

**THE MINUTES OF THE 694<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 JUNE 2020  
REMOTE MEETING ON WEBEX  
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:10:30**

Vice Chair Betty Turner called the meeting to order at 9:16 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined her:

| Commissioner  | Present | Absent | Comment                       |
|---|---------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair                                       | X*      |        | (joined meeting at 9:26 a.m.) |
| Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair | X       |        |                               |
| Kelly Edwards, MUP  | X       |        |                               |
| Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)                  | X       |        |                               |
| Labaron Lenard-Palmer (Dept. of Planning & Development)         | X       |        |                               |
| Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections)             | X       |        |                               |
| Melissa Long (Division of Housing & Community Development)      | X       |        |                               |
| John Mattioni, Esq.   | X       |        |                               |
| Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair | X       |        |                               |
| Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)                  | X       |        |                               |
| H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D. (Commerce Department)                  |         | X      |                               |
| Betty Turner, MA, Vice Chair                                    | X       |        |                               |
| Kimberly Washington, Esq.                                       | X       |        |                               |

Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Commissioners, staff, applicants, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Cisco Webex video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Pedro Pinto  
Josh Wilson  
Tim Shaaban  
Frederick Baumert, Keast & Hood  
Nancy Pontone  
Alyssa Ciampaglia  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch  
Kate McGlinchey  
Eric Quick  
Michelle Schmitt  
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties  
Alexander Herman  
JM Duffin  
Jay Rosen  
Paul Boni, Esq.  
Jennifer Robinson  
Edward Snyder  
George Poulin  
Phoebe Grace  
Steve Bartlett  
Gregory Heleniak, Esq.  
John Mondlak  
Neil Sklaroff, Esq.  
Oscar Beisert  
Luca Segato  
Klyde B.  
Euphemia O'Connor  
Peter Cunningham  
Eleanor Sharpe  
Kelly Wiles  
Stephen Figlin  
Jeanette Lloyd  
Ed Eimer  
Matthew McClure  
Donna Rilling  
Jay Ferraro  
Gregory Peluso  
Ryan Furlong  
Craig Lewis  
Vincent Cordisco  
Michelle Bond  
Jay Farrell  
Eric Leighton  
Kevin Block  
Jonathan Doran  
Molly Lawrence  
Chris Carickhoff  
Greg Mastalerz  
Ryan Lohbauer  
Jacqueline Wiggins

David Fecteau  
Gail Loney  
Doug Mooney  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Emmaline Goodwin  
Michelle Shuman  
Sean McCauley  
Alison Lies  
Eric Boss  
David Gest, Esq.  
Kathy Dowdell  
Cecil Baker  
Robert Spear  
N Drye  
Colin Evans  
SJ Ayoub  
Sally Louise Polk  
Mason Carter  
N Gibson  
Chris Menna  
David Orphanides, Esq.  
Mike Feinberg  
Becka Gorelick  
Elenore Toczynski  
David Traub  
Inga Saffron  
John C. Manton  
Maggy White  
Carl Primavera, Esq.  
Suzanna Barucco  
Alex Balloon  
Janice Woodcock  
Dennis Carlisle  
Randal Baron  
Celeste Morello  
Paul Boni

## **ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 693RD STATED MEETING, 8 MAY 2020**

**START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING:** 00:13:50

### **DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Turner asked the Commissioners if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 693<sup>rd</sup> Stated Meeting, held 8 May 2020. None were offered.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ACTION:** Ms. Edwards moved to adopt the minutes of the 693<sup>rd</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 May 2020. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

|  |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: Minutes, 693rd Stated Meeting</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOTION: Adoption</b>                    |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: Edwards</b>                   |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Mattioni</b>               |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner                               | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair                              |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Cooperman                                  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)                                | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey                                  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)                        |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington                                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                      | 11  |    |         |        | 2      |

## **CONTINUANCE REQUESTS**

### **ADDRESS: 156 W SCHOOL HOUSE LN**

Name of Resource: Boxwood

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Teen Challenge Training Center Inc.

