

**THE MINUTES OF THE 684TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 AUGUST 2019
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BETTY TURNER, ACTING CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:01:36

Ms. Turner, the acting chair, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined her:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair		X	
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Mark Dodds (Division of Housing & Community Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X		Arrived 9:11 am
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	X		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	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:

- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Kelsey Sturdivant
- Parris Sturdivant
- Doug Fogie
- Allison Neff
- Sam Ginsberg
- Ian Smith
- Tim Weglicki

Carrie Nase, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Michael P. Creedon, Esq., Creedon Feliciani
Pastor John Sweet, Frankford Presbyterian Church
Khyle Baxter
Jack Tomczek
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
R. Tookes
A. Tookes
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermeyer
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kevin Kaminski, Kaminski + Pew
Whitney Joslin, Kaminski + Pew
Adam Lane
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joseph Pecora, Esq.
Idris Haynes
Mary McGettigan
J.M. Duffin
Lawrence Solomon
Celeste Morello
Tim Kane
Paul Boni, Esq.
Glenn Kucher

DRAFT

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 683RD STATED MEETING, 12 JULY 2019

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:03:52

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Turner asked the Commissioners for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting, the 683rd Stated Meeting, held 12 July 2019. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the minutes of the 683rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 June 2019. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 683rd Stated Meeting					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards					X
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	10				3

STATUS UPDATE ON CONTINUANCE

JEWELERS’ ROW HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: During the 8 March 2019 Historical Commission meeting, the property owners’ within the proposed Jewelers’ Row Historic District requested that the nomination review be continued to a future Committee on Historic Designation meeting. The property owners’ asked for the additional time to consult with an architectural historian and have the historian prepare a report in response to the nomination. The continuance was granted by the Historical Commission with the agreement that the property owners’ representative, Michael Phillips, would provide a status update at the August 2019 meeting.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:04:55

PRESENTERS:

- Attorney Michael Phillips representing the majority of the property owners in the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips provided a status update on the report that the property owners will be presenting in the future. He explained that architectural historian George Thomas is serving as the property owners' historical expert. Mr. Phillips noted that Mr. Thomas has advised him that the response report will be ready in October or November. He stated that he would like to update the Historical Commission in October on the status of the report. Mr. Phillips noted that there will be no prejudice whatsoever, in so far that all the properties remain subject to the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the pendency of the nomination.
- Mr. Steinke stated he has no fundamental objections to the timeframe that Mr. Phillips presented, although it is longer than they expected. He recalled that the continuance was granted back in April or May to this month for a status update. Mr. Steinke added that Mr. Phillips is correct that the nomination still holds on the proposed district, and therefore the Alliance will not object.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that if they were to schedule it for the December Committee on Historic Designation (CHD) meeting, the nomination could always be continued if appropriate. She pointed out that at least then the nomination would be on a schedule. Mr. Cooperman added that at this point the agendas for the next two CHD meetings are fairly full.
- Mr. Phillips stated that he could provide a status update in a letter for the October 2019 Historical Commission meeting rather than taking up the Commission's time at a meeting. He noted that he would provide a timeline at that time. Mr. Phillips added that he would have liked to have seen this progress more quickly as well, but Mr. Thomas spends his summers traveling back and forth and has a busy schedule. Mr. Phillips noted that Mr. Thomas is working on the report and it is a complex project with 57 properties. He observed that he does not fundamentally object to placing it on the agenda for December but asked if the Commission could hold off on doing that until October. Mr. Phillips added that the property owners have an interest in moving this process along as well.
- Ms. Trego asked if the comments of Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Phillips conflicted. She asked if the nomination review is placed on the CHD December agenda and then Mr. Phillips reports they need more time, whether it could be moved to a future CHD agenda.
 - Ms. Cooperman and Ms. Turner stated they do not conflict and this can be done.

