

**THE MINUTES OF THE 685TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2019
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X*		Arrived at 9:22 am
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	X		
Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
Melissa Long (Division of Housing & Community Development)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	X		
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
- 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:

- Micah Gold-Markel, Solar States
- Jennifer Boggs, University of Pennsylvania
- Alli Davis, University of Pennsylvania
- Greg Maxwell, University of Pennsylvania
- Kathie Brill, University of Pennsylvania
- Hillary Morales, University of Pennsylvania

Jingyu Liao, University of Pennsylvania
Hanna Stark, University of Pennsylvania
Joshua Lewis, University of Pennsylvania
Xin Li, University of Pennsylvania
Namratha Kondam, University of Pennsylvania
Naftalia Flatte, University of Pennsylvania
Charles Homler, City View Condominiums
Martin Reynolds
Kathleen Harleman
T. Curry
Patrick Boyle, Spring Garden CDC
Andrew Kaplin
Marc Kaplin
Ifrah Asif, University of Pennsylvania
Richard DeMarco, Esq.
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Jose Hernandez, University of Pennsylvania
Lindsey Glasgow
Neil Sussman
Meris Westberg, University of Pennsylvania
Dairon Qui, University of Pennsylvania
Dara Epison, University of Pennsylvania
Ann Moyer
Haleem Ro, University of Pennsylvania
Joe Casile
Jose Hernandez, JKRP
Liz Scott
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty
Jim Robertson
Gabrielle Goldstein, University of Pennsylvania
Nicole Felicetti, University of Pennsylvania
Yiling Hu, University of Pennsylvania
Chelsea Beroza, University of Pennsylvania
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Areen Taj
Rawan Shraim
Eman Elkalban
Yao Huang, Sky Design Studio
Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design Studio
Su Bin Jian
Michael Mattioni, Esq.
Jennifer Rosenberg
Mara Swift
Judy Robinson
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Brett Feldman, Esq.
Basak Sikler
Andrew Miller, Esq.
Sean Whalen, Esq.
Neema Mohajery
Molly Gallagher

Charles Dombrowski
 David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
 Aaron Wunsch, University of Pennsylvania
 Michelle Eshelman, University of Pennsylvania
 Kangire Liu, University of Pennsylvania

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 684TH STATED MEETING, 9 AUGUST 2019

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:01:38

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting, the 684th Stated Meeting, held 9 August 2019. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the minutes of the 684th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 August 2019. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 684th Stated Meeting					
MOTION: Approval					
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	12				1

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2019

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:20

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 2079-85 N. 63rd Street and 152, 154, 156, 158, and 160-64 N. 2nd Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA					
MOTION: Adopt the Consent Agenda					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
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

Mr. Thomas announced that the Historical Commission would break from its agenda and consider the National Register comment next, while the IT staff repaired the digital projector.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

PROVIDENT MUTUAL INSURANCE BUILDING, 4601 MARKET STREET

Nominator: Heritage Consulting Group

Owner: City of Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 4601 Market Street, historically known as the Provident Mutual Insurance Building. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

According to the nomination, the Provident Mutual Insurance Building is significant under Criterion A in the Area of Commerce, as an important resource to Philadelphia's insurance industry and one of the first companies in Philadelphia to offer life insurance. The site served as the company's headquarters for over 50 years with the goal of providing their employees with an exemplary work environment. The period of significance begins in 1927 with the construction of the building and ends in 1983 the company departed the site and moved to a new location.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:04:19

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the National Register nominations to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nomination for 4601 Market Street, historically known as the Provident Mutual Insurance Company, meets Criterion A in the Area of Commerce.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- It supports the National Register nomination for 4601 Market Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2079-85 AND 2095-97 N 63RD ST

Proposal: Construct 5-story mixed-use building, rehabilitate garage building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: North 63rd Street Association

Applicant: Nathan Torok, Rock Construction & Development

History: 1910; Overbrook Garage

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, under consideration

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a five-story, mixed use building on 63rd Street in Overbrook Farms.

The Historical Commission initiated the designation of the Overbrook Farms Historic District in 2011 but tabled the review of the nomination in 2012. The nomination has been on hold for more than seven years. On 14 August 2019, after the submission of this application, the Historical Commission restarted the Overbrook Farms Historic District process, when the Commission notified all property owners in the district that it would consider whether to designate the proposed district at public meetings in October and November 2019. The Historical Commission may consider this application while the district is under consideration, but the application will be automatically approved if the district designation process is not finalized within 90 days of the submission of the application.

The site in question includes several buildings classified as non-contributing in the proposed district and one classified as contributing. The staff has already approved the demolitions of the non-contributing buildings but they have not yet been demolished. The contributing building will be retained and reused.

