

**THE MINUTES OF THE 687<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 NOVEMBER 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 9:06 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X*		Arrived at 9:11 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*		Arrived at 9:16
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair	X		
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)	X		
Meredith Trego (Department of Planning & Development)	X		
Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq.	X*		Arrived at 9:08 am

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
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Todd Curry, Emerald Windows
- Kate Cowing, Kate Cowing Architect
- Lindsey Peruto
- D. Wagner
- S. Vorwerk

Mary Ellen McNish  
Kevin Wilson  
Dart Sageser  
Ming Yuan, Olson Kundig  
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting  
Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
David Nepley  
Stuart Udis, PA Realty Advisors  
Larry Spector, Society Hill Civic Association  
Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects  
Lisa Lamprou, Manayunk Development Corporation  
Derrek Etsell  
Kelli Etsell  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Lauletta Birnbaum  
Kevin Block  
Dan Kelley  
Eric Marshall  
George Shaffer  
Steven Peitzman  
Rich Thom  
Emelyn Nafere  
Doug Taber  
Gary Murray  
Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture Studio  
Bill O'Brien, Esq., Manayunk Law  
Blake Krevolin, JKRP Architects  
Joan Denenberg, Manayunk Development Corporation

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 686<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING, 11 OCTOBER 2019**

**START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00**

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting, the 686<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting, held 11 October 2019. None were offered.

**PUBLIC COMMENT: None**

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the minutes of the 686<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 October 2019. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ITEM: Adoption of Minutes, 686<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting**

**MOTION: Approval**

**MOVED BY: Cooperman**

**SECONDED BY: Long**

<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards					X
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni					X
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	10				3

**THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 SEPTEMBER 2019**

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

**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 69-71 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, 2016 Spruce Street, 7105 Ridge Avenue, 6626 Germantown Avenue, and 1520-28 Spruce Street. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adopt the Consent Agenda</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Trego</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards					X
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni					X
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					X
Total	10				3

**ADDRESS: 12 LONGFORD ST**

Proposal: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Derrek Etsell and Jeff Etsell

Applicant: Derrek Etsell

History: Vacant lot; house damaged by fire and demolished, 2011

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Greenbelt Knoll Historic District, Contributing, 6/9/2006

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

**BACKGROUND:** The applicant seeks to construct a house on a lot in the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District. The houses in the district are Modernist in style. The house that stood on the site was damaged in a fire, declared Imminently Dangerous, and demolished in 2011. The proposed house seeks to use the vocabulary and massing of the old house though it does not replicate it. The staff recommends that proposed design could perhaps better match the vocabulary of the district by using casement windows without muntins, particularly as the proposed muntins are sandwiched between the glass. The staff also recommends against cladding the house with vinyl siding.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct house on vacant lot

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions [and] related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

- The proposed design is compatible with the district in massing and scale but could better match the detail and materials to protect the environment of the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of a revised design that uses casement windows and wood or composite siding rather than vinyl siding, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing materials and design elements such as windows, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:07:20

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission and explained that the applicant had revised the design to follow the Committee's comments.
- Property owners Derrek and Kelli Etsell represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub emphasized the significance of the development and opined that the design is not compatible.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised design with casement windows and composite siding is compatible with the district, provided the overall façade color is more recessive.
- The building is located significantly below the grade of the street, but is still somewhat visible from the public right-of-way.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised design with casement windows and composite siding complies with Standard 9, provided the overall façade color is more recessive.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided that the overall façade color is more recessive, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>ITEM: 12 Longford St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval, with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Trego</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

**ADDRESS: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4TH ST**

Proposal: Remove rear ells and additions; construct additions  
 Review Requested: Review In Concept  
 Owner: 234 S. 4th St. LP and Forman Family Realty Trust  
 Applicant: Ming-Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig  
 History: 1805  
 Individual Designation: 4/30/1957  
 District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999  
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:**

This in-concept application proposes to combine two historic rowhouses and construct large additions at the rear and on an adjacent vacant lot to create one large residence. The Architectural Committee reviewed the first in-concept application in July 2019. The Committee objected to the proposal and the application was withdrawn before the August meeting of the Historical Commission. The Architectural Committee reviewed a second in-concept application in August 2019 and voted to recommend denial of it, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance, the demolition prohibition. The applicants were granted a one-month continuance following the Architectural Committee’s August meeting, during which they developed a third design. At its 11 October 2019 meeting, the Historical Commission considered and then remanded the third in-concept application to the Architectural Committee for review at its 22 October 2019 meeting. The Commission remanded it because the third design, which the Architectural Committee had not seen, deviated significantly from the second.

The application proposes work to a site that consists of three parcels and includes two historic rowhouses at 230 and 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and a lot surrounded by a non-historic brick wall with fence. The rowhouses face S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and open onto Leithgow at the rear. The open lot runs west from 4th Street to Leithgow Street along Locust Street. The application proposes to combine the parcels, join the historic rowhouses, remove the rear ells of the two rowhouses as

well as later garage and dining room additions, and construct additions to create one large dwelling. The houses date to about 1805. The rear ells may or may not be original, but are evident in their current forms on the 1860 Hexamer & Locher map. A rear addition at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed in 1913, when the building was converted into a clubhouse for an insurance industry trade organization. Later one and two-story rear additions were built alongside the rear ell at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The application proposes to remove most of the rear ells and additions and construct new side and rear additions. The piazza at 230 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street would be retained. The new additions would be clad in brick with metal windows. The additions would be in the style of nearby mid twentieth-century Modernist houses. The new design includes four courtyard areas and a garage accessed from Leithgow.