Nominator: Penn Knox Neighborhood Association

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 156 W. School House Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that Boxwood reflects the Colonial Revival style of architecture as applied to

upper-class suburban residences in late nineteenth-century Philadelphia. The nomination further argues that the “cottage-stable” at the rear of the property represents Gothic Revival cottage motifs popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that Boxwood was designed by Mantle Fielding, a prolific and significant architect who influenced the built environment in Northwest Philadelphia at the turn of the twentieth century.

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

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 156 W. School House Lane and remand it to the December 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

**START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING:** 00:17:00

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Turner presented the continuance requests and asked if any Commissioners or members of the audience wished to comment.
- Mr. Lenard-Palmer inquired about the reason for such a long continuance.
- Ms. Keller stated that the new owner, the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, is undertaking a master plan of its campus and is requesting a continuance of six months to allow for the completion of the plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 156 W. School House Lane and remand it to the December 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: Continuance of 156 W. School House Lane</b><br><b>MOTION: Continue review to December 2020 CHD meeting</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 11  |    |         |        | 2      |

Mr. Thomas joined the meeting at 9:26 a.m. and assumed the role of chair.

**ADDRESS: 1617 WALNUT ST**

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Rosenberg Family Partners

Nominator: Staff of the Historical Commission

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1617 Walnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation D. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the Seeburger & Rabenold-designed building conveys the aesthetics of the Italian Renaissance Revival style through its classical temple form, verticality, and classical detailing. While the ground-story commercial space has been altered several times, most recently in 2011, the modifications have remained sensitive to the building's original detailing and classical style.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1617 Walnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 1617 Walnut Street and remand it to the August 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

**ACTION:** See below.

**ADDRESS: 3412 HAVERFORD AVE**

Name of Resource: Frame Twin

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mary E. Drummond

Nominator: University City Historical Society

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3412 Haverford Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation J, in part because it is representative of “the historical heritage of the neighborhood’s initial period of development, as well as the economic and social history” of the community’s founders. The nomination also contends that “the subject property is representative of the early development of the Mantua neighborhood, as well as a once common house type that has largely vanished from the built environment of West Philadelphia.”

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3412 Haverford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J. The staff, however, recommends against naming the resource for its associated developer, Julia A.A. Blodget Britton.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 3412 Haverford Avenue and remand it to the August 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

**ACTION:** See below.

**ADDRESS: 3414 HAVERFORD AVE**

Name of Resource: Frame Twin

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: LINA Holdings LLC

Nominator: University City Historical Society

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3414 Haverford Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation J, in part because it is representative of “the historical heritage of the neighborhood’s initial period of development, as well as the economic and social history” of the community’s founders. The nomination also contends that “the subject property is representative of the early development of the Mantua neighborhood, as well as a once common house type that has largely vanished from the built environment of West Philadelphia.”

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3414 Haverford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J. The staff, however, recommends against naming the resource for its associated developer, Julia A.A. Blodget Britton.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the

nomination of 3414 Haverford Avenue and remand it to the August 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

**ACTION:** See below.

**ADDRESS: 1132 MARLBOROUGH ST**

Name of Resource: Jacob Souder House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Adam and Jeremy Margent

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1132 Marlborough Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Jacob Souder house, a two-and-a-half-story wooden house constructed c. 1810, represents one of the few surviving frame buildings typical of Fishtown's foundational development.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

**ACTION:** See below.

**ADDRESS: 527-37 W GIRARD AVE**

Name of Resource: North Sixth Street Farmers Market House and Hall

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Franklin Berger

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 527-37 W Girard Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former North Sixth Street Farmers' Market House and Hall, which is composed of several interconnecting masses constructed between 1886 and 1887, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property represents the development of Philadelphia in the second half of the nineteenth century as the city transitioned from the use of outdoor, public food markets to privately-owned, multi-purpose, indoor markets and halls. Under Criterion J, the nomination asserts that the mixed-use building played an important role in the cultural, social, and economic lives of the local and predominantly German-American community. The nomination also argues that the building is significant as the work of architects Hazelhurst & Huckel, satisfying Criterion E.