The new, five-story, mixed use building will include four ground-floor commercial spaces, 111 dwelling units, and 43 parking spaces. Parking and loading will be located in the rear, accessed by a side driveway. The building will have a brick veneer façade and GFRC, limestone-like accent elements. The existing brick building, which is utilitarian, will be repaired and repointed, and new windows and doors will be installed. The site of the proposed building is near the Septa Regional Rail Station along 63rd Street, where many of the neighborhood's commercial and large multi-family buildings are located.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct a five-story, mixed use building; rehabilitate garage building.

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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. It will 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 the proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided metal railings are used at the arched storefronts, an architrave is added at the raised cornice, and the rear wall siding is revised, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2000 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct 4-story building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2000 Spring Garden LLC

Applicant: Andy Miller, Law Office of Andrew L. Miller & Associates, PC

History: 1964; Office of Dr. Stanley Dorman; Alkon & Vanderwerff, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a four-story, multi-family building on the southwest corner of 20th and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District. The demolition of the existing building, which is listed as non-contributing in the district, was approved by the staff. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction. In May 2019, the Architectural Committee reviewed an in-concept application to construct a five-story building on this site. The application was subsequently withdrawn and never reviewed by the Historical Commission.

The building proposed in the current application would feature a cast stone base and brick first through third floors. The fourth floor would feature a mansard-roofed “main block,” aligning with that of the adjacent property. The rear portion of the fourth floor would be set in from 20th Street and be clad in standing-seam metal and feature a cantilevering deck with glass railing accessed by a pilot house. The front façade along Spring Garden Street would approximate the details of the neighboring property, but with squared openings rather than arched. The side elevation would be broken up by a series of double-hung windows, a prominent central stair, two fiber-cement-clad bay windows, and Juliette balconies. The rear of the building would be stepped, with balconies on the second, third, and fourth floors. Parking would be accessed from the rear of the building and concealed behind a gate.

The building currently proposed was designed in response to the Architectural Committee’s suggestions provided at the May 2019 in-concept review. At that time, the Architectural Committee suggested that:

- the new construction should be limited to four stories in height,
- the garage openings on the 20th Street elevation should be removed,

- the cantilevering planes of the upper floors at the front of the building should be removed,
- the front façade should not try to replicate the exact details of the historic property to the west, and,
- the front and side elevations of the proposed construction should have a more cohesive appearance.

The applicants implemented these suggestions for their submission to the Architectural Committee in August 2019.

At their August meeting, the Architectural Committee suggested additional revisions, including that:

- the basement windows should be aligned with the windows above,
- the cantilevered deck should be pulled back to make the portion of the mansard roofed “main block” one plane,
- the deck railing should be inconspicuous,
- the parapet around the fourth-floor deck should be reduced so that it does not project above the roof of the main block

The applicants subsequently made additional modifications to address the Architectural Committee’s concerns including aligning the basement windows with the windows above, eliminating the cantilevering deck to create one plane at the fourth-floor rear portion, lowering the parapet around the fourth floor to align with the mansard roofed main block, and replaced the glass railing with a metal picket railing.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a four-story, multi-family building.

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 floor and window heights of the proposed new construction align with the neighboring property, while the details, including squared window openings, a simplified cornice, and metal-roofed mansard differentiate the new from the old. The proposed materials of brick and cast stone are compatible with the environment of the district. The height and depth of the proposed construction are likewise appropriate. Historically, corner buildings were often longer and taller than their mid-block counterparts.
 - The proposed project complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:12:58

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Hyon Kang, attorney Andrew Miller, and property owner Ramy Shraim represented the application. Mr. Miller noted that this has been an involved, collaborative process, and the concept and plan have evolved in response to the concerns expressed by the staff, Architectural Committee, and community. He opined that the current proposal meets historic preservation standards. Mr. Kang explained the revisions that have been made, and that they believe they have developed a sensitive and complementary design that will add to the character of the historic district. He noted that they initially started with a five-story, seven-unit building, and have reduced it to a four-story, less massive, five-unit structure that is more in keeping with the neighboring properties. Mr. Kang noted that the design now resembles but does not duplicate the adjacent historic structure. He explained that they have taken visual cues from the adjacent structure at 2002 Spring Garden and have reduced the massing from a solid block to a series of setbacks from the rear more typical of corner properties in the district and in the city. Mr. Kang opined that they made as many concessions as they could that still allows them to have a functional design. He noted that, in addition to reducing the height and massing, they aligned and reduced the number of windows to make the façade more cohesive. The front of the proposed building features a mansard that matches in height and shape that of the neighboring property but does not completely replicate it. In order to differentiate between the old and new, pursuant to historic preservation standards, they transitioned to an ell-like fourth-floor structure with a wrap-around deck and added vertical black metal railings that will be less conspicuous from the street. He noted that they carried the standing-seam metal roofing material from the mansard through the rear of the fourth floor for a more cohesive design.
- Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, disclosed for the record that he previously represented the adjacent property owner at 2002 Spring Garden Street. He also noted that Mr. Thomas's firm, Campbell Thomas, previously worked on the property at 2002 Spring Garden Street.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the staff's position is that the revised design is both compatible with the review criteria set forth in the historic preservation ordinance and is also compliant with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The staff contends that the proposed construction is compatible with the historic district, with the site, and with the streetscape.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Historical Commission received three letters of opposition: one from City Council President Clarke, one from neighbors, and one from the Spring Garden Civic Association, submitted prior to the revised application.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco, representing Molly Gallagher of 2002 Spring Garden, opposed the project. He opined that the project will be taller than Ms. Gallagher's 48-foot tall property, since the permit application form submitted calls for a maximum 55-foot tall structure. He argued that the Historical Commission's staff approved his client's proposal to rehabilitate the rear of her property and opined that it is important to maintain the visibility of the rear of her property from the street. He asserted that the Historical Commission is required to apply the historic preservation ordinance and opined that the wording of the ordinance is stronger than the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, by which the Historical Commission is guided. He argued that