After the 11 October meeting of the Historical Commission but before the 22 October meeting of the Architectural Committee, the applicant submitted a supplement, which responded to the Historical Commission's comments and questions at the 11 October 2019 meeting. It included the following:

1. A proposal to retain, not demolish, the Leithgow Street facades of the historic buildings;
2. Additional information about the restoration work, including the repair of the stucco on the south party wall of 234 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street, which was specifically requested by the chair of the Historical Commission at the 11 October 2019 Commission meeting;
3. Additional information about and photographs of the rear ells, including detailed information about the sections of the ells that would be retained and removed;
4. Information about a similar project including demolition of a rear ell that the Historical Commission approved for the two buildings to the north at 226 and 228 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street; and
5. A comparison of the rear elevation shown to the Historical Commission and the new proposed rear elevation revised since the October Historical Commission meeting.

To date, the reviews have focused on whether the removal of the rear ells and additions would constitute a demolition or an alteration as defined in the historic preservation ordinance. The applicants have argued that the rear ells are not character-defining features, and, therefore, their removal is not a "demolition." The historic preservation ordinance, at Section 14-203(88), defines a demolition as:

Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

If the removal of the rear ells and additions is a demolition in the legal sense, the Historical Commission may only approve it after finding that there is no feasible reuse for the buildings without the demolition or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. If the removal is found to be an alteration, the Commission may approve it at its discretion. For the removal to constitute a demolition in the legal sense, it must be a "razing or destruction ... in significant part." The Historical Commission must determine whether the rear ells and additions are "significant parts" of the historic rowhouses. The application now includes a report from a historic preservation consultant, who concludes that:

As these rear appendages were secondary in character and are not character-defining, their removal does not alter the historic character of the subject properties and should not be considered a demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d). Additionally, the ells are not readily visible from primary vantage points and thus their removal will not negatively impact the feeling of the historic district.

The Historical Commission has reviewed many applications proposing the removals of rear ells since the enactment of the current preservation ordinance in 1985, when it gained the authority

to deny demolitions. The Commission has approved some and denied others, always based on the unique circumstances of the case. Perhaps most famously, the Historical Commission approved the removal of the rear ell or wing of the Dilworth House as an alteration, not a demolition. That case was litigated for years. Ultimately, the Commonwealth Court affirmed the Historical Commission's decision to approve the removal as an alteration, citing that sufficient evidence was on record to support the decision.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove rear sections of the buildings at 230 and 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Construct additions.

**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.*
  - Whether this application satisfies the first requirement of Standard 9 depends on whether the rear ells and additions are considered "historic materials that characterize the property." The proposed additions are differentiated from the old and are compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- *Standard 10: New Additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - Whether this application satisfies Standard 10 depends on whether the rear ells and additions are considered part of "the essential form and integrity of the historic property."
- *Section 14-203(88) of the Philadelphia Code defines "Demolition or Demolish" as "The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface."*
  - Whether this application would result in a "demolition" in the legal sense depends on whether the removal of the rear ells and additions is considered a "razing or destruction ... in significant part."

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff offers no recommendation on whether the rear ells and additions are historically significant and whether their removals would constitute a demolition in the legal sense until it has visited the site and inspected the rear ells in person. The staff recommends that the proposed additions satisfy the "new construction" section of Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the concept of removing the original and older sections of the rear ells, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:15:35

**PRESENTERS:**

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



- Architect Ming-Lee Yuan, preservation consultant Nick Kraus, and property owner Michael Forman represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Forman explained the site and its context. He informed the Historical Commission how he acquired the properties. He stated that that the rear ells are not highly visible from the streets, are in poor condition, and have been altered many times. He stated that he would restore the fronts of the buildings.
- Ms. Yuan stated that the rear ells are not character-defining features.
- Mr. Farnham noted that he visited and prepared a report on the histories of the rear ells. He explained the histories of the buildings to the Commissioners.
- Mr. Kraus stated that the Historical Commission approved removing the rear ell at the property to the north of the properties in question for the current applicant.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the claim that the rears of these buildings are unimportant negates the lives of the people who worked in these spaces, which is “unacceptable.”
- Mr. Forman stated that he is respectful of the Historical Commission’s mission and is a preservationist himself but can find no way to reuse these rear ells. He stated that the conditions and the configurations of the ells do not allow for their reuse.
- Ms. Yuan stated that maintaining the rear facades on Leithgow Street are an option.
- Mr. Thomas suggested that recordation might be an option in this case. The information that the rear ells contain could be recorded and made available.
  - Mr. Forman stated that he would be happy to record the buildings.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the rear ells would be largely invisible to the public with new construction on the open lot.
  - Mr. Forman observed that the rear ells are largely obscured from public view now, owing to the 1950s additions and the trees on the vacant lot.
- Mr. Forman stated that he wants to restore the block to its single-family residential character. A large apartment building was proposed for the vacant lot. The building at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street was used as an office building.
- Mr. Kraus discussed the history of the site and its surroundings as it is detailed in his report. He also noted that rear ells were routinely removed during the Redevelopment period of Society Hill.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that he toured the properties last week. He observed that the houses are not habitable today and he congratulated Mr. Forman for his project to restore them. He stated that the proposed design would be an excellent addition to Society Hill. He suggested that Mr. Forman make one change to the design, that he preserve the piazza at 232 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street in addition to the piazza at 230 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Steinke noted that the rear facades on Leithgow Street have little or no historical significance.
- Larry Spector, the president of the Society Hill Civic Association, praised Mr. Forman for working with his association. He stated that his association is very enthusiastic about the project and advocated for its approval.
- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association accompanied Mr. Spector.
- Dan Kelly, representing Bingham Court, a development across S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street from the site, advocated for the approval of the application. He stated that the project will protect the neighborhood from inappropriate construction and will restore the historically significant buildings. The project offers a great opportunity to bring excellent architecture to the neighborhood.

- Steven Peitzman opposed the project.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed project will not destroy historic materials because the rear ell and additions do not characterize the properties.
- Despite the removals of the rear ell and additions, the essential form and integrity of the historic properties will be unimpaired.
- The removals of the rear ell and additions will not constitute the razing or destruction of the buildings in significant part.
- The proposed new construction will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the properties and their environment.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The work proposed in the application is an alteration, not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88) of the Philadelphia Code.
- The work proposed in the application satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application in concept, provided the historic rear sections of the buildings are documented before removal, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 2. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Lippert dissented.