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for the Jewelers' Row Historic District and remand it to the 5 December 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, with a status update to be provided at the 11 October 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Status update on continuance					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Trego					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards					X
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	10				3

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2019

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:11:50

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Turner asked the Commissioners for comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Attorney Joseph Pecora, representing the potential conservator in the case of 1512-16 N. Broad Street, asked if the Commission could approve the submission for 1512-16 N. Broad Street but require that the court supervise the work. He said that his client has concerns about the applicant's ability to undertake the proposed work in a timely fashion. Mr. Mattioni responded that the Historical Commission could not require the court to supervise the work. Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, provided background on Act 135, the conservatorship law. Attorney Alex Sokolow, representing the applicants for 1512-16 N. Broad Street, opined that requiring court supervision was beyond the scope of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 1512-16 N. Broad Street, 325 S. 2nd Street, 505-09 S. 9th

Street, 228 Monroe Street, and 2309 St. Albans Street. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA					
MOTION: Adopt the Consent Agenda for 1512-16 N Broad St, 325 S 2nd St, 505-09 S 9th St, 228 Monroe St, and 2309 St Albans St					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	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: 1512-16 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Demolish fire-damaged rear; brace and make safe front of building
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: The Original Apostolic Faith Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, Inc.
 Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio
 History: 1933; Levin Funeral Home; Edwin Rothschild, architect
 Individual Designation: 11/27/1985
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The application proposes to demolish a fire-damaged rear ell, seal the building at the resulting opening, reconstruct a parapet, and seal window openings. The front, three-story portion of the building as well as rear garage will be retained. The damaged decorative parapet at the front of the building will be rebuilt using original materials. The applicant proposes to remove the front windows and temporarily seal the openings.

The building suffered from a fire on 29 March 2018. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations and partially demolished the middle section of the building. An engineering report has been submitted to document the condition of the middle section of the building proposed for demolition. The Commission reviewed a previous application to demolish the entirety of the building in May 2019 but denied that application and recommended repair of portions of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear ell
- Seal rear of building.
- Reconstruct parapet
- Seal windows

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 parapet will be reconstructed using original materials.
- *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 work is necessary to stabilize the building, which suffered from a significant fire. The rear ell that will be removed does not characterize the property. The windows may be sealed, but the surviving window sash and frames should be retained in place behind the seals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the front windows and window frames are retained in place, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, provided the surviving window frames and sash are retained in place, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 523 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Legalize windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kelsey H. Sturdivant

Applicant: Kelsey & Parris Sturdivant

History: 1815, Stephen Girard, developer

Individual Designation: 10/30/1962

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl, one-over-one windows and a door and doorframe installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The staff approved an application for a building permit to re-point the building for the current owner, provided a pointing sample was reviewed in the field prior to the work. The pointing was undertaken without the required review of a pointing sample. At the same time, the property owner installed vinyl, one-over-one windows. Six-over-six wood windows are the correct

windows. In addition, the dormer window should have an arched sash. The correct windows are documented by photographs and an insurance survey. The property owner later contacted the Historical Commission about a new door, but then went ahead and installed the door and frame without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The door and frame do not replicate the historic door and frame.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows, door, and door frame

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 windows, door, and door frame do not match the historic elements in design or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:19:26

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Lawrence Solomon and Parris Sturdivant represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building is an individually designated structure constructed for Stephen Girard in the Greek Revival Style.
- The contractor exceeded his permit but understood that the Historical Commission had jurisdiction over the property, having sought a permit for other work to the building.
- Although the building had one-over-one windows for a number of years, at the time that the windows were replaced, the applicants were responsible for installing the historically correct 6-over-6 windows.
- Separate from the contractor, the owner replaced the door and door frame with an incorrect door and frame without a permit after consulting with the Historical Commission's staff about the replacement.
- Other owners in this row of designated buildings have complied with the Historical Commission's review of windows. The staff has not approved any non-historic windows for this row of designated buildings.
- The applicant has not submitted a financial hardship application.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The windows and door that have been installed do not comply with Standard 6.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 523 Fairmount Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 325 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Cut new window opening at side; replace rear window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Meredith Rockwell and Brian Goldberg

Applicant: Matthew Blank, Orion General Contractors, Inc.

History: 1965; Penn’s Landing Square

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 325 S. 2nd Street, constructed in 1965, is a Contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District, the significance of which includes the Redevelopment Era and its associated mid-twentieth century buildings.

Located at the corner of S. 2nd Street and Delancey Street, the building is one of two end units that bookend a row of houses that face S. 2nd Street between Delancey and Pine Streets. While the front elevations of the whole block and the rears of the mid-block units are uniform in appearance, the side and rear elevations of the two end units differ in massing and fenestration.