- the Commission must consider the impact of a proposal on the building, structure, site, or object, and that, even though the existing building is non-contributing and is going to be demolished, it is two stories and currently allows for views of the rear facades of the neighboring properties. He claimed that the Historical Commission should be limited to approving a new building that does not exceed the volume of the existing non-contributing, non-historic building.
- Neighbor Molly Gallagher distributed materials to the Historical Commission. She explained that she was aware of the historic designation and hired a reputable firm to rehabilitate her property. She argued that corner properties in Philadelphia are not always longer and bigger than mid-block properties and discussed the 1884 Baist atlas that shows that originally the property at 2000 Spring Garden was not longer than her property. She opined that the existing building is an eyesore and that the proposed building is lovely but is a massive overbuild of this parcel. She discussed the work to her own property, including copperwork to the rear and side bay windows.
 - Mr. Mattoni objected to the materials Ms. Gallagher distributed, citing the fact that the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations at Section 4.6.b require substantial testimony including any supporting documentation to be submitted to the Commission seven days in advance of the meeting to allow the Commission and public an opportunity to review the materials.
 - Mr. DeMarco argued that the Historical Commission should waive that requirement in this situation.
 - Neighbor Kathleen Harleman opposed the project on behalf of herself and several neighbors and read into the record the letter she submitted to the Historical Commission dated 11 September 2019.
 - Al Perry, president of the neighboring CityView Condo Association, supported the project. He noted that the existing building is an eyesore and opined that the proposed construction will beautify the area. He opined that the scaffolding on the rear of the adjacent property at 2002 Spring Garden, Ms. Gallagher's property, has also been an eyesore for the last several years.
 - Neighbor Eman Elkalban spoke in support of the project and submitted a letter of support dated 8 September 2019 on behalf of herself and several community members.
 - Patrick Boyle represented Spring Garden Civic Association and opposed the project, citing the reasons laid out in the letter submitted to the Commission dated 26 August 2019.
 - Neighbor Liddy Thall expressed concern that the proposed construction could damage the adjacent property at 2002 Spring Garden Street.
 - Charles Homler, manager of CityView Condominiums, spoke in support of the project. He opined that the height and design of the proposed building, which aligns with the neighboring property, ties in well with the character of the neighborhood and eliminates an unattractive and incompatible building.
 - Neighbor Neema Mohajery spoke in support of the project and opined that the design adheres to Historical Commission standards.
 - Neighbor Neil Sussman spoke in support of the project. He opined that the existing building is an eyesore and the proposed building is compatible with the historic district.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Architectural Committee raised concerns about height, massing, and features of the proposed building during its two previous reviews. The proposed design has undergone three significant revisions and has successfully addressed the concerns raised by the Architectural Committee.
- The final application, which includes a reduction in height from five to four stories, reduction in massing from a solid block to a series of setbacks at the rear, and the use of a mansard roof for the front portion of the fourth floor that aligns with the front of the neighboring property, directly responds to the comments of the Architectural Committee and its concerns about height, massing, and features.
- The materials of cast stone and brick are in keeping with the masonry materials found along 20th and Spring Garden Streets and throughout the historic district.
- The proposed construction will align in height with the adjacent property at 2002 Spring Garden Street.
- The only additional change that should be made to the design is to pull the fourth-floor railing back from the mansard-roofed portion of the building to align with the railing below.
- The height of the project noted on the permit application form in the submission materials is not expository as the application form alone does not define the work that will be permitted. The architectural drawings in the submission show the front of the proposed building aligning with the neighboring property, and the Historical Commission staff should ensure that the final permit application materials including construction drawings, which are checked by the Commission's staff, stamped approved if compliant, and then forwarded to the Department of Licenses & Inspections, are consistent and reflect this fact and any other details required by the Historical Commission.
- The Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations at Section 4.6.b authorizes the Historical Commission to permit anyone to speak on an agenda item. The Historical Commission does not restrict public testimony to those who reside adjacent to or near a subject property.
- No greenway exists along the rears of properties along the south side of Spring Garden Street, as claimed during the public comment period. The area in question consists of a series of privately-owned backyards. The use of the term "greenway" implies public property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new construction will be differentiated from and compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic buildings in the Spring Garden Historic District and will protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.
- Pursuant to Section 1401005(6)(e)(.1-.5) of the Philadelphia Code, the historic preservation ordinance, in making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed new construction, the Historical Commission considered the following and concluded that the proposed new construction satisfies the review requirements set forth in the preservation ordinance.
 - The purposes of historic preservation ordinance;
 - The lack of identified historical, architectural, and aesthetic significance of the existing, non-contributing building at 2000 Spring Garden Street;