<b>ITEM: 230, 232, and 234-36 S. 4<sup>th</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval in concept</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Mattioni</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman		X			
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)		X			
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11	2			

**ADDRESS: 69-71 N 2ND ST**

Proposal: Construct roof deck, stair tower, and elevator tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 69-71 N. 2nd St LLC

Applicant: Kevin Wilson, 69-71 N 2nd St LLC

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

The applicant has been working with the staff to renovate two commercial structures into residential units. The staff has already approved a storefront, windows, and an addition at the rear. The applicant now seeks to construct a roof deck and two pilot houses. The rear pilot house will sit on the new addition and will not be visible from the street. The front pilot house will house a stair and will replace an existing visible freight elevator penthouse. The staff recommends lowering and sloping the roof of the front pilot house and relocating the HVAC units to the lower roof to reduce the visibility of the new construction from the street. Industrial buildings of this type often had rooftop structures.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Install roof deck and pilohouses.

**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.*
- *Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning ... when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.]*
  - The proposed deck and pilohouses partially comply with this Standard and Guideline. However, they could be improved by reducing the height and sloping the roof of the pilohouse and relocating the HVAC units to the lower roof to reduce the visibility of the new construction from the street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the suggested modifications are implemented, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced, the roof of the pilot house is sloped down toward the street, and the mechanical equipment is relocated from the pilot house roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 3001 BYBERRY RD**

Proposal: Construct one-story addition and ADA ramp

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Trustees of the Byberry Friends Meeting

Applicant: Kate Cowing, Kate Cowing Architect, LLC

History: 1808; Byberry Friends Meeting House

Individual Designation: 9/12/1974

District Designation: None

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

**BACKGROUND:**

The applicant proposes to add a single-story structure with a restroom, kitchen, and function room to a historic meetinghouse. The addition will also provide accessibility to the meetinghouse. Although there is a garage addition at the rear that could perhaps be adapted, that structure has a much lower floor level, which poses accessibility problems. There is also a historic outhouse wing, the only restrooms at the meetinghouse, but altering or removing it would detract from the historic character of the site. The applicant has designed the proposed addition to avoid obstructing the rear windows of the meeting house, demolishing its historic outhouse wing, altering the historic stepped pews, removing significant trees, altering views of the meetinghouse from the street, or building on the historic graveyard.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct one-story addition along the side façade of the meetinghouse.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed addition partially complies with this Standard. However, it could perhaps be improved by orienting it along the driveway, connecting with a glazed link and using more compatible fenestration.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided additional refinements are explored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:04:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Kate Cowing represented the application. She provided a revised design to the Commissioners.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The addition proposed in the revised design attaches to the least significant facade.
- The addition proposed in the revised design will avoid the removal a significant tree.
- The addition proposed in the revised design will preserve the historic outhouse.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The addition proposed in the revised design satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

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

<b>ITEM: 3001 Byberry Rd</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Turner</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

**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](mailto: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. The Architectural Committee reviewed and the Historical Commission denied an earlier proposal for a third-story addition because of concerns about the extent of demolition and incomplete information regarding the proposed addition’s relationship with the main block.

## 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.

## 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 applicant is proposing to add a third story with a mansard roof to the two-story rear addition. Shingles are proposed for the new third story mansard to match the main house. The work also involves the removal of all existing windows at the second-story addition, with three at the east façade's ground level to be in-filled and the rest replaced.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - The building permit application mentions that the sun-room at the rear of the house will be rebuilt. Staff requests further explanation of the extent of those changes and if they are limited to the interior of the space.
- *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 amount of demolition of historic fabric has been reduced in the revised plans for alterations to the existing two-story rear addition.
  - The new third story appears to connect to the rear wall of the existing main house sensitively.
  - The applicant has responded to comments from both the staff and the Architectural Committee to finish the new third-story addition with a treatment that is more sensitive to the existing main house through the use of a mansard.
  - The applicant has revised the plans to leave the existing cornice of the two-story addition in place rather than relocating it to the new third-story addition, as previously proposed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the applicant confirms that the exterior of the existing sunroom will not be altered, with the staff to review and approve details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that no work is done to the existing sun room without an additional approval and the height of the mansard is lowered by at least one foot, with the staff to review the lighting, railing, and curb details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 7105 RIDGE AVE**

Proposal: Construct three-story building at rear of property

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AETT LLC

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Lauletta Birnbaum LLC

History: 1851

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

Designated as part of the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District in 2018, the property consists of a two and a half story building fronting Ridge Avenue with a large rear yard, a portion of which currently serves as a parking area. No work to the historic structure is proposed in this application.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story, multi-family residential building at rear yard.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed three-story building would be limited to the rear yard and would be minimally visible from Ridge Avenue. A parking area would further separate the proposed new construction from the historic resource. The building would be compatible in massing, size, and scale.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - The proposed building could be removed in the future without impacting the historic structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the windows visible from Ridge Avenue are one-over-one or six-over-one aluminum clad or composite double-hung sash windows and that the street-facing façade is not clad in vinyl siding, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

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

- the larger fixed window is changed to be more consistent with the other windows;
- the windows are a composite material and not vinyl;
- the siding is either HardiePlank or stucco;
- the PTAC units do not project from the face of the building;
- the north elevation steps back at least one foot where Unit 3 is identified in plan; and,
- drawings of the north and east elevations are provided to the Historical Commission.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 565 JUDSON ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 1601-03 Ridge Avenue LP

Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: None

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application for new construction at 565 Judson Street follows two previous applications to the Historical Commission that were reviewed in March 2017 and January 2019. The Historical Commission maintained full jurisdiction over those reviews because each proposed to construct an addition to the adjacent historic structure at 563 Judson Street. The current application proposes only to construct a building on the vacant lot and does not include any work to the adjacent property. Consequently, the Historical Commission maintains review and comment authority over the application.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story, single-family residential 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 proposed three-story building would be incompatible with the massing, size, and scale of the two-story buildings that comprise the row. The architectural features, including the window configurations, materials, cornice, and projecting bay, are insensitive to the historic context, both of Judson Street and of the Spring Garden Historic District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff comments that the proposed construction at 565 Judson Street is incompatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee commented that the building is incompatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, and Judson Street specifically, in its massing and materials, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:11:40

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the application.



