims about the building's architectural significance; it makes no claims about its social or cultural significance.
- The period of significance proposed in the nomination is 1897 to 1898, which would not include any of the later social and cultural aspects of the neighborhood.

The Historical Commission concluded 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.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find the property at 200 S. 12th Street fails to satisfy any Criteria for Designation and to decline to designate it as historic or list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 0, with three abstentions.

ITEM: 200 S 12TH Street MOTION: Decline to designate MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Trego					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman			x		
Edwards			x		
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)			x		
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	8		3		2

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.

The nomination contends that the building was constructed at some point between 1818 and 1836, was renovated in 1853 and 1854, and the front façade was replaced about 1880. In fact, the front façade of the building was replaced in a different style after the Minton family sold the property to Thomas C. Kelly in 1893.

The building has undergone numerous changes over time and appears to bear little resemblance to the building purchased by Henry Minton in 1853, which was presumably a Greek Revival rowhouse. The original three-story front façade was replaced with a taller step-

gabled façade, by Kelly, a subsequent owner. The nomination claims that front façade was replaced about 1880 but provides no evidence for this assertion. The post-Minton façade was then significantly altered in the late twentieth century. The first floor was rebuilt to accommodate the commercial use, when several adjacent buildings were interconnected. Double glass doors with a metal and glass canopy and large brick stoop were added; the windows were replaced with a small single window; the first floor was clad in metal; and the entire façade was painted. Also during the twentieth century, the building was incorporated into the Camac Baths complex. As it was integrated into the surrounding buildings, the side and rear walls of the house were breached and altered in many significant ways. Today, the house is not a stand-alone building, but is part of the much larger complex. Owing to the alterations at the ends of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the building does not retain its mid nineteenth-century appearance, when Minton occupied it.

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.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:18:00 in stand-alone recording file

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.
- Attorneys Matt McClure and David Gest and historic preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton represented the property owner and opposed the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Duffin asked about the documentation of the reconstruction of the front façade of the building. Mr. Farnham stated that the construction of the new front façade of the building in question is documented by a building permit as well as a newspaper notice about that building permit. The new façade dates to the middle of 1893, about two months after Thomas C. Kelly purchased the property from the Minton family. Mr. Duffin asked if the building permit includes a precise street address. Mr. Farnham stated that it locates the work on the west side of 12th Street south of Walnut Street. He stated that he researched the other buildings on the west side of the block and found that no other façades were reconstructed during this time period. The permit can only refer to the Minton Residence. Mr. Duffin observed that the Historical Commission designated the William & Letitia Still house, which also had a façade constructed after the Stills occupied the house. It was noted that the new façade at the Still House closely mirrored the earlier façade and the building had retained significant historic fabric.

- Mr. Mattioni asked about the changes to the building. Ms. Cooperman explained that the front façade that exists today was constructed in 1893, after the Mintons' ownership. She stated that the only exterior portion of the building that survives from the Minton period is the pitched roof, which has a rear dormer. However, that roof and dormer are not visible from the public right-of-way. She stated that the Committee on Historic Designation struggled with whether the property should be designated based on its association with Minton when very little from the Mintons' occupancy survives. Mr. Mattioni concluded that the major changes to the building have important implications for the discussion. At the request of Ms. Trego, Mr. Farnham clarified that the front façade that exists today was built 10 years after Henry Minton's death and months after the Minton family sold the property. The front façade postdates the Mintons' ownership. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff has struggled with this nomination. Minton is clearly an important person, but the surviving building inside and out has little or no connection to Minton. He stated that he has toured the building and almost nothing of the Minton period survives. The interior has been fully integrated into the surrounding buildings, with walls removed and breached. Mr. Farnham concluded that the Historical Commission must decide whether it should designate a property owing to its relation to someone who is undeniably historically significant when the physical, material artifact, the building, has little or nothing to do with the historical figure. Mr. Mattioni asked how the Historical Commission would regulate the building if the building has nothing to do with the Mintons. He suggested that alteration and even demolition of the building should be allowed because the building has no relationship to the Mintons, only the site does. He stated that the Historical Commission has an obligation to the property owner to explain how it will review subsequent building permit applications if it designates the property. Mr. Thomas stated that the history is not tied to the structure.
- Mr. Beisert stated that the volume of the main block survives. He noted that the front windows are in the same location.
- Mr. McClure questioned the timing of the nominations. All three nominations were filed at the same time by the same nominator for buildings owned by the same entity. Mr. McClure stated that he called Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance after being retained to discuss the bases for these three nominations for the same assemblage. Mr. Steinke told Mr. McClure that near neighbors have had a concern for more than one year that the Midwood, the owner, was going to develop a high-rise. Mr. Steinke indicated that the real motivation behind the nominations was to prevent the development. Mr. Steinke also told Mr. McClure that Mr. Beisert is concerned about Camac Street and is attempting to create a de facto historic district to protect Camac Street. Mr. McClure stated that he confirmed Mr. Steinke's assertion with Mr. Beisert, that the goal of the nominations was to protect Camac Street. Mr. McClure stated that, as someone who cares very deeply about historic preservation in Philadelphia, he is very troubled by these nominations. "These three nominations intend to use the preservation ordinance, we believe, as a sword, as opposed to a shield." He objected to Mr. Steinke's suggestion that the Commission could designate and then identify an appropriate means of commemoration in the future. He stated that the Historical Commission regulates "bricks and sticks" and the preservation ordinance does not provide any wiggle room to allow for alternate regulatory solutions. If these bricks and sticks do not tell the cultural story, they should not be designated. He explained that the interior of the building has been greatly altered to internally connect it with the surrounding buildings. Its side and rear walls have been breached and removed. Mr. McClure stated that his client