- The effect of the proposed demolition on the non-contributing building and its appurtenances;
- The compatibility of the proposed new construction with the character of the Spring Garden Historic District and with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape; and,
- The design of the proposed work.
- The proposed new building compatible with the character of the Spring Garden Historic District and with the character of its site, including the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to approve the revised application, provided the fourth-floor railing is pulled back to align with the railing below, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Review Criteria set forth in Section 1401005(6)(e)(.1-.5) of the Philadelphia Code, the historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Sánchez dissented. Mr. Thomas abstained.

ITEM: 2000 Spring Garden St					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions					
MOVED BY: Trego					
SECONDED BY: Hartner					
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	1			1

ADDRESS: 2016 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct third-story addition and garages

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Peruto

Applicant: Lindsey Glasgow, Peruto Development LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This three-story double-wide brownstone at 2016 Spruce Street is a contributing structure in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. It was constructed c. 1870.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct a third story on the existing two-story addition at the rear.
- Construct a one-car garage.
- Construct a four-car garage with deck.
- Rebuild existing sun room at rear of house.
- Replace all windows at rear of house.

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 proposed new third story at the existing two-story rear addition involves the demolition of historic fabric, including brick walls and windows. The amount of demolition should be reduced to satisfy the standard.
 - Brick is proposed for the new third-story addition to match the other existing floors. The proposal to match the new third-story cornice with the existing may not sufficiently differentiate the new floor from the original. The staff recommends that the applicant consider a mansard roof at the new addition instead.
 - The applicant proposes composite windows at the rear of the house that appear to be appropriate for use on this secondary facade. Two new masonry openings are proposed for the southern façade of the existing two-story addition in order to accommodate access to the proposed deck. Three existing windows at the ground floor of the addition are to be filled in.
 - The proposed garage doors facing Cypress Street would not detract from this service alley which is already comprised of other garage doors along the block.
- *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 construction off the proposed third story at the existing two-story rear building involves the demolition of historic fabric, including brick walls and windows. The amount of demolition should be reduced to satisfy the standard.

- The new third story appears to connect to the rear wall of the existing main house sensitively.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the amount of demolition proposed at the two-story rear building is reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:59:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Owners Charles Peruto and Lindsey Glasgow represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The concept of new garages and a third story addition at the rear is acceptable; however, there were concerns about the specifics of the proposed design. The extent of demolition the applicant was proposing at the ground floor of the rear ell is excessive. The plans under review also failed to show the main house, making it difficult to understand the relationship between the proposed third-story addition and the main block. Additionally, the applicant's idea to remove the existing cornice from the second story of the rear addition and relocate it to their proposed third story addition had not been recommended by the Architectural Committee.
- The 1970s addition at the rear of the house was designed by architect Louis Kahn for the president of the University of Pennsylvania at the time, Martin Meyerson. This addition should be treated as a major work of modern architecture. The rear two-story addition was part of the original fabric of the house.
- Many of the existing conditions at the rears of neighboring properties along Cypress Street mentioned by the applicant were likely constructed prior to the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over them.
- A third-story addition to the existing ell would be highly visible from Cypress Street, regardless of the treatment of the roof. Differentiating the new third story to allow the historic material to read more clearly would result in a more successful proposal.
- Owing to the extent of the concerns with the details of the proposal, the applicant should work with the staff to revise their plans and return to the Architectural Committee for an additional review.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- This application is not complete. It lacks information about the relationship between the proposed third story addition at the rear ell and the main house.
- This application does not comply with Standard 9, owing to the fact that the applicant is proposing to relocate the original cornice of the rear ell, and also because the treatment of the third story does not sufficiently differentiate new fabric from historic fabric.
- This application does not comply with Standards 9 or 10, owing to the extent of demolition of historic fabric that is proposed at the ground floor of the rear ell.