**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Neighbor Doug Taber stated that the Historical Commission staff prepared a report. He expressed appreciation for the changes made to the design. He urged the Commission to take plenary jurisdiction over the property, adding that the justification for the by-right proposal is that this was an “undeveloped site” according to the preservation ordinance. He summarized the five specific reasons provided by the staff to justify the Historical Commission’s level of review over the property. Mr. Taber admitted that the points were true, adding that the properties were jointly owned but never consolidated into a single tax parcel. He then suggested that the true consideration should be for the structure that stood on the parcel in the 1930s. He advocated for a small rowhouse that matches the dimensions of the original building to be constructed. From the staff’s report, he continued, the period of significance for the Spring Garden Historic District spans from 1850 to 1930. He commented that the rowhouse at 565 Judson Street stood until at least 1938. He claimed that the Historical Commission designated 563 and 565 N. Judson Street as a single developed site, adding that the district inventory explicitly calls the two properties a “home and garden.” He contended that the lot was well maintained with trees at the time of designation, which suggests it was not an undeveloped site. He stated that the staff claims the inventory designation as a single site was a mistake and again claimed that the Commission has the authority to take plenary jurisdiction. If the owner cannot reconstruct the building that existed in the 1930s, the next best use for the property in Mr. Taber’s opinion would be to place the property under the stewardship of the garden trust and keep it as open space. Mr. Taber then argued that the neighborhood considers the two properties to be a single site, though he acknowledged that they are two separate tax parcels.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property meets the three criteria of an undeveloped site: 1) the site has never been individually designated; 2) the inventory attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value; and 3) no building or structure stood at the time of designation.
- The property at 565 Judson Street has been separately deeded and considered by the City as a separate property from 563 Judson Street since the 1870s when the much larger lot was subdivided into nine separate properties.
- Though 563 and 565 Judson Street have at times been under the same ownership, 565 Judson Street has always been a separate and distinct parcel.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission has review and comment authority only and not plenary jurisdiction over the property in question.
- The proposed building is incompatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, and Judson Street specifically, in its massing and materials. The application does not satisfy Standard 9.

**COMMENT:** The Historical Commission commented that the building is incompatible with the Spring Garden Historic District, and Judson Street specifically, in its massing and materials, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 1733 SPRING GARDEN ST**

Proposal: Construct exterior stair

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1733 Spring Garden LLC

Applicant: Dale You, 1733 Spring Garden LLC

History: 1875; 1st story addition between main building and rear; 1886 Carriage House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

**BACKGROUND:**

Located at the northeast corner of N. 18<sup>th</sup> and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District, the property at 1733 Spring Garden Street extends to Brandywine Street and features a four-story mansion with a historic two-story extension and detailed bay, and a detached carriage house. The courtyard between the house and carriage house is enclosed by a historic wall and fence.

This application proposes to construct an exterior stair that would provide egress from the third floor of the main building to the courtyard. The stair would be accessed from a new door that would be cut in the brick façade of the third-floor rear wall and open onto the roof of an existing historic bay window, which would be enclosed by a metal railing. The application does not include a drawing of this elevation nor does it demonstrate why access cannot be provided by cutting down the existing third-floor rear window. Likewise, details of the attachment of the stair to the bay window and possible necessary modifications to the bay window are not provided. The proposed stair also appears to require the removal or relocation of mechanical equipment and ductwork, the details of which are not included.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Cut doorway
- Construct exterior stair

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *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.*
  - Depending on the attachment details of the proposed stair as it relates to the historic bay window, the stair may be easily reversible.
  - The application may comply with this guideline.
- *Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline: Recommended: Adding a new stairway or elevator to meet life-safety code requirements in a manner that preserves adjacent character defining features and spaces; Using existing openings on secondary or less-visible elevations or, if necessary, creating new openings on secondary or less-visible elevations to accommodate second egress requirements.*
  - The application proposes work to a secondary, but highly-visible elevation.
  - The application partially complies with this guideline.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the applicants demonstrate that the existing window cannot be cut down to a door; that a new door is minimal and compatible in design and material with the historic building; that the mechanical equipment is removed or relocated to an inconspicuous location; and that the railing and stair are attached in such a way that minimizes

damage to the historic bay window, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the design is modified so that

- the third-floor egress doorway is created by modifying the window opening rather than cutting a new opening in the wall;
- the sill and window that are removed are retained on site;
- the mechanical equipment is removed or relocated to an inconspicuous location; and,
- the railing and stair are detailed and attached in such a way that minimizes damage to the historic bay window and other historic fabric,

with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:21:20

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- A change in use for the third through fifth floor created the requirement for a second means of egress.
- The exterior stair should be as minimal and as recessive as possible.
- The exterior stair is planned for the interior side of the rear courtyard.
- Interior photographs showed extensive historic architectural details and finishes that would need to be partially demolished to create an interior secondary stair. Although the proposal for an exterior stair would have a negative visual impact along N. 18<sup>th</sup> Street, it is the best option to protect historic fabric.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The design of the exterior stair will be modified to address concerns about the attachment details as it relates to the historic bay window and other historic fabric; third-floor egress doorway will be created by modifying the window opening rather than cutting a new opening in the masonry wall; and the historic sill and window will be retained on site in the event stair is removed in the future, meeting Standard 10.
- An existing window opening will be used to create third-floor egress doorway to exterior stair; attachments to historic fabric will be minimized, and stair will be located on the interior side of the rear courtyard, meeting the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 12 to 1. Ms. Sanchez dissented.