purchased the assemblage of buildings with no expectation that they would ever be nominated or regulated for preservation. Designating any of these buildings would have an adverse effect on investment in the city and would be fundamentally unfair to his client. There is no way that the owner of this property could ever expect that the property would be nominated. If this type of nomination is accepted, it will compel every developer to obtain a demolition permit as soon as he or she buys a property. Mr. McClure stated that he is not minimizing the importance of Henry Minton. He stated that there is no nexus between the physical building, the bricks and sticks, and Henry Minton. He asked the Commission to consider the staff's recommendation.

- Ms. Hamilton, the preservation consultant, discussed her report on the property. She stated that the building has been altered beyond recognition since the Mintons' ownership. She stated that nothing at the property that can be seen from the public right-of-way is associated with Henry Minton. Ms. Hamilton showed the building permit for the replacement of the front façade in 1893. She stated that the building has been extensively altered since 1893. She listed the alterations. She stated that, to merit designation, the building must have integrity. This building does not have sufficient integrity to convey the Minton significance. A historical contemporary of Minton would not recognize this property. Unlike the Marian Anderson House, there is no direct link here between the historical figure and the building. She stated that the Minton House should not be designated because there is no direct link here between the historical figure and the building.
- Mr. Duffin stated that he and other citizen preservationists file nominations because developers will not negotiate with them unless they have the leverage of a nomination. Without a nomination, they cannot compel developers to negotiate with them. He stated that they have been forced into this position. He observed that they must use these tactics to get developers to the table to negotiate.
- Mr. Beisert stated that his goal is preservation. He stated that he began working on the nominations to protect Chancellor and Camac Streets, but then learned more. He stated that he was willing to negotiate with the developer. He stated that he could have nominated a district, but it would have been pointless because it would not have been reviewed quickly enough.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Dayna Pilgrim identified herself as a student at Yale University writing on Philadelphia caterers. She stated that she is studying the Mintons. She distributed copies of emails and letters. Mr. McClure objected to the introduction of new material at this point in the process. Ms. Pilgrim stated that she and the authors of the emails and letters contend that this building is historically significant because of its association with Henry Minton and his family.
- Faye Anderson of All That Philly Jazz and Avenging the Ancestors Coalition stated that she supports the designation of the property, owing to its association with Henry Minton as described by W.E.B. Du Bois. She stated that the history of this site is not about "bricks and mortar." It satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Minton Residence is listed as contributing in the East Center City National Register Historic District and in the proposed local register Washington Square West Historic District. It was pointed out that neither district inventory attributes the significance of the building to the Mintons, who are not mentioned in the inventories. Mr. Steinke spoke of the site of the residence of Octavius Catto, which is designated as historic, and suggested that it

could serve as a model in this case. Mr. Farnham observed that the Catto site was designated as a piece of ground, what the ordinance refers to as a site. The Historical Commission later permitted the demolition of the building that stood on the Catto site at the time of designation because the building had nothing to do with Catto. The Commission then allowed a new building to be constructed. Mr. Steinke suggested that, if the Minton site is designated, the building could be demolished as long as the developer commemorated the Minton history with the new construction.