The nomination places the period of significance between the date of construction in 1886 and 1908, the year it ceased operations as a farmers' market, but notes that the community



significance may extend through the 1940s, until which time the building remained in use as a public hall and movie theater.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 527-37 W Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 527-37 W. Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J, and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

**START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING:** 00:21:15

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Thomas presented the continuance requests and asked if any Commissioners or members of the audience wished to comment. No one offered comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas asked if there was unanimous consent to continue the reviews of the nominations for 1617 Walnut Street and 3412 and 3414 Haverford Avenue and remand them to the August 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation and to continue the reviews of the nominations for 1132 Marlborough Street and 527-37 W. Girard Avenue to July 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. The Commissioners agreed to the continuances by unanimous consent.

|                                     |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: Continuance of reviews</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOTION: Approval</b>             |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>Moved BY:</b>                    |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY:</b>                 |     |    |         |        |        |
| VOTE                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner                        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman                           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni                            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey                           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Turner, Vice Chair                  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Washington                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                               | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 00:22:50

### **DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners for comments on the Consent Agenda.
- Ms. DiPasquale and Ms. Chantry reported that various persons had requested the removal of the applications for 1935 Diamond Street, 2100 Diamond Street, 4101-05 Ludlow Street, and 62 W. Queen Lane from the Consent Agenda.
- Ms. Cooperman requested the removal of the applications for 1935 Diamond Street, 2100 Diamond Street, 4101-05 Ludlow Street, and 62 W. Queen Lane from the Consent Agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas asked if there was unanimous consent to adopt the revised Consent Agenda with the applications for 1810 Chestnut Street, 1901-05 Walnut Street, 4328 Main Street, 1509 Green Street, 135 S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street, 2225 Spruce Street, and 1618-22 Chestnut Street. The Commissioners agreed to the revised Consent Agenda by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA</b>                     |     |    |         |        |        |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>MOTION: Adopt the revised Consent Agenda</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>                      |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY:</b>                             |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                     |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner                                    | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman                                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)                                     | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey                                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)                               | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)                             |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington                                      | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total   | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

## **EMERGENCY MATTER**

### **ADDRESS: 107 CHESTNUT ST**

Proposal: Complete demolition of Unsafe building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cheswal LP

Applicant: David Orphanides, Esq., Orphanides & Toner

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, [jon.farnham@phila.gov](mailto:jon.farnham@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the complete demolition of the building at 107 Chestnut Street, which has been deemed Unsafe by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The application contends that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition as necessary in the public interest to abate the dangerous condition. The applicant has filed a Complaint for Emergency Special Injunctive Relief against the City of Philadelphia in Equity Court asking the court to order the Department of Licenses & Inspections to immediately issue a permit authorizing the complete demolition of the building. The City's Law Department requested and the applicant has agreed to appear before the Historical Commission before proceeding with the lawsuit. The application is being presented to the Historical Commission on an emergency basis during litigation negotiations because the Department of Licenses & Inspections concurs with the property owner's engineering assessments and has concluded that the building must be demolished promptly to ensure public safety.

Section 6.10.c.12 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations authorizes the staff to approve applications proposing:

the repair or removal of features determined Unsafe or Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, provided that the permit is issued with the condition that the owner is required to restore such historic features to their original appearance and location within one year of their removal.

The staff could approve an application like this one under Section 6.10.c.12 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations. In this case, the applicant has opted to appear before the Historical Commission itself rather than accept a staff approval with conditions, which was offered during the litigation negotiations. If the staff were to approve an application like this one, it would require the following:

1. The reconstruction of the building to its original appearance and location within one year of its removal using the salvaged materials described below.
2. Accurate documentation of the existing building before demolition including dimensions and profiles of:
  - a. the columns and column spacing of the storefront,
  - b. the sizes of the masonry window openings and spacing between window openings on the upper floors,
  - c. the cornice.
3. Salvaging during the demolition of the following:
  - a. All granite and other stone sidewalk slabs, steps, and sills.
  - b. All marble and other stone components of the storefront including the columns and storefront cornice.
  - c. All stone lintels and sills of the front-facade, upper-floor windows.