<b>ITEM: 1733 Spring Garden St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Trego</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)		X			
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12	1			

**ADDRESS: 2201 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct exterior stair

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara McGinley Living Trust; Barbara C. McGinley Trust

Applicant: Michelle Kleschick, Parallel Architecture Studio LLC

History: 1879

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct an exterior egress stair at the rear of this corner property. The new owners of the single-family residence intend to convert the building into a three-family dwelling, and are seeking the exterior stair owing to the increased occupancy and as a means of egress in the event of an emergency.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct exterior egress stair at rear of building from third through fifth floors.
- Install casement window in mansard dormer at rear.

**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 exterior stair will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The stair will be differentiated from the old and will read as a modern intervention to provide egress.
- *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 exterior stair could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.
- *Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline: Recommended: Adding a new stairway or elevator to meet health and safety codes in a manner that preserves adjacent character-defining features and spaces.*
  - The addition of the exterior stair does not negatively impact character-defining features and spaces.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:29:05

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Carolina Pena and property owner Dale You represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property is currently a single-family home and is being converted to a three-family dwelling. Owing to this conversion, a second means of egress from the upper floors (of the five-story building) is required by code.
- The applicant made the decision to put the second means of egress on the exterior to protect the historic finishes on the building's interior.
- The proposed exterior stair goes from the fifth floor down to the third floor. From the third floor to the ground floor the second means of egress is an existing interior stair.
- The architect confirmed that code requires bi-level apartments to have a second means of egress for apartment on the fourth and fifth floors.
- The owner explained that the building's historic interior finishes are intact, and they did not want to remove them to create a secondary stair on the interior.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The construction of the exterior stair will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The stair will be differentiated from the old and will read as a modern intervention to provide egress, meeting Standard 9.

- The exterior stair could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired, meeting Standard 10.
- The addition of the exterior stair does not negatively impact character-defining features and spaces, meeting the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline.

**ACTION:** Mr. Lippert moved to approve the application, provided documentation of interior finishes is provided, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Code Required Work/Life-Safety Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 12 to 1. Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

<b>ITEM: 2201 Delancey PI</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval, with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Lippert</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Mattioni</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey		X			
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12	1			

**ADDRESS: 6626 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Proposal: Construct multi-family building at rear of property  
 Review Requested: Final Approval  
 Owner: Hebron Tabernacle of America  
 Applicant: Stuart Udis, PA Realty Advisors LLC  
 History: 1905; Pelham Pharmacy; David Knickerbocker Boyd, architect  
 Individual Designation: 3/8/2019  
 District Designation: None  
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a four-unit residential building at the rear of the former Pelham Pharmacy building. The historic building is situated at the corner of Germantown Avenue and W. Phil Ellena Street, and contains an area of undeveloped land at the rear along W. Phil Ellena Street. The property was designated in March 2019 for significance related to its architect and for exemplifying the historical heritage of the planned Pelham development. The designation includes the entire tax parcel which encompasses both the historic building and the undeveloped land at the rear.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application in August 2019 which proposed the construction of three townhouses at this site. The Committee recommended denial of the application, and provided suggestions for improving the proposal, including a change in materials, setback from street, massing, and spatial relationships. The applicant withdrew that application after the Committee review to incorporate the Committee's comments into a revised design.

The current application proposes a 10-foot front yard setback, which removes the front porches and rear parking from the earlier in-concept application. It also now proposes a larger side yard setback and decreases the overall lot coverage. The materials have been changed from white brick and vertical board to red brick and gray stone veneer. The proposed building reads as a twin rather than three townhouses, as it was designed in the in-concept application.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct multi-family building fronting W. Phil Ellena Street on undeveloped land at rear.

#### **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 massing, scale, and materials are compatible with the historic property. The setback from the street and darker material choices allows the new building to be deferential to the historic building. The staff suggests the mansard roof should have a steeper slope to reduce its visual impact.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided:

- the mansard is reduced in height;
- the roof deck is pulled back from the front of the building so that it aligns with the top of the step, and has a simple metal guardrail;
- the dormers are moved away from the edge of the building and the fronts are trim rather than siding;
- the vertical stone element is omitted from the front façade;
- the size and positioning of the front façade windows is reconsidered;
- elevations are provided of the sides and rear with materials specified.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 1520-28 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Demolish non-historic penthouse; construct two-story penthouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spruce Street Commons

Applicant: Ronald J. Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1917; The Touraine; Frederick Webber, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to demolish an existing penthouse and construct a two-story penthouse on approximately the same footprint on the roof of the Touraine apartment building. The Historical Commission did not review the existing penthouse because it was constructed prior to the designation of the building. Both the existing penthouse is visible and the proposed penthouse would be visible from several vantage points, as the location is at the far southern end of the building.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Demolish non-historic penthouse.
- Construct two-story penthouse.

**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 penthouse would not destroy historic materials and features that characterize the property. It would be differentiated from the historic building.
- *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 penthouse could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.
- *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 penthouse would not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining features.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Roofs Guideline.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.



## **THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 22 OCTOBER 2019**

Dan McCoubrey, Acting Chair

### **ADDRESS: 106-08 AND 110 GRAPE ST**

Proposal: Demolish buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Nedusin

Applicant: William O'Brien, Manayunk Law Office

History: 106-08 Grape Street, c. 1930; 110 Grape Street, c. 1835

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk, 12/14/1983

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

**BACKGROUND:** This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage at 106-08 Grape Street and a three-story residential building at 110 Grape Street.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the Historical Commission from approving a complete demolition of a contributing resource in a historic district unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, i.e. that compelling the preservation of the building would cause the owner to suffer a "financial hardship." This application claims that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The financial hardship application will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship as well as the Historical Commission.