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that this building would be handsome if renovated. He described several buildings in the area. Mr. Thomas asked him to limit his thoughts to this building and nomination. Mr. Traub continued to talk about a group of buildings as a potential district. Mr. Mattioni asked him to focus his thoughts on this property and nomination. He continued to describe the buildings in the image being projected on the screen. Mr. Thomas declared that he was out of order. Mr. Traub continued to speak.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- Henry Minton is a significant figure in Philadelphia's history.
- The building at 204 S. 12th Street has been so altered since the Minton family's ownership that it is no longer able to convey the Mintons' significance. The front façade was replaced in 1893. The interior and exterior of the building was repeatedly altered in the twentieth century to accommodate the Camac Baths and Twelfth Street Gym.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the Minton Residence fails to satisfy any Criteria for Designation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the Minton Residence fails to satisfy any Criteria for Designation and to decline to designate it as historic or list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 0, with three abstentions.

ITEM: 204 S 12TH Street, Minton Residence MOTION: Decline to designate MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Trego					
VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman	x				
Edwards			x		
Hartner (DPP)	x				
Lippert (L&I)			x		
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)		x			
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	8	1	2		2

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.

The nomination proposes that the three structures in question should be designated as historic for their histories as club buildings and a bathhouse. None of the three buildings was built to serve those purposes identified for commemoration. The so-called 1907 building was

constructed as a light manufacturing or warehouse building in 1905 and then converted to provide support services for two nearby residential hotels in 1910 before being converted to a bathhouse in 1928. Since serving as a bathhouse, an overbuild was added and the building has been used as a gym and offices.

The non-descript building at 1204-06 Chancellor Street began life in the first half of the nineteenth century as a two-story store and was used for various commercial and office purposes. It served for a short time as the T-Square Club, an architect's club, from 1897 to 1914, when the club moved to permanent quarters on Quince Street. As an aside, the Quince Street T-Square Club building is designated as historic. The building on Chancellor was then used as offices and a tailor's shop before being incorporated into the adjacent bathhouse in 1938. The exterior has been altered extensively. It has lost all features that identify it as a former clubhouse.

The non-descript building at 201-03 S. Camac Street began life in the first half of the nineteenth century as a row of small court houses at 201 and a larger rowhouse or stable at 203. The houses were significantly altered to create one building that housed the Stragglers Club in 1912. The party walls and roofs were removed, new window openings were created, and a large rear addition was constructed at that time. The club appears to have vacated the building about 1920, after about eight years of service as a club. By 1925, it was being used as a beauty parlor. It was incorporated into the bathhouse in 1942. The exterior has been altered extensively. It has lost all features that identify it as a former clubhouse.

Several other structures on the block were also incorporated into the bathhouse over time, but those structures are not proposed for inclusion in this nomination. The nomination states that:

> By 1959, it appears that an entrance to the Camac Baths existed on S. Twelfth Street, and while that section of the building may have significance, it no longer has sufficient integrity to convey that significance as shown in the photographs from 1959, the 1970s, and 2018.

Wrongly identifying the buildings at 1206, 1208, and 1210 S. 12th Street (they are actually 206, 208, and 210), the nomination also states that:

> The Camac Baths would again be enlarged in the 1950s with a mid-century building being added at 1206 and 1208 S. Twelfth Street. A photograph from 1959 shows this addition, which was later expanded to the corner, subsuming the property at 1210 S. Twelfth Street. However, as stated in the physical description, only the earlier portions of this complex are subject to the proposed designation due to the physical changes of the façade of the building at the northwest corner of S. Twelfth and St. James Streets.

While the nomination claims that the bathhouse structures on 12th Street do not retain sufficient integrity to be included in the nomination, it nonetheless proposes the designations of the other bathhouse structures, even though they also suffer from a lack of integrity. The three structures proposed for designation under this nomination have also been significantly altered and retain little if any integrity. Their alterations include infilled openings, new openings, replacement doors and windows, glass block, stucco, fire escapes, mechanical equipment, additions, partial demolitions, Zagar murals, and other changes. The three structures included in the nomination, which were not purpose built as either a bathhouse or clubhouses, have lost any historic character and integrity they may have had from their many unsympathetic alterations. Owing to their lack of integrity, they fail to inform the public of any historical significance they may have had and therefore fail to qualify for designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR CAMAC BATHS: 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.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:24:09