This application proposes to cut a single casement window at the second-floor of the side elevation of the property in order to allow for light into and egress out of a new interior room. The proposed window would align in height with the front second-floor windows, but as currently shown, would be slightly offset from the third-floor windows. The staff suggests that the

applicants align one edge of the new window with the third-floor window, to be in keeping with the alignment of other fenestration on the building. The application also proposes to replace an existing window at the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Side Elevation:
 - Cut opening and install single casement window at second floor
- Rear Elevation:
 - Replace existing second-story window with two-pane slider over awning

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.*
 - While this application proposes to remove some original exterior brick, the modification is minimal and does not destroy character-defining materials. The proposed window is differentiated from the old, but is compatible with the overall design of the property.
- *Windows Guideline | Recommended: Adding new window openings on rear or other secondary, less visible elevations, if required by a new use. The new openings and the windows in them should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but, in most cases, not duplicate the historic fenestration.*
- *Windows Guideline | Not Recommended: Changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows on primary or highly-visible elevations which will alter the historic character of the building; Cutting new openings on character-defining elevations or cutting new openings that damage or destroy significant features.*
 - While this application proposes to install a new window on a street-facing elevation, it is a secondary elevation, and the new window is minimal, is compatible with the overall design of the building, and does not destroy any significant features of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided one edge of the new window aligns with an edge of the third-floor side window, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Windows Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided one edge of the new window aligns with an edge of the third-floor side window and there is no build-down of the rear window, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Windows Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 505-09 S 9TH ST

Proposal: Demolish and reconstruct rear ells at 507 and 509 S 9th Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 505-09 South 9th Associates LP

Applicant: Ian Smith, Ian Smith Design Group LLC

History: 1840; The Drexmoor/Branch House of St. Francis' Industrial School

Individual Designation: 7/23/1963

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located on the east side of S. 9th Street between Lombard and South Streets, 505-09 S. 9th Street is a consolidated property with three, 3.5-story c. 1840s rowhouses. The property recently suffered a fire, after which time it was discovered that the bearing walls of the three-story rear ells of 507 and 509 are substantially deteriorated and structurally compromised. The ells have been declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. An engineer's report determined that the rear ells should be demolished in order to abate the dangerous condition. The rear of the property is partially visible from S. Darien and South Streets.

This application proposes to demolish the majority of the three-story rear ells and reconstruct them to their historic height and width, but to extend them by approximately 15 feet (or approximately two bays) in depth, plus an additional one-story extension with optional deck. Although not explicitly identified, based on the renderings, the additions would be clad in brick and would feature a combination of one-over-one and six-over-six windows, the material of which is also not specified in the application. The additions would be visible from S. Darien and South Streets.

The staff notes that, although not part of this application, alterations were made on the main block of the property without the Historical Commission's review or approval following the fire. The staff recommends that these elements be restored to their historic appearance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ells of 507 and 509 S. 9th Street
- Construct rear additions

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The severity of deterioration of the rear ells of 507 and 509 S. 9th Street necessitates their removal. With the exception of the two additional bays in depth and one-story addition, the proposed construction matches the old in design and materials. The application largely complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided one-over-one windows are used on the rear eaves, the offset of the rear eaves is struck at the midpoint of the buildings to align with the peak of the roof, and the front dormers are restored to their historic appearance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 6813 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Legalize wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gil Chavez

Applicant: Gil Chavez, Pasta To Go, Inc.

History: 1825

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 6813 Ridge Avenue contains a restaurant in the main building, and apartments in additions at the side and rear. To access the apartments from Ridge Avenue, one would cross an open area to the side of the main building and enter into a rear addition. Until recently, a low metal fence with gate separated this open area from the sidewalk along Ridge Avenue. Despite the metal fence, the open area was subject to illegal dumping, drug use, and other illicit activities. The owner, who was frustrated with the illicit activity, installed a wall behind the fence without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The wall is free-standing, clad in vinyl siding, and includes an entrance door. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the construction of a one-story "addition" without an approval or permit. The owner seeks to legalize the wall to comply the violation.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize wall constructed without permits.