- d. All outer-layer brick from the front facade.
  - e. All masonry and stone components of the cornice.
- 4. All salvaged materials to be numbered and inventoried (except bricks) and stored securely on site.
- 5. All components listed above that cannot be salvaged to be photographed and explanations of why they could not be salvaged to be provided in a report to the Historical Commission.
- 6. For components that cannot be salvaged, pieces that provide information about shapes, sizes, and colors of storefront components to be retained and stored securely.
- 7. The Historical Commission and Architectural Committee to review for approval the architectural plans for the reconstructed building.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:28:25**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Reuter presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney David Orphanides represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Reuter clarified that this application is a request for approval to demolish 107 Chestnut Street as necessary in the public interest. The building, he continued, currently has Unsafe violations dating back several years, though some work had been done in the intervening years, including in 2008 and 2013. He stated that in the last couple months, the owner has provided two engineering reports and an update to a third regarding the building's structural problems, which includes bricks falling from the front façade and shifting joists. He reiterated that the applicant is requesting that the Historical Commission consider approving demolition in the public interest, adding that the Rules & Regulations have no specific requirement for Architectural Committee review for requests for demolition in the public interest, though Mr. Reuter noted that past applications of this kind have been reviewed by the Committee. A case like this that involves a potential emergency matter does not need to be reviewed by any particular Committee, he added. In this particular instance, he continued, one option is for the staff to approve the removal of historic features or a historic structure on the condition that it be rebuilt within one year. He noted that the option exists in the Rules & Regulations and the staff has approved the rebuilding of entire facades. Mr. Reuter explained that the applicant decided to apply to the Historical Commission for demolition rather than accept the staff's approval for demolition on the condition that the structure be rebuilt. He added that there is no particular recommendation being presented. Mr. Reuter asked whether the Commissioners had any questions and whether they understood the application.
  - Mr. Thomas answered that he understood and read the reports, one of which was submitted by Keast & Hood to check the findings of the structural engineer retained by the owner. He noted that Keast & Hood was in agreement with those findings.
  - Mr. Reuter stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) does not disagree with the substance of those engineering reports, adding that the Department believes the building is unsafe and that it may collapse. He explained that the Department did not conduct an independent analysis to determine whether the building could be stabilized without an unreasonable risk to the public or to workers. He further clarified that no assessment has

been conducted by an engineer not hired by the owner to determine whether emergency repairs would be feasible.

- Ms. Cooperman asked whether L&I has declared the building imminently dangerous.
  - Mr. Reuter responded that he did not know whether an imminently dangerous violation has been issued to the property and reiterated that the property is listed as unsafe. He stated that owners seeking the demolition of unsafe or imminently dangerous properties fall within the necessary in the public interest exception. Because there are no specific rules, he continued, there is no requirement that the building be labeled imminently dangerous. He clarified that the section of the Rules & Regulations that allows the staff to approve the demolition of an unsafe structure on the condition that it be rebuilt within one year does not require that the building be deemed imminently dangerous. Mr. Reuter elaborated that a building deemed imminently dangerous, while life-threatening, may have an issue such as a cornice that is in danger of falling and argued that there is not a great substantive difference between imminently dangerous and unsafe determinations.
- Mr. Thomas stated that, after reading the reports, he is convinced that the building is in a very precarious position and needs to come down. He then commented that the Historical Commission does not need to duplicate what staff can approve, adding that the owner did not accept the condition of rebuilding the structure within one year. He then asked to speak to the owner's objection to rebuilding under those conditions and questioned what the owner plans are once the building is demolished.
- Mr. Orphanides noted that Mr. Reuter and staff explained the process for demolishing and reconstructing the building within one year, adding that the regulation applies to demolishing the entire building and not just a façade. He contended that the engineers' reports make it evident that the building needs to be demolished and argued that the issues for the owner relate to rebuilding within one year and to restoring the entire building. He directed the Commission to photographs of the west wall, stating that it is currently an exterior wall but was historically an interior wall. Mr. Orphanides commented that his position is rebuilding should only apply to the front façade. He argued that a portion of the second-story wall of the front façade "blew out onto the sidewalk," as visible in photographs, and has caused further, serious deterioration between February and today. He stated that he filed a complaint for an emergency injunction with Court of Common Pleas on June 3 but did not file the petition, having been in communication with Mr. Reuter and Mr. Farnham, and knowing he would need to follow this administrative process. He contended that the photographs, dated May 18, show that the brick is in bad condition, particularly at the second, third, and fourth stories. He added that both engineers and consultant George Thomas found that the exterior hard-pressed brick is not bonded to the wythes of salmon brick behind and that mortar is missing in many areas. He then stated that he was unsure the staff could distinguish and limit what would need to be rebuilt and wanted to give the Historical Commission the opportunity to hear his findings. He noted that he is speaking mostly about the ground story, including the granite columns, architectural embellishment, and commercial storefront window, adding that the building would need to be demolished by hand to "take care" of the granite.
  - Mr. Thomas questioned what Mr. Orphanides meant by "take care" and whether he was suggesting that the ground-story features would be preserved. Mr. Thomas then noted that the brick is causing issues and not the granite.