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.
- Attorneys Matt McClure and David Gest and preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton represented the property owner and opposed the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas advised the audience that the Historical Commission is considering a nomination proposing individual designation. It is not considering the historic value of Camac and Chancellor Streets, even if the alley streets are important. It is also not considering a historic district, even if Washington Square West and the Gayborhood could be historic districts. He asked everyone in the audience to focus on the matter at hand and restrict their comments to that matter.
- Mr. Beisert stated that the bath house catered to a Jewish clientele and also accepted gay and bisexual men. He stated that this site is historically significant and should be preserved because it was a gathering space for marginalized communities. He pointed to letters of support of the designation. Mr. McClure objected to the submission of the letters, contending that nominators "choreographed" them and they were provided late, less than seven days before the meeting. He stated that the nominators must follow the rules for his client to receive due process.
- Mr. Beisert showed a series of images of the building as a Powerpoint presentation. He claimed that the building is Arts & Crafts or Mission in style. He stated that the building looks "pretty much the same" today as it did in the 1930s. He stated that the building is listed as contributing in the National Register Historic District. He stated that the adjunct buildings are "ugly," but are part of the baths. He showed an image of the Stonewall Inn in New York City and noted the similar appearance. He showed images of gay bars in Washington DC that have been surveyed. He highlighted letters from the civic association urging designation of the building to stop its demolition for a parking lot in the 1980s. He showed photographs of the interior of the building. He explained that "one of the motives for this nomination is that it is part of a distinctive area."
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the building appears as it did during the period of significance from the street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mark Sandberg stated that he is Jewish and his aunt went to the Camac Baths every week for a schvitz.
- David Traub noted the Isaiah Zagar mural. He stated that this nomination is not designed to protect a specific building but is instead designed to protect an area, a streetscape containing an assemblage of buildings. This nomination is not about the Camac Baths but is about protecting Camac Street as a district or area. The

Historical Commission should designate the Camac Baths to protect the area surrounding it, the attractive streetscape.

- Josh Yeager introduced himself as a resident of North Kensington and a member of the LGBT community. He stated that the building should not be demolished and the site should not be redeveloped.
- David Campbell stated that it is difficult to do research on gay bathhouses because of their clandestine nature. He asked the Historical Commission to take that into account.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that Camac Street is the "Little Street of Clubs" and the Camac Baths was a club. Mr. Steinke stated that the William Way Center was located in the building. He stated that his organization concurs with the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation to only designate the taller, corner building, not the T-Square and Stragglers Club buildings.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure asked for an opportunity to present his expert, who would comment on the merits of the nomination. Mr. Thomas told him that time had run out and he wanted to entertain a motion on the nomination. Mr. McClure requested that his client, the property owner, have an opportunity to address the nomination. Mr. Thomas told him that he had two minutes to present his case. He explained that the Historical Commission has a full calendar and another matter to consider. Mr. McClure asked for equal time with the supporters of the nomination.
- Mr. McClure stated that his client does not dispute the significance of the history of the LGBTQ community. He stated that his client acknowledges that that community has been discriminated against in every possible way. He stated that his client is very sensitive to these issues. He acknowledged that other cities have done a better job protecting its LGBTQ history than Philadelphia. He stated that, nonetheless, the Historical Commission must remember its task today, to decide whether there is a basis for regulating a particular set of "bricks and sticks." He stated that his expert has serious concerns about many of the factual assertions put forth in the nomination. He observed that Philadelphia does not have a comprehensive survey of historic resources and therefore cannot place this site in context. He observed that other cities have such surveys and he held up the LGBTQ historic context statement from the City of Los Angeles. He noted that New York has one as well. Mr. Thomas, the chair, stated that the Historical Commission does not have time to hear from Mr. McClure because it needs to move on to other matters. Mr. McClure stated that his client is offering to fund an LGBTQ historic survey for Philadelphia. Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission does not have the time to consider the proposal to fund a survey. Mr. McClure requested an opportunity for his expert to speak on the merits of the nomination. Mr. Thomas responded that the Historical Commission does not have sufficient time to hear from the consultant. Mr. Reuter advised the chair that the property owner should have an opportunity to present his expert to speak about the report she prepared. Mr. Thomas stated that the attorney already had an opportunity to present his case when the Historical Commission considered the two earlier nominations. Mr. Reuter stated that the property owner must be given a full opportunity to address the factual aspects of the Camac Baths nomination. The supporters of the nomination were given time to speak without limit. Mr. Reuter stated that it must be clear in the record that the Commissioners considered the factual claims about the nomination made by the property owner. He

stated that the Historical Commission cannot deny the property owner a right to participate because the meeting is running long. Mr. Lippert asked why the members of the public were able to speak without limitation while the property owner was limited to two minutes.