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 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 materials and design of the new wall are not compatible with the historic property. A tall fence or even a stucco garden wall with entrance gate would be more in keeping with the historic property.
- *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 wall could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:39:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Tim Weglicki represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The wall was constructed without a building permit or the approval of the Historical Commission.
- A fence, taller gate, or stucco garden wall could be appropriate for this location and could address the property owner's concerns regarding illicit activities.
- The applicant should investigate zoning regulations related to fences along a front property line, which may conflict with the Standards used by the Historical Commission.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The wall as constructed does not comply with Standard 9, owing to its materials and design.
- A fence, taller gate, or stucco garden wall could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 6813 Ridge Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Lippert					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 228 MONROE ST

Proposal: Remove rear roofs; construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John and Mary Viscardi

Applicant: Whitney Joslin, Kaminski + Pew

History: 1765

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 11/24/1964

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This three-story residence was constructed in 1765. Historic maps dating back to 1858 and 1895 show the existence of a two-story ell and a one-story rear addition

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing second-floor roof at rear ell; construct new third-story addition;
- Remove rear portion of gambrel roof, including dormer, to tie in new addition;
- Interior alterations.

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 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 existing two-story rear ell appears on early atlases, and the gambrel roof of the main block is original to the period of construction; the applicant proposes

partial demolition of both in order to construct a third-story on top of the existing two-story rear ell.

- It does not appear that the proposed rear addition will be visible from the right of way;
- The use of a stucco finish and windows to match the existing is a compatible design choice.
- *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.*
 - Because this proposal involves the removal of both the roof of the existing rear ell, as well as a portion of the rear gambrel roof, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be altered to an extent that it would not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff is not opposed to the idea of a rear addition at this property given the likelihood that it would not be visible from the right-of-way. However, because of the partial demolition of historic fabric that is proposed to the second-story roof of the ell and a portion of the rear gambrel roof, the staff does not think that the project as presented complies with the standards. The staff recommends tying in the new third-story addition in a way that does not adversely impact the gambrel roof. The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, but approval of a third-story addition connected to the house through the existing dormer to retain more of the gambrel roof.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 3948-50 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Apply terra cotta sealant

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Glenn Kucher, Robert Michaels and Associates, Inc.

History: 1905, Clarence C. Zantzing, architect, West Philadelphia Branch of the Free Library

Individual Designation: 4/10/2015

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This Renaissance Revival style building was constructed in 1905 to the design of Clarence C. Zantzing. The building, the first Carnegie Library branch built in Philadelphia, has a granite base and is clad with glazed terra cotta tiles. There is a modern bay window at the north façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

The following work is limited to the building's west façade:

- Power wash water table, coping stones and terra cotta elements;
- At the water table: cut out mortar joints and replace with new backer rod and sealant;
- At the coping stones: cut out sealant and backer rod and replace in kind;
- At the terra cotta façade: cut out mortar joints and install new tooled mortar joints;

- At the windows: remove sealant and backer rod from around the windows and masonry openings and replace in kind;
- Reglaze terra cotta façade from the top of the window lintels to the top of the parapet walls.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *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 proposal indicates that the façade will be power washed without specifying water pressure or whether any cleaning products will be used;
 - The proposal to treat areas of the terra cotta where the glazing has been lost is intended to address what has been described as a problem with water infiltration. The waterproofing work, including the removal and replacement of mortar and sealant at the joints is understood to be in response to the same issue. However, the application materials do not provide sufficient information about the existing conditions at the roof in order to understand whether water is leaking from there into the building and causing the loss of glazing seen at locations under the projecting cornice. The staff has concerns that the proposed treatment is not adequately addressing the root cause of the water infiltration because there is not sufficient evidence provided in the application that explains specifically why or where it is occurring.
 - The staff does not understand if the proposed coating is intended to both repair/fill existing voids/spalls and perform as a waterproof replacement for the missing glaze.
 - The staff would like to know what percentage of the terra cotta tiles are experiencing this loss of glaze? Is this loss limited to the west façade of the building? How will the coated tiles look next to those that remain uncoated? Is the water infiltration limited to the west façade of the building?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff requests assistance from the members of the Architectural Committee to determine whether the application adequately explains the water infiltration issue, and if the proposed scope of work appropriately addresses the problem.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:49:46

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Project manager Glenn Kucher represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application did not provide any assessment to show the cause of the water infiltration.
- Coating the surface of the terra cotta units would not necessarily treat the underlying moisture issue and could in fact exacerbate the problems.
- The project requires the expertise of a preservation professional.
- The applicant should provide the staff with additional information about the condition of the roof and an assessment of the cause of the water infiltration.
- There were many features of the façade’s design that made understanding the source of and response to the water infiltration complicated.
- The applicant should prepare a mock up of any proposed coating to be reviewed and approved by the staff prior to treating the entire façade.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application did not comply with Standard 7, owing to a lack of information about the cause of the underlying moisture problems that justify the use of the proposed coating.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 7. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 3948-50 Walnut St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 2309 ST ALBANS ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ahmir Thompson

Applicant: Mieczyslaw Pawelec, Mietek Construction Co.