- Mr. Orphanides agreed that the brick is causing problems, adding that the west wall is also an issue.
- Mr. Thomas acknowledged that the front façade brickwork is deteriorating. He opined that he has worked on numerous buildings of this construction type and understands the issues they face. He summarized the issues Mr. Orphanides had mentioned by stating that the building at 107 Chestnut Street was historically part of a row and is no longer attached to an adjacent building at its west façade. The party wall, he continued, was never exposed in the past, though he argued that the south façade is what contributes to the district. The question for discussion, he stated, is whether the ground-story stonework will be preserved and whether the second, third, and fourth stories will be reconstructed when this building is demolished. He claimed that the rest of the building could be constructed to the owner's plans, noting that eventually a building would be built adjacent at the west.
- Mr. Orphanides observed that the properties at 105 and 107 Chestnut Street were historically part of a row and are now isolated together. He then claimed that the only continuity between the two buildings exists at the ground story and contended that the windows above do not align. He further claimed that the brick is insignificant and deteriorated. He agreed to "attempt to preserve" the ground-story materials, though he added that one cannot be certain that the materials can be preserved during the course of demolition and construction. He stated that his plan is to demolish the entire building and to "take care of" the ground-story frontage. Mr. Orphanides then suggested that his plan is contingent on whether the adjacent building at 105 Chestnut Street remains standing. He questioned whether the building code would allow for a reconstruction of the original ground story of 107 Chestnut Street. He acknowledged that because the property is both individually designated and contributing in the Old City Historic District, any new construction would need to be approved by the Historical Commission. At that time, he continued, he will examine the current codes and determine how to utilize the materials. He suggested that extreme care will be taken to dismantle the building with multiple preservation professionals on site. He added that there is no plan to develop the site within one year. He reiterated that the plan is to retain as much material as possible and to reinstall it within a new building that will be presented to the Historical Commission in the future.
- Mr. Thomas asked whether Mr. Orphanides's client also owns 105 Chestnut Street and whether the properties would be combined in the future.
- Mr. Orphanides stated that they do not own 105 Chestnut Street but do own the lot to the west of 107 Chestnut Street, which wraps around both buildings at the north and extends to Front Street. He added that his client also owns 111 Chestnut Street.
- Mr. Thomas clarified that, even with the demolition of the building, the Historical Commission would retain jurisdiction over the property, since it is both individually designated and part of the Old City Historic District. He summarized Mr. Orphanides's request to the Historical Commission, which is to demolish the entire building, retain and store the ground-story stone elements, review plans for a new building at a future date when the owner is ready to proceed with construction, and incorporate the retained historic elements into the new building. Mr. Thomas then called for the retention and storage of all ground-story elements, the lintels, shutter hardware, and façade brick.
- Mr. Reuter stated that, if the staff had approved the application, the requirements would have included photographs of the front façade annotated with dimensions of