- Mr. McClure introduced his expert. She stated that she has toured all of the buildings in question. She stated that the interior of the corner building is significantly altered and is consistent with the interiors of office buildings. She stated that the T-Square and Stragglers Club buildings have been altered beyond recognition from their club appearances. The buildings do not retain any integrity. She stated that she reviewed the building permit for the bathhouse renovation in the late 1920s. The total cost of the work was minimal. Little was done to convert this building from a powerhouse to a bathhouse. The renovation was minor in scope. She stated that the bathhouse uses were not limited to the building at the corner, but were spread out over several buildings, some of which were not proposed for designation. She stated that there is no "rigorous" documentation to support the claim that the building was used in any significant way by the gay community. She stated that the corner building has been significantly altered since its conversion to a bathhouse. She stated that the bathhouse was widely advertised as a baths and spa. She stated that there were large blade signs for the bathhouse on Walnut and 12th Streets. The building was not hidden away; it was widely advertised in publications and with large signs. Ms. Hamilton stated that the baths were used by the Jewish community but did not have a specific religious function. The bathhouse was used by the general community, not specifically the Jewish or gay communities. Ms. Hamilton stated that she consulted Derek Duquette's work on LGBTQ history in Philadelphia called "Red, Green, and Blue," which catalogued Philadelphia's LGBTQ places. His graduate thesis lists 58 sites that are important to LGBTQ history in Philadelphia. The Camac Baths is not mentioned anywhere in the study; it is not one of the 58 places listed as being significant. Ms. Hamilton concluded that the Camac Baths does not merit historic designation. The nomination does not document any historical significance. Ms. Hamilton stated that she has reviewed the proposed Washington Square West Historic District, which was prepared by the Preservation Alliance and which cites the area's LGBTQ history as part of the area's significance. She stated that the building housing the Camac Baths is not noted in the nomination for its significance to the LGBTQ community. She stated that the history of the site could be commemorated in many reasonable ways such as a marker or booklet, but designation is not appropriate. She concluded that the developer's offer to fund a study of LGBTQ historic sites in the city would allow the Historical Commission to accurately identify such sites.
- Mr. Duffin asked to speak. Mr. Thomas allowed him to address the Historical Commission. Others objected. Mr. Duffin asked why Ms. Hamilton spoke about the interior when the Historical Commission designates exteriors. He also questioned her interpretation of advertisements for the Camac Baths. He asserted that the baths catered to a Jewish clientele. Mr. McClure disputed his assessment of their testimony and noted that the baths were advertised in periodicals targeted at the Jewish community and at the general community.
- Mr. Beisert stated that he worked with Mr. Duquette on his thesis and explained that the Camac Baths did not appear on his list of Philadelphia's LGBTQ historic sites "because it was not ever known as a gay bath."
- After the Commissioners discussed designating the so-called 1907 Building but not the T-Square and Stragglers Club buildings, Mr. McClure pointed out that many of

the spaces that housed the activities that the nomination claims were significant occurred outside the 1907 Building, in other structures in the complex, some of which are proposed for designation and some of which are not. He observed that it would be misguided to designate the 1907 Building based on activities that never occurred in that building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Thomas recognized Venise Whitaker, who stated that "gay bashing is existing every day. When you see someone get beat because of their sexual choice or race, it's unbelievable." She asked the Historical Commission to designate this building as historic. She stated that members of the LGBT community are voters and they deserve this designation. She asked the Historical Commission to give them this designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the 1907 Building of the Camac Baths is capable of conveying the historical significance of the bathhouse.
- The portions of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the T-Square and Stragglers Club buildings are significantly altered and therefore incapable of conveying any historical significance.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the 1907 Building of the Camac Baths satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J.
- The portions of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the T-Square and Stragglers Club buildings do not satisfy any of the Criteria for Designation.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street known as the 1907 Building of the Camac Baths satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 4.

ITEM: 204 S 12TH Street, Camac Baths, 1907 Building only MOTION: Designate, Criteria for Designation A, G, and J 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				
Dodds (DHCD)		x			
Mattioni		x			
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)	x				
Trego (PCPC)		x			
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington	x				
Total	7	4			2

Commissioners Sanchez and Washington excused themselves from the meeting.