- The window replacement proposed for the south facade of the main block can be approved by the staff.

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

ITEM: 2016 Spruce St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Long					
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	12				1

ADDRESS: 109 BAINBRIDGE ST

Proposal: Install fourteen solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ann E. Moyer

Applicant: Solar States LLC

History: 1830; new front façade, windows, and doors, 1974

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This three-story home was constructed about 1830 and was individually designated in 1958.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install fourteen solar panels on the roof of the main block and rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- Roofs Guideline: *Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof (such as heating and air conditioning units, elevator housing, or solar panels) when required for a new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*

- The proposed location of the solar panels is on the roof of the main block and rear addition. Because of the low roofline of the adjacent property to the east, the solar panels at the front of the roof of the main block will likely be visible from Bainbridge Street, looking west. A mock up should be constructed to demonstrate whether the solar panels will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The design should be modified if the mock up demonstrates that the solar panels would be conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that a mock up demonstrates that the solar panels are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:18:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Ann E. Moyer, and Jack Steketee and Micah Gold-Markel of Solar States, LLC, represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The concerns that the Architectural Committee expressed, including the structural integrity of the roof, the current condition of the existing roofing materials, and the visibility of the arrays, had all been satisfactorily addressed with the supplemental information provided by the applicants.
- This application was a very good example of retrofitting solar panels onto a historic house.
- All of the suggestions and recommendations provided to the applicant as to how to improve the proposal had been followed.
- The arrays are removable, should that become necessary in the future.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- This application complies with the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 109 Bainbridge St					
MOTION: Approval					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Turner					
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	12				1

ADDRESS: 260 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Su Bin Jian and Bo Meng Lin

Applicant: Yao-Chang Huang, Sky Design Studio

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The application proposes to demolish the building’s rear ell and replace it with a new three-story addition. The existing, historic ell is three stories tall. Historic maps show that the 1860 building originally had a one-story rear wing. The existing rear ell was added between 1860 and 1895.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish existing three-story rear ell.
- Construct new three-story addition with rear roof deck on second floor and rear balcony on third floor.
- Interior renovations within main block; no work to front facade.

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 demolition of the rear ell will result in the removal of distinctive materials and the alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The demolition of the rear ell will diminish the historic character of the

property. The application does not demonstrate rear ell requires full demolition and cannot be rehabilitated.

- *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 construction of the rear addition will destroy the historic rear ell, which characterizes the property. The proposal will not protect the historic integrity of the property. The application does not demonstrate rear ell requires full demolition and cannot be rehabilitated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:23:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Yao-Chang Huang and Chwen-Ping Wang, Sky Design Studio, and Su Bin Jian, owner, represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The rear ell is not visible from any public right-of-way.
- Historic rear ells can be character-defining features of buildings, even if not visible from the street.
- The proposed scope includes removing the entire rear wall of the main block. It was noted by the Commission that the removal of the full rear wall of the building constitutes a demolition. Because of the lack of the detailed information in the application, the Commission could not determine if the proposed scope of work constituted an alteration or demolition.
- The new addition will be wider than original ell and will cover entire rear of building and extend rear property line.
- The application is not complete. The drawings and photographs do not communicate fully what currently exists, current conditions, what is being removed, and what the new construction would look like.
- The application requires additional information to fully evaluate the proposed scope of work. Existing condition drawings (elevations and plans) and existing condition photographs should be submitted for review. The Commission must be able to understand what currently exists on the rear ell including information such as window and door openings and overall condition. More fully developed drawings of the new addition should be submitted as well.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not provide enough information to fully assess whether the proposed scope of work does or does not comply with the Standards.
- The staff should visit the site and document the rear of the building.
- The application should be revised to provide explicitly the current state of the rear of the building and the proposal for it.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, owing to incompleteness. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Mr. Lippert dissented.

ITEM: 260 S 20th St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Long					
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	1			1

ADDRESS: 152, 154, 156, 158, 160-64 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing buildings; construct 6-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Swift Bros. Inc and 160-164 N 2nd St LP

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application to construct a six-story structure at the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets follows a series of applications to the Historical Commission. In 2017, the developer requested that the Commission reclassify 152 N. 2nd Street from contributing to non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The Commission denied that request, finding that the building was constructed within the district's period of significance

In 2018, the developer submitted an in-concept application to construct a 19-story mixed-use building that included a contextual brick base with a setback tower. The contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street was to be retained and function as a hotel lobby. Members of the public and

the Historical Commission raised concerns over the height and massing of the proposed building.