The Manayunk Development Corporation ("MDC"), a non-profit charitable organization, submitted the application. The application includes a cover letter from the MDC that 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." The application includes an affidavit from the current owner, which is not the Manayunk Development Corporation, but is instead a for-profit real estate company. 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 includes a report from a historic preservation consultant that opines that 106-08 Grape Street is classified as non-contributing in the historic district and 110 Grape Street is classified as contributing. The report concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street lacks historical significance and integrity. The application includes an engineer's report that concludes that the building at 110 Grape Street is severely deteriorated and suffers from structural defects. Finally, the application includes a financial analysis that seeks to demonstrate that the building at 110 Grape Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

The MDC submitted a similar application without the financial analysis to the Historical Commission in the spring of 2019. The Historical Commission tabled that application for a period not to exceed six months to give the applicant an opportunity to supplement it with the requisite financial analysis. The applicant failed to submit the financial analysis during the tabling period and the Historical Commission had no choice but to deny the application in

September 2019. The applicant subsequently resubmitted the application with a financial analysis.

The building at 110 Grape Street is a small, two-and-one-half story rowhouse built about 1835. It is about 1,457 square feet in size. A garage was inserted into the front façade at some point in the twentieth century. The house has been vacant for decades and is in very poor condition.

The application includes a construction cost estimate for a mixed-use commercial and residential project of \$1,155,052, or \$792.76 per sf. The financial analysis consists of a discounted cash flow analysis over 10 years with various assumptions about interest rates to borrow, rental rates, vacancy rates, operating expenses, and appreciation rates. Using the construction cost estimate of \$1,155,052, the analysis predicts negative cash flows every year and a net present value for the project of negative \$796,179.

After receiving and reviewing the financial analysis, the staff informed the applicant that it considered the estimated construction cost of \$1,155,052 to be unrealistically high. Subsequently, the applicant adjusted the construction cost to \$700,000, or \$480.44 per sf. Using the new construction cost, the revised analysis predicts negative cash flows every year and a net present value for the project of negative \$458,695.

The staff considered the second construction cost estimate, \$480 per sf, to be high as well. The staff undertook a sensitivity analysis to determine the impacts of adjusting the various assumptions, especially the construction cost estimate. To do so, the staff reverse-engineered the financial analysis using MS Excel. Using a more reasonable construction cost of \$350 per sf or \$510,000 total and discounting the purchase price to \$0 to reflect a property of no value, but leaving the other assumptions constant, the staff found that the project over 10 years would still produce negative cash flows every year and a negative net present value for the project. The staff concluded that the financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission:

- acknowledge that the 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 and is not binding on the Historical Commission;
- acknowledge that the complete demolition of the contributing resource triggers the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance;
- decline to apply the provisions of Section 10 of the Rules & Regulations, titled “Financial Hardship and Non-Profit Organizations,” because a non-profit does not currently own the property;
- 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 to keep the building in good repair;

- find that, despite its inflated construction costs, the financial analysis demonstrates that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; and,
- approve the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommend to the Historical Commission that the building at 110 Grape Street cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted; that the sale of the property is impracticable; that rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return; and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed; pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:36:55

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Mattioni recused, owing to involvement with a non-profit associated with the applicant. Ms. Turner chaired the review.
- Attorney William O'Brien, and Lisa Lamprou and Joan Denenberg of the Manayunk Development Corporation represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commented that the building appears to have suffered from demolition by neglect by the current owner. He stated that, based on the financial analysis provided by both the applicant and the staff, it appears to be a reasonable claim of hardship and the Alliance does not oppose the application for demolition at this time, owing to the finding of financial hardship.
- Steven Peitzman asked for clarification about the financial hardship process, and about which owner needs to be experiencing the hardship.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that the hardship process is designed specifically to determine whether the building itself can be adaptively reused in a feasible manner by any potential owner operating in a rational manner and expecting a reasonable rate of return. The financial state of the current or prospective owner is irrelevant. The hardship process determines whether the condition, configuration, location, and other aspects of a building allow it to be feasibly reused by any owner.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code does not provide a mechanism for reviewing this application proposing demolition.
- Section 18 of the Rules & Regulations authorizes the Historical Commission to apply the "financial hardship" provisions of the Rules & Regulations to this application even through it was designated under Chapter 8 of the Property Maintenance Code.

- The classifications provided in the inventory for the Main Street Manayunk National Register Historic District correctly attribute a Non-contributing status to the property at 106-08 Grape Street and a Contributing status to the property at 110 Grape Street.
- The poor condition of the building at 110 Grape Street could be considered demolition by neglect 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.
- The Historical Commission is not considering the design of the new building proposed for this site.
- The Commission will retain plenary jurisdiction over the review of building permit applications for this property regardless of the outcome of this application.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Owing to the extremely poor condition, the limited square footage, and the existing configuration of the building at 110 Grape Street, the financial analyses performed by both the applicant and the staff demonstrate that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

**ACTION:** Ms. Trego moved to approve the application, pursuant to the findings of the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Messrs. Thomas and Mattioni recused.

<b>ITEM: 106-08 and 110 Grape St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Trego</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair				X	
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>			<b>2</b>	

## **THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 16 OCTOBER 2019**

Emily Cooperman, Chair

### **ADDRESS: 81-95 FAIRMOUNT AVE**

Name of Resource: Terminal Warehouse Company Headquarters

Proposed Action: Amend boundary of individual designation

Property Owner: VMDT Partnership

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to amend the boundary of the designated property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue to exclude the non-contributing portion of the property to the north and west of the historic buildings. In November 2016, the Historical Commission designated the property as historic and listed it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. While the entire tax parcel was subject to that designation, only the row of eight Federal-style buildings fronting Fairmount Avenue was categorized as historically significant in the nomination. The buildings immediately to the north, noted as 707-09 N. Front Street and 704-08 N. Beach Street in the nomination, were identified as non-contributing.