the column spacing, dimensions of the storefront, dimensions of the masonry openings, and spacing between window openings at the upper stories and cornice. He added that the applicant would be asked to salvage all granite and other stone sidewalk slabs and steps; the marble and other stone components of the storefront, including the columns and cornice; all the stone lintels and sills of the front façade; all brick from the outer wythe of the front façade to the extent possible; and the masonry components of the cornice. Except for brick, he continued, those salvaged items should be numbered for reassembly. He then requested that those items be safely stored onsite and that photographs be taken of all components that could not be salvaged with an explanation of why they could not be retained. He reiterated that he is particularly concerned about the stonework such as the cornice and lintels. He then noted that in the past the Historical Commission has allowed demolition with the retention and reinstallation of historic materials for later reuse or reconstructions, though the instances are limited.

- Ms. Cooperman asked whether the applicant is requesting a longer timeline beyond the one-year limit the staff has the authority to approve for reconstructions. She contended that the applicant should be required to reconstruct the building, arguing that the building consists of more than just a façade. She commented that it is a three-dimensional object with height and a roofline that is visible from the public right-of-way. She again asked whether the applicant is seeking relief from the conventional one-year timeframe or whether the applicant is preemptively requesting to change the building envelope.
  - Mr. Orphanides answered that the timeframe is problematic, adding that the extent to which the building would need to be reconstructed further poses an issue. He opined that he does not feel it would be necessary to rebuild the entire building and that the front façade is of the most significance.
  - Mr. Mattioni stated that Mr. Orphanides's intentions are reasonably clear, though maybe not acceptable to the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Thomas asked that the Commission move forward with discussion of whether to approve the demolition of the building according to the requirements Mr. Reuter outlined and address the issues of the timeline for reconstruction and the amount of reconstruction required.
  - Mr. Orphanides interjected that the upper-story brick is not unique and may not be salvageable. He asked that the front-façade brick not be included in the list of items to be salvaged.
  - Mr. Thomas disagreed, adding that the exterior brick is hard-fired and not soft salmon brick like at the interior wythe. He contended that much of it is likely reusable and argued that as much of the historic brick as possible should be reused. He then noted that nearly half the façade consists of windows, so the amount of brick that would be salvaged is not very considerable. He concluded that new brick could be integrated with historic brick where necessary.
- Mr. Lippert asked whether the salvaged materials would be stored on the site in a secure area.
  - Mr. Orphanides asked whether Mr. Lippert was suggesting that he “pile everything up” at 107 Chestnut Street, adding that he intended to store the salvaged material at the demolition contractor's yard.
  - Mr. Lippert reiterated that the salvaged material would need to be stored onsite in a secured environment.
  - Mr. Orphanides countered that it would be safer elsewhere, since it would be stored behind a six- or eight-foot fence. If in a container, he continued, it would