The current application abandons the previous design, though it similarly seeks to rehabilitate the contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street and repurpose it as an entrance to the adjacent new building. The five lots would be consolidated and the remaining three buildings, which are considered non-contributing, would be demolished.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish non-contributing buildings
- Rehabilitate building at 152 N. 2nd Street
- Construct six-story brick building with roof deck

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.*
 - This application proposes to rehabilitate and repurpose the contributing building at 152 N. 2nd Street with minimal loss to historic fabric. The building would abut a new six-story structure that references the industrial qualities of the historic structure. Though larger than the historic buildings immediately surrounding it, the new structure is generally compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features and would be situated across from a high-rise building. The proposed work complies with this standard.
- *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 construction minimally impacts the historic structure and would leave the building at 152 N. 2nd Street unimpaired. The work complies 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 roof deck would be inconspicuous from all public rights-of-way and would comply with the Roofs Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the clapboard material is substituted for a paneling system, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 776 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Replace Windows

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Joseph Casile

Applicant: Joseph Casile, Contractors R Us

History: 1800

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to remove multi-pane wood windows from the front façade of a Georgian style town house and replace them with windows that do not match in design. The applicant has not provided shop drawings or other documentation of the proposed windows to demonstrate that they will faithfully replicate the exterior appearance of the historic windows. The brand of window that is proposed is available with muntins sandwiched between the glass or a very shallow applied muntins, neither of which replicates the appearance of the original windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace 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.*
 - The proposed windows will not match the historic windows in design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to an incomplete application.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:48:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Owner Joseph Casile represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- These windows are on a highly visible façade on a very significant early building.
- The proposed windows do not match the design of the historic windows particularly in the depth of the muntins.
- The proposal is incomplete in documentation because the manufacturer has not provided shop drawings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- This application does not comply with Standard 6.
- This application is incomplete.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 776 S Front St					
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	12				1

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 508-32 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct pedestrian bridge and rooftop enclosure
 Type of Review Requested: In Concept
 Owner: Keystone Property Group
 Applicant: Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
 History: 530, Edgar Seeler 1914; 520, Ernest J. Matthewson, 1930; 508, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, 1971, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company Building
 Individual Designation: 9/25/1962
 District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The property at 508-32 Walnut Street, the former Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, includes three interconnected buildings: a 1971 building by Mitchell/Giurgola Associates at 510 Walnut; a 1930 building by architect Ernest J. Matthewson at 520 Walnut; and a 1914 building by architect Edgar Seeler at 530 Walnut. This in-concept application originally proposed to construct a pedestrian bridge at the top floor, west façade of the 1971 building, but that portion of the application has been withdrawn. The application now proposes only the addition of a rooftop enclosure for a restaurant on the 1930 building.

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company installed a public observation deck with views of Independence Hall on the rooftop of the building at 520 Walnut about 1963. In anticipation of the Bicentennial, the observation deck was relocated to the top floors of the new Mitchell/Giurgola building at 510 Walnut in 1975. The deck in the new building was serviced by two elevators that ran from the lobby directly up 22 floors; the elevators are indicated with articulations on the north or front façade of the Modernist building. In 1983, Penn Mutual closed the observation deck because it was losing money.

The current application proposes to reopen the original observation deck on the 520 Walnut building as a restaurant. To access the restaurant, the direct lobby-to-rooftop elevators in the 510 Walnut building would be utilized and internal corridors would connect the 510 building to the 520 roof. The rooftop area around the mechanical penthouse would be enclosed with a steel and glass greenhouse-like structure for the restaurant. The non-historic canopy framing currently on the roof would be removed. The forms of the canopy framing to be removed roughly approximate those of the proposed structure. Mechanical equipment to support the restaurant would be added at the roof and mechanical penthouse levels. The equipment would be screened. The roof structure would be internally strengthened to support the extra load.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove non-historic rooftop canopy framing
- Construct rooftop enclosure
- Add mechanical equipment with screening

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 construction of the rooftop enclosure will be differentiated from and compatible with the historic property and environment. The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, provided the sizes and locations of the mechanical equipment are adjusted to reduce its visibility from the street and the screening is limited to the areas around the equipment.
- *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 rooftop enclosure and mechanical equipment could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, provided the sizes and locations of the mechanical equipment are adjusted to reduce visibility and the screening is limited to the areas of the equipment, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:57:20

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Brett Feldman, architect Sam Olshin, and developer Jennifer Rosenberg represented the application. The applicants explained the revised proposal and confirmed that the bridge portion of the application had been withdrawn.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that his organization supports the concept. He added that the application for final approval should include information about the lighting of the rooftop space.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the proposal, provided the bridge portion has been withdrawn.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The bridge portion of the application has been withdrawn.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission does not regulate interior spaces unless the Historical Commission has explicitly designated the interior space as historic. It does, however, regulate exteriors including exterior light fixtures and exterior glass.
- The alteration proposed in the application complies with Standards 9 and 10.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to approve the application in concept, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 508-32 Walnut St					
MOTION: Approval in concept					
MOVED BY: Trego					
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	12				1