On 4 October 2019, the staff approved an application submitted by the property owner to demolish the non-contributing buildings, with the condition that the rear party walls of the historically significant buildings are properly sealed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends amending the boundary of the individual designation of the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue to exclude the non-contributing portion to the north and west of the row of eight Federal-style buildings.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the boundary of the individual designation of the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue to exclude the non-contributing portion to the north and west of the row of eight Federal-style buildings.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:47:23

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the boundary amendment to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

#### **HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The amended boundary includes the row of eight Federal-style buildings, portions of two rear ells, and the existing rear yard.
- Only portions of the site currently considered non-contributing would be excluded from the boundary.
- The staff approved an application for the demolition of several non-contributing structures at the site on 4 October 2019.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission would retain full jurisdiction over the significant row of Federal-style buildings.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the boundary amendment of the individual designation of the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue to exclude the non-contributing portion to the north and west of the row of eight Federal-style buildings. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>ITEM: 81-95 Fairmount Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Amend boundary of individual designation</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Hartner</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

**ADDRESS: OVERBROOK FARMS HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owners: See list on file at Historical Commission

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This proposed historic district, located in West Philadelphia, is composed of 501 properties, approximately 90% of which are residential, with the remaining serving commercial and institutional uses. Thirteen properties are considered significant, 430 properties are considered contributing and 58 properties are considered non-contributing. An additional two properties are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District is bounded at the north to City Avenue, the east by N. 58th Street, the south by the property line of the properties facing onto Woodbine Avenue, and the west by N. 66th Street.

According to the nomination, Overbrook Farms is a neighborhood initially financed by investors known as the Drexel Syndicate and envisioned by developers Herman Wendell and Walter Bassett Smith that illustrates trends in suburban community planning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The nomination argues that many of the various architectural styles that were popular at this time (roughly 1893-1929) are represented in the Overbrook Farms Historic District. Although there are over 20 styles represented, the majority of houses are Colonial Revival or Tudor Revival. Other styles include Arts & Crafts, Dutch Colonial Revival, Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Prairie, Romanesque, and Shingle.

The majority of the buildings in the Overbrook Farms Historic District, particularly the dwellings, maintain their original form and materials. In many cases, additions and alterations were made within the period of significance (1850-1929). More recent alterations include replacement windows, glazed porches, and wing additions. Although modern alterations and materials are present, original or otherwise historic exterior materials dominate this district. This is likely owing to the predominance of masonry construction. The majority of buildings are in good to excellent condition.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, F, H and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, F, H and J.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:52:45

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in support of the nomination.
- Thaddeus Squire, chair of the Overbrook Farms Club, the registered community organization for Overbrook Farms, informed the Historical Commission that a recent survey of the residents in the neighborhood evidenced overwhelming support for designation.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nomination was very thorough, well documented, and interesting.
- The nomination includes extensive documentation of the developers, architects, and engineers who designed the buildings, landscapes, and infrastructure of the district.
- The nomination includes extensive documentation of owners and occupants of the residences and of the owners and operators of the businesses in the district.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination is an authoritative history of the development of Overbrook Farms, successfully demonstrating the district's satisfaction of Criterion for Designation A.
- The nomination demonstrates that the developers, architects, and engineers who created the neighborhood are historically significant and that they designed and created a historically significant, cohesive collection of houses and other structures that represent several of the most popular architectural styles of the era, satisfying Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

- The nomination demonstrates that the developers created a neighborhood that included innovative infrastructure systems, landscaping, and design, satisfying Criteria for Designation F.
- The nomination demonstrates that the neighborhood includes several structures that, owing to their unique locations and singular physical characteristics, represent established and familiar visual features of the neighborhood, thereby satisfying Criterion for Designation H.
- The nomination demonstrates that the development of the Overbrook Farms exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, thereby satisfying Criterion for Designation J.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, F, H and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>ITEM: Overbrook Farms Historic District</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate, A, C, D, E, F, H, and J</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Trego</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				



## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **ADDRESS: 239 CHESTNUT ST**

Proposal: Construct seven-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Mazal Tov Development LLC

Applicant: Kevin O'Neill, KJO Architecture LLC

History: 1852; Lewis Building; Stephen D. Button, architect; destroyed by fire in 2018

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

**BACKGROUND:** Significant architect Stephen Button constructed the two buildings at 239 and 241 Chestnut Street as a pair in 1852; the Historical Commission individually designated the pair together as one entity, 239-41 Chestnut Street, in 1976. The building at 239 Chestnut Street was destroyed by fire and the ruins were demolished in 2018. The building at 241 Chestnut Street was damaged but repaired. Before 239 Chestnut was demolished, the Department of Licenses & Inspections laser scanned the front façade and salvaged the cast-iron first floor by Daniel Badger so that the building could be reconstructed. The applicant, who is considering purchasing the lot, proposes to construct a building that does not reuse the historic fabric or reproduce the historic façade. While the front façade would be rebuilt to the height of the historic façade, an additional two stories would be constructed set back from the new façade. Because the site is close to the corner and the building across the street is notched to create a pocket park, these additional two floors would be quite visible from the street. The standards suggest that the front façade should be reconstructed to its historic appearance because it is a component of a larger ensemble. Extensive documentation and fabric exists to promote an accurate reproduction of the front facade. A rooftop addition that was set back from the front façade to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way would comply with the standards.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct new seven-story building.

### **STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
  - The front façade of the proposed building would not match its twin to the west at 241 Chestnut Street, even though very complete documentary evidence exists for the reconstruction. The project does not comply with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall ... be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The architectural features of the proposed front façade will not be compatible with the environment, especially the adjacent twin building at 241 Chestnut Street. The project does not comply with this standard.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:51:58

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Kevin O’Neill and developer Gary Murray represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building is very significant and was designed by an important architect.
- The City undertook significant efforts to preserve pieces of the façade and to create a digital record the façade in order to allow for the reconstruction.
- Arguments related to the cost of the reconstruction and the size of an overbuild needed to subsidize that reconstruction are financial hardship arguments.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not satisfy Standard 6 because the proposed facade does not match the original façade or its twin at 241 Chestnut Street in massing, materials, design, or color. The historic façade should be reconstructed.
- The application does not satisfy Standard 9 because the new design does not incorporate the original façade pieces and the height of the overbuild would be highly visible from the public right-of-way and Independence National Historical Park. The proposed construction would not protect its environment, including its twin at 241 Chestnut Street.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Trego seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ITEM: 239 Chestnut St**  
**MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9**  
**MOVED BY: McCoubrey**  
**SECONDED BY: Trego**

<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

DRAFT

## **JEWELERS' ROW HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

**OVERVIEW:** During the March 2019 Historical Commission meeting, the owners of properties in the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District requested that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination to a future Committee on Historic Designation meeting to allow for additional time an architectural historian to evaluate the nomination and write a report. The Historical Commission granted the continuance with the understanding that the property owners' attorney would provide a status update on the report at the August 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission.