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 wing 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 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 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: 00:00:00 in a separate recording file

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorneys Al Fuscaldo and Philip Rosenzweig, architect David Ertz, consultant Craig Schelter, and property owner John Turchi represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Rosenzweig informed the Historical Commission that he spoke with Steve Masters, one of the attorneys representing the objectors, and was told that Mr. Masters would not be attending today's meeting.
- Mr. Fuscaldo stated that he believes that the Commonwealth Court decision in the Turchi cases is dispositive with regard to the question of whether the proposed removal of the rear wing is a demolition or alteration in the eyes of the preservation ordinance; it is an alteration, not a demolition. He stated that the project has obtained its zoning and use permit, which is a by-right permit. The Art Commission has given its preliminary approval and will likely grant final approval next month. He stated that

the changes to the historic building are almost identical to those that were approved in 2007. One slight deviation is the way in which the new building attaches to the rear wall of the main block of the historic building. He explained the revision to the plan, which will be completely hidden from the public right-of-way. He stated that any argument that the current proposal differs in any meaningful way from the earlier approved proposal with regard to the alterations and removals from the historic building is a "red herring."

- Mr. Ertz, the architect, described the proposed architectural plans as well as the site and its context. He pointed out photographs of the site and its context. He walked the Commissioners through the architectural plans, explaining his design decisions. He discussed the proposed materials. He explained that the tower will not be visible from the sidewalk in front of the house. He showed drawings of the proposed alterations to the historic building including the removal of the rear wing. He stated that it is almost identical to the extent of the removal approved in 2007. He explained the slight deviation from the 2007 plan regarding the rear of the main block of the historic house. He showed a drawing that indicated where the current project deviates from the 2007 project. He noted that they will not remove the gate as originally proposed. He noted that rear windows proposed for removal can be encapsulated in place. He displayed plans for every floor and discussed them. The first floor of the historic house will be used as common space. The upper floors of the historic house will be used as a residential unit. Mr. Ertz distributed a new rendering showing the building at night. Mr. Ertz displayed materials samples including the zinc panels and window materials. He showed glass samples. He stated that they will repair the party wall with the Athenaeum. He explained that, unlike the earlier approved proposal, this building will stand eight feet off the Lippincott Building and will not block their windows. The current plan includes a tower that is much shorter than and set back farther from 6th Street than the 2007 approved proposal. The tower is designed to recede. Mr. Ertz stated that the tower is shorter than or about the height of the shorter tall buildings on Washington Square. He asserted that his building is related to the buildings around it. Mr. Ertz explained that the finishes and details on the rear wing that is proposed for removal are not as nice as those of the main block that is proposed for retention. The rear wing is faced in stucco and recessed. It is not a primary element of the historic building like the main block.
- Mr. Schelter introduced himself and detailed his credentials as a planning and preservation expert. He provided numerous examples of his experience with major historic preservation projects. Mr. Schelter stated that, in his expert opinion, the house is important for its association with Mayor Dilworth, who undertook numerous important projects related to the redevelopment of Society Hill. Mr. Schelter stated that the design of the proposed building, including the removal of the rear wings, maintains the important aspects of the historic house and does not detract from its character. He stated that the proposed tower is appropriately scaled. He stated that the rear wing is not historically significant; the important or primary part of the house is the main block, especially the front elevation. He stated that the scale, massing, and the materials of the proposed addition are appropriate in his opinion. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that he especially appreciates the fact that all floors of the main block with be occupied.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the architect Edwin Brumbaugh was a designer of new buildings; he was not only a preservationist. She stated that, all things being equal, without the regulatory and judicial history of this project, she would argue that the rear wing is a character-defining feature of the building. She noted, however, that the history of decisions regarding this project must be factored into the decision. She