History: 1869; Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located mid-block on St. Albans Street, the Second Empire-style building is one of fifty-two nearly identical units on the garden block. Typical features on the front façade include a marble base, iron grilles over the basement windows, a four-panel door with bolection molding, two-over-two windows, and scalloped slate shingles on a mansard roof. The rears include a second-story projecting bay, though many rears have been altered over time.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install roof deck on main block with roof scuttle.
- Install mechanical equipment and enclosure on roof.
- Install new shingles on mansard roof.
- Repair front façade.
- Install new door.
- Repair or replace front and rear dormers.
- Rebuild bay.
- Install new windows and door at rear.
- Stucco rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The application is vague in its description of repair work to the front and rear facades. The front and rear dormers appear to be in repairable condition and should not be replaced. More information on the bay's condition is necessary to determine the proper treatment. The mansard roof currently contains asphalt shingles, and the staff recommends replacing the front façade roof with either slate or rubber to match the original in color, shape, and dimension. The proposed restoration work may comply with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The application proposes to stucco the entire rear of the building. The rear is currently only stuccoed at the first story, and exposed brick is visible at the second story. The work does not comply with this standard.

- *Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
 - The proposed roof deck would be set back 8 feet from St. Albans Street, leaving the railings potentially visible from the garden court. There are very few decks on this block of St. Albans Street, and no precedent for roof decks on the main blocks of the buildings. The Historical Commission approved a smaller deck, limited to the rear ell, at the adjacent property at 2307 St. Albans Street. The staff recommends that the applicant reduce the size of the deck to match the adjacent deck at 2307 St. Albans Street. As proposed, work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the facades, with the staff to review details, but denial of the roof deck and roof scuttle, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline, with the following conditions:

- No stucco is installed on the second-story rear wall;
- An annotated photograph is provided to the staff to show specific locations of brick replacement;
- The mechanical equipment is located in the rear yard;
- The deck is limited to the rear ell, with the hatch on the main block, to match the deck configuration at 2307 St. Albans Street; and
- The staff reviews the details of the windows, doors, and deck railing, and a brick pointing sample.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 4315 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Install stucco over wire mesh

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Presbyterian Church

Applicant: Timothy Kane, TJ Kane Enterprises Inc.

History: 1859-60; Presbyterian Church of Frankford; John McArthur Jr.

Individual Designation: 2/4/1982

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The Frankford Presbyterian Church was designed by architect John McArthur Jr. and constructed in 1859-1860. John McArthur Jr. is best remembered as the architect of Philadelphia City Hall (1872-1901). In preparation for the church building's upcoming anniversary, the congregation hired the applicant to re-stucco, clean, paint all exterior wood, and re-putty the windows.

Historical Commission staff members visited the site and met with the applicant on 6 May 2019 to review the scope of work and the exterior condition of the building. The staff observed areas of stucco missing and sections where the stucco appeared cracked or loose. Specific areas had a brown material under a layer or layers of stucco and paint. Based on oral history and a review of historic photographs, the church was originally brownstone or a brownstone color and was most likely painted pink during the 1930 or 1940s.

After further discussion with the staff, the applicant engaged Schnabel Conservation to analyze the existing stucco conditions and review the proposed plan for stucco repair. Schnabel Conservation provided its observations and recommendations in a letter dated 30 May 2019.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Power wash all wood with cleaning solution.
- Remove all loose stucco and install bonding agent.
- Install wire mesh over all stucco and stone areas of building.
- Apply scratch coat, brown coat, and acrylic base coat. The final coat will match existing color of building.
- After stucco work is complete, scrape, sand, caulk, and repair the wood surfaces as needed.
- Reputty and glaze windows including stained glass as needed.