At the August 2019 meeting, the attorney updated the Historical Commission, explaining that the evaluation would be ready in October or November and agreeing to provide a status update at the October 2019 meeting. The Historical Commission continued the review of the historic district nomination and remanded it to the December 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, with the understanding that a status update would be provided at today's meeting.

The attorney again provided a status update to the Historical Commission in the form of a letter in October 2019. In his update, he explained that the consultant is still working on the evaluation and concludes that the report may or may not be complete in time for the December 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. The attorney offered to provide an update at the November 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission and make any request for an additional continuance at that time.

On 1 November 2019, the attorney provided another status update via letter. The attorney stated that the report would be done in December but the preservation consultant, George Thomas, has a scheduling conflict and would not be available to attend a CHD meeting until February 2020. Since time would be required for the CHD to review the Mr. Thomas' response report in addition to scheduling conflicts for Mr. Thomas, the attorney asked for a continuance to the February 2020 CHD.

The Preservation Alliance submitted a letter responding to the attorney's letter on 6 November 2019.

**START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:23:28

### **PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham updated the Commissioners on their review of the nomination for the Jeweler's Row Historic District. He informed the Commissioners that the Historical Commission had received a continuance request letter from Michael Phillips, the attorney representing many of the property owners in the proposed district. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission had tentatively scheduled the review of the nomination for the 5 December 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation and the January 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. He explained that Mr. Phillips has retained a preservation consultant, George Thomas, to prepare a report on the nomination. Mr. Farnham stated that, owing to Mr. Thomas' schedule and the fact the report is not complete, Mr. Phillips is now asking the Commission to continue the matter again to the Committee's February 2020 meeting and the Historical Commission's March 2020 meeting. Mr. Farnham explained that the report will not be complete and Mr. Thomas will not be available to

testify on his report at earlier meetings. He added that, if the Commission does continue the matter, the proposed properties within the proposed historic district would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction as though the district were designated. Mr. Farnham pointed out that the Commissioners have a letter from the owner's attorney requesting a continuance to later meetings and a letter from Paul Steinke, Director of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, which is a response to the attorney's letter. He noted that the Preservation Alliance is the nominator of the historic district.

- Mr. Steinke stated that first notice letters notifying owners that their properties were nominated were sent to property owners in December 2018. He noted that the nomination was continued from the February 2019 Committee meeting to the August 2019 Commission meeting. Mr. Steinke observed that Mr. Thomas should have already completed his report because he has had few obligations to Harvard University, where he teaches. Mr. Steinke stated that he looked at the Harvard web site and found that Mr. Thomas is only teaching one course, one day per week. He noted that the Commissioners have been patient. He suggested that the Commissioners should reject this request. Mr. Steinke remarked that the Preservation Alliance has been lining up its witnesses for December Committee on Historic Designation meeting and the witnesses are preparing their testimony. He stated that almost one year has passed since the first notices were sent and well over six months since the consultant was retained. Mr. Steinke insisted that the Commission should reject the request and move forward with the review. Mr. Steinke noted that the letter from the Preservation Alliance was shared with Mr. Phillips, who is not present at the meeting to dispute the Alliance's question about whether a conflict really exists. Mr. Steinke asserted that the attorney's absence implies that he is conceding that there is no conflict. Mr. Steinke insisted that the Commission keep the schedule to hear the nomination at the 5 December Committee meeting as scheduled. Mr. Steinke also added that although Mr. Thomas teaches at Harvard, his primary residence is in Philadelphia. Mr. Steinke concluded that there is no valid excuse for the absence of Mr. Thomas at the December meeting.
- Commissioner Thomas noted that the Mr. Phillips' letter stated the final report would be complete in December but that Mr. Thomas would not be available until the later dates to attend the Committee and Commission meetings. Commissioner Thomas stated that the Commission needs to decide whether it has already granted enough time and enough continuances.
- Ms. Edwards asked if anyone had ever participated in a Historical Commission meeting remotely with Skype or similar software. She asked if presenters had to attend the meeting in person. Mr. Reuter stated that participating remotely would be acceptable from a legal standpoint.
- Mr. Farnham stated that, after the receipt of Mr. Phillips' letter, the staff assumed that the continuance would be granted and scheduled several other nominations to be heard at the 5 December Committee meeting in place of the nomination for the Jewelers' Row Historic District. He noted that they certainly can accommodate any decision that is made but that it should be noted that the December Committee meeting and January Historical Commission could include twice as many designation matters as a result.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The attorney representing a majority of the owners has requested and been granted multiple continuances.
- The nominator is attempting to schedule witnesses to testify and is challenged by the multiple date changes of the Committee and Historical Commission meetings.
- The properties in the proposed Jewelers’ Row Historic District remain under the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction during the continuance periods requested by the owners’ attorney.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Owing to the multiple continuances already granted, the Historical Commission should move ahead with the scheduled Committee on Historic Designation’s 5 December 2019 review of the nomination.
- The attorney for the property owners may make an additional continuance request at the 5 December 2019 CHD meeting.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to confirm the scheduling of the review of the Jewelers’ Row Historic District nomination for the 5 December 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>ITEM: Jewelers’ Row continuance</b>					
<b>MOTION: Confirm scheduling of the review for 5 December 2019</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Lippert</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

**ACTION:** At 11:46 a.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

<b>ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: To adjourn MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Long</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Lippert (L&I)	X				
Long (DHCD)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Stanford (Commerce)	X				
Trego (DPD)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	13				

### **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](http://www.phila.gov/historical).