also acknowledged that this is a site that "has been begging for redevelopment for a long, long time." She also wondered whether there may be a need for archaeology in the rear yard. She noted that the inventory for the historic district does not indicate that this site has archaeological potential. She stated that, despite those factors, she believes that there is a compromise position that will allow this project to move forward. She stated that the developer should consider saving the front façade of the side wing facing 6th Street and incorporate it into the entrance to the residential mid-rise building. The presence of the side wing on the street should be preserved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Richard DiMarco, an attorney representing the Society Hill Civic Association, introduced himself. He stated that Steve Masters, one of the attorneys representing one the objectors, Independence Place, joins in with the testimony of the Society Hill Civic Association. At Mr. Reuter's request, Mr. DeMarco stated that he is not replacing Mr. Masters or representing Independence Place.
- Paul Boni, the chair of the zoning and historic preservation committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, introduced himself. He submitted a set of photographs of the property taken from the public right-of-way and noted that the label on them was incorrect. He stated that the Historical Commission should consider this application anew and should not simply adopt the earlier decisions of 2006 and 2007. Mr. Fuscaldo objected and asked whether Mr. Boni was serving as a fact witness or an attorney. He noted that his testimony appears to be legal argument. Mr. Boni objected to the way in which the Architectural Committee's decision was recorded in the Architectural Committee's minutes. He asserted that the Committee did not make findings or reach conclusions. Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission changed the format of its minutes a few months ago. The Architectural Committee's minutes to which Mr. Boni objects are in the new format. Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Boni has not appeared before the Historical Commission recently and may not be familiar with the new format. Mr. Farnham asserted that the Committee had agreed with the staff that the removal of the rear wing was an alteration, not a demolition. He noted that the same set of Architectural Committee minutes was presented at the last Historical Commission meeting and neither the Commissioners nor Mr. Boni objected to it at that time. Mr. Farnham then explained that, in response to Mr. DeMarco's letter, he sent the letter along with the Architectural Committee's minutes to the chair of the Architectural Committee, Dan McCoubrey, who could not attend today's meeting, and asked him to comment on the claims made in the letter. Mr. Farnham read Mr. McCoubrey's email response into the record, which rejected the letter's claims and stated that the minutes accurately reflect the findings and conclusions of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, addressed the Historical Commission to offer his legal opinion on the Commonwealth Court's decisions regarding the 2006 and 2007 decisions about the demolition vs. alteration matter. Mr. Reuter read from the Turchi II decision regarding the demolition-alteration question. He advised that, if the Historical Commission now decides that the removal of the rear wing is a demolition, not an alteration, that decision must be based on facts that are substantially different now from the facts in the case in 2007. Mr. Boni objected. Mr. Boni discussed the review of a 2003 application for constructing a new rear wing on the building, which the Historical Commission approved with conditions. He submitted paperwork related to the review. He stated that the later decisions in 2006 and 2007 were not reconcilable with the 2003 decision. He concluded that the earlier decisions should not dictate today's decision. Mr. Boni asked that the Historical Commission incorporate

materials that he submitted during an earlier 2005 review into today's record. Mr. Fuscaldo objected, stating that they were not submitted during the 2006 and 2007 reviews related to new construction, but were instead submitted in 2005 during an aborted request to reclassify the project as non-contributing. He stated that they have nothing to do with today's project and should be rejected. Mr. Boni stated that they show that the architect of the Dilworth House is important. He added that he also submitted numerous newspaper articles dating from the 1950s to the 1970s that show that Dilworth and the house are important. Ms. Edwards stated that no one is disputing that the house and former Mayor are important. She asked Mr. Boni to get to his point. He responded that he believes that the removal of the rear wing is a demolition in the legal sense; the house is not a house without the rear wing. Also, the proposed addition is not "proper."

- Bob Powers introduced himself as a historic preservation consultant. He showed photographs of the house. Mr. Powers discussed his letter of 6 March 2019, which restated his conclusions proffered in his 25 July 2005 report on the proposal to reclassify the site in the Society Hill Historic District inventory. He discussed the reclassification attempt in 2005 and noted that he opposed it at the time. He stated that the Historical Commission confirmed that the building is significant. He stated that one must consider the entire building as significant, not parts of it. It is all significant. He showed more photographs of the building. He stated that every part of the building is a key component; every aspect of the building is significant. Nothing should be removed. He showed plans of the building and pointed out the original interior uses. He discussed the uses of the areas proposed for removal. He stated that he would not discuss whether the proposed removal is an alteration or demolition in the legal sense. He stated that he does not care whether it is an alteration or demolition. He stated that the removals are not appropriate. He stated that this proposal fails to meet Standards 2, 5, and 9. He stated that the addition fails to meet the National Park Service's guidance. He added that the Historical Commission should require an archaeological study of the foundations of the Walnut Street Prison.
- Mr. DeMarco stated that the Historical Commission is about to make an error law by refusing to overturn the 2007 decision. He stated that the Historical Commission must review this application anew and not simply rely on the 2007 decision. He informed the Historical Commission that it could reject its earlier decision and deny this application. Mr. Thomas agreed that the Commission must review anew and stated that the Historical Commission would consider the current set of facts and the current application before rendering a decision. Mr. Reuter stated that Mr. DeMarco is conflating two issues. The Historical Commission is free to review this application anew and approve or deny it. The Historical Commission is, however, somewhat restrained by the Turchi II decision with regard to the very specific question of whether the proposed removal of the rear wing would constitute an alteration or demolition in the legal sense. The Historical Commission is free to review the new application on its merits. Mr. DeMarco stated that the Historical Commission should look at both the 2003 and 2007 decisions. He stated that the Historical Commission cannot be "slaves to prior decisions." Mr. Thomas asked Mr. DeMarco to stop haranguing the Historical Commission; the Commission is reviewing the current application based on its merits. Mr. DeMarco apologized and asked the Historical Commission to deny the application.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that his preservation organization supports this project. He stated that the design represents a good balance between preservation and development. He stated that this plan should serve as a model for similar