ADDRESS: 106-08 AND 110 GRAPE ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Daniel R. Neducsin

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 1835 and 1930

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. amount paid for the property, date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, whether business or familial, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current owner, Daniel R. Neducsin, purchased the property from Clifford LeBlang for \$65,000 on 25 April 1991. The seller and buyer had no business or familial relationship.
2. assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according to the most recent assessment;
 - a. The affidavit states that the current assessed value is \$207,900.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish buildings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission:

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

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

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

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:11:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Thomas and Mr. Mattioni recused, owing to involvement with a non-profit associated with the applicant. Ms. Turner chaired the review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the application must be reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship, if a financial hardship is being sought by the applicant, or the Committee on Historic Designation, if a reclassification of the buildings is being sought by the applicant.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission reviewed this very same application at its 8 March 2019 meeting, at which time it voted to table the application for a period not to exceed six months, to allow the applicant time to submit additional materials for review by the Commission and its Committee on Financial Hardship.
- No additional materials have been submitted by the applicant, and the six-month tabling period has expired.
- The staff has informed the applicant via email and USPS mail that the application must be on the Historical Commission's agenda for today.
- The applicant is welcome to submit a new application with the required additional materials, which will be processed in the typical manner and which will go before the appropriate committees before review by the Historical Commission.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not comply with Section 9 of the Rules & Regulations, as it does not contain additional materials which demonstrate that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted.

ACTION: Ms. Trego moved to deny the application, owing to incompleteness. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 106-08 and 110 Grape St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Trego					
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	10			2	1

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 contends that the company exemplified the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of Kensington in the industrial age in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

At the 12 March 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, an attorney representing the property owner stated that the redevelopment of this property was underway and a demolition permit had been filed in April 2018, nearly one year before the property was nominated. The representative requested a continuance to allow the demolition, which had been legally permitted, to be completed. It was verified that the property owner held 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. The representative explained that the property owner intended to act on that demolition permit in the near future. The Committee recommended in favor of a continuance owing to the valid demolition permit. At the 12 April 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission, the Commission continued the nomination to a future meeting to allow for the demolition permit process to be completed. The demolition was undertaken soon thereafter. The Historical Commission staff visited the property on 20 August 2019 and confirmed that the building proposed for designation had been completely demolished. The nomination did not propose that the property had archaeological significance, or any other significance not associated with the building that was demolished.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission decline to designate the property at 152-78 W. Berks Street because it no longer satisfies Criteria for Designation G, H, and J, owing to the legal, permitted, complete demolition of the building.

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.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION 12 APRIL 2019 MEETING: On 12 April 2019, the Historical Commission continued 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.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:16:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Michael Mattioni, attorney, represented the application for the property owner.

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Mattioni recused, owing to his law firm's representation of the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 152-78 W Berks Street has been demolished.
- The property owner held a valid demolition permit, which was applied for and issued before the Historical Commission's notice announcing the consideration of this nomination was sent to the property owner.
- The owner legally demolished the building and is in the process of redeveloping the property.
- The property was nominated for the building alone, not because of any other characteristic of the site.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- When the building was still standing, the property merited designation under Criteria for Designation G, H, and J.
- Owing to the complete demolition of the building, the property no longer meets the applied Criteria for Designation put forth in the nomination.

ACTION: Mr. Lippert moved to find that the property satisfied Criteria for Designation G, H, and J prior to demolition, but declined to designate it as historic or list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, owing to the loss of the resource. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: 152-78 W. Berks St					
MOTION: Decline to designate					
MOVED BY: Lippert					
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			1	1

ADDRESS: 2101 WASHINGTON AVE

Name of Resource: Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: 2101 Washington Avenue LLC; 2101 Washington Avenue TH LLC; RGR Chocolate Factory LLC
 Nominator: Dennis Carlisle
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 2122 KIMBALL ST

Proposal: Construct 40 townhouses
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: 2101 Washington Avenue LLC
 Applicant: Atiya Groomes, OCF Realty
 History: 1865; Howell & Brother Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory; additions, 1883, 1912; most structures demolished in 2018
 Individual Designation: Under consideration
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The Historical Commission has two matters pending before it for 2101 Washington Avenue. First, the property has been nominated for designation, but the Historical Commission tabled the nomination while a valid demolition permit was open for the property. Second, a building permit application proposes to construct 40 townhouses at the rear of the property known as 2101 Washington Avenue, which has been subdivided off as 2122 Kimball Street.