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 new stucco will add approximately ¾" additional depth to the stucco areas of the building. The additional layers will compromise the projection of key architectural details and the overall appearance of the building.
- *Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*
 - The current pink color of the church was not part of the original design. The plan by the congregation to maintain the pink color meets Standard 4, as the current congregation and local community have long identified the church by its distinct color and appearance.
- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - The application of additional stucco layers will alter the distinctive features of this property.
- *Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.*
 - The details of the plan for pressure washing and cleaning wood areas of the building should be reviewed. The proposed work should comply with National Park Service's "Preservation Brief #10: Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5. Based on the site visit and letter from Schnabel Conservation, the staff communicated to the applicant that the stucco portion of the project could be approved administratively if it was revised to stucco patching and repainting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial owing to incompleteness, specifically the lack of information on the exterior walls and the potential loss of historic fabric, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:58:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Tim Kane and Pastor John Sweet represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The church's façade is rubble stone covered with a smooth stucco finish as confirmed with probes undertaken by MacInstosh Engineering on 30 July 2019. Early layers of stucco were a brownstone color.
- The openings created on 30 July 2019 show the stucco separating or pulling away from the stone. As a result, the applicant stated that they will need to remove more stucco than originally planned.
- The church has an exterior stone base that should remain uncovered, without stucco.
- Applicant has not identified the source(s) of water infiltration.
- Applicant proposes to remove stucco around windows and other projected areas of detail and feather in the stucco. The intent is to preserve the historic appearance of window lintels and other projections.
- The applicant concluded his team needs to do more field testing before they can determine the overall methodology and scope for the stucco repair and replacement.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not meet Standard 2, owing to the change in appearance that will be created by the current proposed scope of work. The additional layers will compromise the projection of key architectural details and the overall appearance of the building.
- The application does not meet Standard 2, owing to the building's overall historic character being at risk due to the ongoing water infiltration. The water issues need to be assessed and root cause(s) identified and remediated prior to moving ahead with the stucco work.
- The application does not meeting Standard 5 because additional stucco layers will alter the distinctive features of this property.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 4315 Frankford Ave					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 8500 FRANKFORD AVE

Name of Resource: St. Dominic’s Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. Dominic’s Roman Catholic Church

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate St. Dominic’s Roman Catholic Church at 8500 Frankford Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. While the larger parcel includes several buildings and an expansive cemetery, the nomination proposes exclusively to designate the church building. The nomination contends that the church building satisfies Criterion for Designation C. The nomination argues that St. Dominic’s architect, Henry Roby, whose office was located in Lebanon, Pennsylvania, would have been influenced by the Gothic churches designed by prominent Philadelphia architects, including Edwin Forrest Durang.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that St. Dominic’s Church located at 8500 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation C.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that St. Dominic’s Church located at 8500 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation C.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:18:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner, stating at the start of the meeting that the Archdiocese neither supports nor opposes the nomination.

- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- St. Dominic’s Roman Catholic Church was designed in the Gothic style of architecture by Henry Roby.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church represents the late-Victorian Gothic style of architecture and reflects late-nineteenth-century churches in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Harrisburg, satisfying Criterion C.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the church building located at 8500 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation C, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 8500 Frankford Ave					
MOTION: Designate, C					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 1616 S 17TH ST

Name of Resource: St. Thomas Aquinas Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate St. Thomas Aquinas Church and Rectory at 1616 S. 17th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. While the larger parcel includes several buildings, the nomination proposes exclusively to designate the church

building and rectory. The nomination contends that the church building and rectory satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that architect Edwin Forrest Durang is significant as one of the most prolific designers during the Archdiocese of Philadelphia's "Golden Age" of church construction. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the construction of St. Thomas Aquinas Church galvanized development of this predominantly industrial part of South Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church and rectory located at 1616 S. 17th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that St. Thomas Aquinas Church and rectory, located at 1616 S. 17th Street, satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:21:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner, stating at the start of the meeting that the Archdiocese neither supports nor opposes the nomination.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The church and rectory were late works designed by influential architect Edwin Forrest Durang.
- The nomination presents a detailed overview of the neighborhood's evolution and the church's role in the growth of the area.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Architect Edwin Forrest Durang was significant for his ecclesiastical designs constructed throughout the City of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E.
- St. Thomas Aquinas church galvanized development of the area, helping transform it from a predominantly industrial section at the city's periphery to a dense residential neighborhood, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that St. Thomas Aquinas Church and rectory, located at 1616 S. 17th Street, satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J, and to designate the buildings as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 1616 S 17th St					
MOTION: Designate, E, J					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Trego					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:23:30

ACTION: At 10:22 pm., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment					
MOTION: To adjourn					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Trego (PCPC)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

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.

DRAFT