preservation problems that arise in the city. This approach could have been used to save the historic buildings of Rindelaub's Row near 18th and Walnut Street. It could have been used to save the Bair Funeral Home on the 1900 block of Sansom Street. It could also be applied to Jewelers' Row. He stated that this proposal saves the significant portion of the Dilworth House. The mid-rise addition is set back far from 6th Street. He made suggestions for minor revisions to the project but concluded that this proposal preserves the important streetscape along 6th Street. He applauded the project and suggested that the Historical Commission approve it.

- Doug Seiler introduced himself as an architect who specializes in the reuse of older buildings. He stated that his architectural office in Norristown is located in a building designed by Edwin Brumbaugh. Mr. Seiler asked the Historical Commission to deny the application because it is incomplete. He stated that there are some "nagging details" that need to be worked out. He stated that he is not opposed to the concept but is concerned that some of the details may not be resolved correctly. He stated that the street façade of the rear wing should be preserved, according to Standard 2. The front wall of the rear wing should be retained. He stated that he is glad that the gate is being retained. He stated that the connector between the house and the new tower should be refined to retain all of the rear cornice. Mr. Seiler objected to the zinc panels. He suggested that the application should be revised. He stated that the project has improved significantly over the earlier projects. He suggested some refinements to the tower in terms of the general proportions. He stated that it should relate better to the historic house. Mr. Fuscaldo asked Mr. Seiler where he lives and works. Mr. Seiler responded that he lives in Blue Bell, Pennsylvania and works in Norristown, Pennsylvania. Mr. Fuscaldo stated that he would like to preserve for the record that he objects to Mr. Seiler's testimony because he does not have standing.
- Mr. Schelter disagreed with the testimony of Mr. Powers and Mr. Seiler and asserted that the proposed project will satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The character-defining features of the historic building will be preserved and the new construction will be compatible with the property and historic district. He added that the Historical Commission's staff will review all details.
- Mr. Fuscaldo offered concluding remarks. He stated that he agrees with Mr. DeMarco that the Historical Commission should review the application on its merits. He stated that no one has offered any evidence to refute the assertion that the removal of the rear wing is an alteration, not a demolition. He stated that the application should be approved.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- 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.
- The rear wing of the building is not historically significant, character-defining, or an essential section of the historic building
- The Historical Commission determined in 2007 and the Commonwealth Court agreed on appeal that the removal of the rear wing 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.
- The current application proposes to remove the rear 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 staff can review all restoration details for the historic house to ensure that the work complies with Standard 6.
- The Historical Commission 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 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.
- The Historical Commission 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 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.
- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of the rear wing will not result in the removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.
- Despite the removal of the rear wing, distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- 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 application satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation including Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, 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. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 3.

ITEM: 223-25 S 6TH ST
MOTION: Approval
MOVED BY: Trego
SECONDED BY: Edwards

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Yes**	**No**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Thomas, Chair	x				
Cooperman		x			
Edwards	x				
Hartner (DPP)		x			
Lippert (L&I)		x			
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)					x
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington					x
Total	6	3			4

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:05:47

ACTION: At 5:03 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: To adjourn 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				
Dodds (DHCD)	x				
Mattioni	x				
McCoubrey					x
Sánchez (Council)					x
Trego (PCPC)	x				
Stanford (Commerce)					x
Turner, Vice Chair	x				
Washington					x
Total	9				4

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."