The property at 2101 Washington Avenue was nominated for designation in December 2017. After the review of the nomination began, the nominator announced his intention to withdraw the nomination, but the Historical Commission rejected the request and remanded the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation for review in April 2018. At about the same time, the

Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that the buildings on the site were imminently dangerous and issued a permit to demolish all but the structures at the southwest corner of the site. After demolition began, the Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination and recommended that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. At its May 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed the nomination and decided to table it until the demolition that was currently underway was completed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had closed out the demolition permit. In October 2018, the Historical Commission approved an application to remove the smokestack at the southwest corner of the site. The smokestack and all other structures except those at the southwest corner of the site have been demolished. However, because the demolition permit remains open, the Historical Commission has not reconsidered the tabled nomination.

The current building permit application proposes to build 40 townhouses at the northern half of the site, which has been subdivided off as 2122 Kimball Street. All structures on the Kimball Street site have been demolished; the site is vacant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff contends that, with the demolition of most of the complex, no historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property survive. The staff recommends that the Historical Commission decline to designate the property. If the Historical Commission does designate the property, the staff recommends that the Historical Commission approve the building permit application for 2122 Kimball Street. There is no basis under Standard 9 for judging the compatibility of the new construction with the site because the site has lost all historic character.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that 2101 Washington Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The Committee recommends that the period of significance end in 2005, when Frankford Chocolate Company relocated and sold the property. The Committee also recommends classifying the main structure, additions, and supporting buildings built between 1865 and 1912 as contributing and the later, makeshift additions, post-1912, as non-contributing to the overall significance of the complex.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the building permit application for 2122 Kimball Street.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:22:04

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination and building permit application to the Historical Commission.
- Developer Ori Feibush and attorney Sean Whalen represented the application. Mr. Whalen stated that 2101 Washington Avenue and 2122 Kimball Street have always had separate deeds but have been owned jointly and had one property tax account. He noted that the lot lines have been recently adjusted. He stated that there are no buildings standing on the 2122 Kimball lot. Mr. Whalen stated that the basis of significance as presented in the nomination is that this complex was the largest wallpaper factory in the world, the largest furniture warehouse in the world, and one of the largest chocolate Easter bunny manufacturers in the world. Significance is predicated on size. Most of the complex is now demolished. The size has been lost and therefore the basis for significance is gone. About 85% of the complex has been demolished. There is not enough historic fabric left to designate the site, he claimed.

He explained that the complex was considered imminently dangerous before his client purchased the property. That imminently dangerous declaration was later confirmed by the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Whalen displayed current photographs of the site and discussed the extent of the demolition. Mr. Feibush explained that the remaining portion of the building is cordoned off to protect the public. He stated that the property was classified as imminently dangerous before he purchased it. He reported that the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections and other officials from the Department inspected the property after he purchased it and confirmed that it was imminently dangerous. He explained that he agreed with the Commissioner that he would demolish most of the structures on the property immediately but wait to demolish the structures on the southwest corner of the property for six months, while the nomination was moving through the Historical Commission's process. He stated that: "At all times here we've acted in good faith with clean hands." Aaron Wunsch interrupted the meeting with loud laughter from the audience. Mr. Thomas warned Mr. Wunsch that he was out of order and observed that he would have his opportunity to speak.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the 1912 building at the southwest corner of the site could be used as a basis for redeveloping the block along Washington Avenue.
- Aaron Wunsch introduced himself as a professor of historic preservation at the University of Pennsylvania. He stated that he wanted to set the record straight. He asserted that "the property in question was designated imminently dangerous at least partially at the owner's request and under a very questionable set of conditions." Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Wunsch to direct his comments to the question at hand and speak to whether the site as it currently exists merits historic designation. Mr. Wunsch stated that the Historical Commission does not have enough information to decide about designation. He also noted that an imminently dangerous citation does not mean that the building must be demolished, but only that the dangerous condition must be addressed.
- Fred Ritter stated that he is a neighborhood resident and a committee man. He stated that the neighbors view this site as a blight and want it redeveloped. He stated that the community supports the completion of demolition and the redevelopment of this site as proposed.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The site was declared imminently dangerous before the current property owner purchased it.
- The demolition undertaken by the current owner was performed with a valid demolition permit.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Insufficient historic fabric survives to merit historic designation.
- The site satisfied Criteria for Designation A and J before the demolition began, but no longer satisfies any Criteria.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to decline to designate the property at 2101 Washington Avenue. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 3. Ms. Cooperman and Messrs. McCoubrey and Thomas dissented. Ms. Edwards abstained.

ITEM: 2101 Washington Ave					
MOTION: Decline to designate					
MOVED BY: Mattioni					
SECONDED BY:					
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	8	3	1		1

Mr. Farnham stated that the building permit application for 2122 Kimball Street is moot because the Historical Commission declined to designate the property and the property and permit application are therefore no longer under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:03:56

ACTION: At 12:11 pm., 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				
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	12				1

PLEASE NOTE:

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