- be enticing for some to find out what is stored inside. He asked that the building materials not be stored in the open.
- Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Orphanides that the materials could be safely stored at a contractor's yard, as long as proper documentation of its storage and contents is submitted to the Historical Commission's staff.
  - Mr. Mattioni agreed with Mr. Thomas's comments.
  - Mr. Reuter clarified that under normal circumstances this application would have been forwarded to the Architectural Committee followed by the Historical Commission. He explained that there is no rule or regulation requiring demolitions in the public interest to be heard by any subcommittee. He elaborated that, in this instance, the Department of Licenses & Inspections determined that, based on the engineers' reports, the building posed a threat to the public. He added that it was believed there was enough time to place it on this month's Historical Commission agenda. Due to the risk to the public, he continued, he did not believe it would have been appropriate to wait until the July meeting to allow the application to be reviewed by the Architectural Committee in June. He clarified that portions of the sidewalk have been blocked off since about late February or March. He explained that the Historical Commission can deny the application outright or can approve it with any conditions it deems appropriate. He advised that any requirements extending beyond exact reconstruction would be superfluous, noting that any different construction would be reviewed by the Historical Commission in the future. He asked that the Commission consider what materials will be preserved and if the applicant will be required to return to the Commission with an application for new construction within a certain timeline.
  - Mr. Thomas suggested that if the building were to be demolished, extensive measures would need to be implemented to ensure the safety of 105 Chestnut Street.
    - Mr. Orphanides agreed, adding that the demolition contractor is well aware of the issues and that the engineers will be monitoring the building. If the adjacent building begins to move, he continued, the Department of Licenses & Inspections will be present and that conversations between the Department and owner will occur.
    - Mr. Reuter stated for the record that 105 Chestnut Street had a bulged wall and fracture in 2013-14, but the issue was addressed and the violation was complied.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the building dates to 1840 and was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1970 and is a contributing resource in the Old City Historic District. He remarked that he is not arguing with three engineers who agree that the building needs to come down, noting that he has not had his own engineer assess the building. He then opined that the other nearby historic buildings were demolished for parking lots and argued that there have been fires and building collapses throughout this neighborhood over the decades. Old City, he continued, should be one of Philadelphia's premier historic neighborhoods, where the city began, but is pockmarked with parking lots where historic buildings stood until recently. In many cases, he added, those demolitions occurred not by accident but by deliberate actions of neglectful property owners. Mr. Steinke argued that this application is a case of owner neglect, claiming that the applicants have denied that accusation. He then contended that this is demolition by neglect practiced so skillfully that the Historical Commission is now confronted with no choice but to allow for its demolition.



180 years after it was built. The preservation consultant hired by the owner, he continued, goes so far as to dismiss its historic significance, claiming the building is unimportant, because so much of the neighborhood has fallen to the same fate. He then argued that this is historic Philadelphia, a city that trades on its history and historic built environment. He called the situation an outrage, adding that he will continue to hold out hope that this building can be saved until it is gone. He commented that if the building does get demolished, he hopes the city and the Commission hold its owners responsible, make sure the adjacent building is kept stable, salvaging as much original building material as possible, and rebuilding in kind as soon as possible on a reasonable timeline. He referenced the Old Shirt Corner building at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Market Streets, noting that it provides an imperfect example of a building rebuilt in some sympathy toward the surrounding Old City neighborhood. He concluded that Old City is one of Philadelphia's most important neighborhoods and asked the Commission to accept and implement the staff's recommendation.

- Oscar Beisert stated that the application is being mishandled, suggesting that the building is not imminently unsafe. He argued that the application should go through a normal process, allowing time to review the documents. If the building is so unsafe, he argued, it should have been braced from the exterior. He noted that the property owners have owned the building for decades and that they are the same owners of the demolished building at the corner of the same block at Front and Chestnut Streets. He stated that the Historical Commission is charged with protecting these buildings and argued that allowing demolition would be a failure to fulfill that role. He then listed a number of buildings that the property owner has demolished. He asked that prior to demolition, a study of the effects of demolition on 105 Chestnut Street be undertaken. He claimed that the earlier discussion involving 105 Chestnut Street implied the building could be discarded and called that discussion outrageous. He asked for more transparency to the process, remarking that if the property owners were concerned about the safety of the building, they should have secured it to allow for a proper review that involves the Architectural Committee and additional public comment.
- Jim Duffin stated that there are multiple uses of the term "cornice," noting that the attorney representing the property owner uses cornice to denote the area between the first and second stories, while the Historical Commission's requirement for documentation uses cornice to reference the feature at the roofline. He asked that the documentation requirements that reference cornice be clarified to refer to the cornice at the roofline. He then contended that restoring the cornice will be an integral part to preserving the building when it is reconstructed.
  - Mr. Reuter agreed that the staff documentation references the cornice at the roofline.
- Mason Carter supported the comments provided by Messrs. Steinke and Beisert. He then commented that, should the building be dismantled, there would not be enough historical elements considered. He criticized the lack of timeline, arguing that it has not been properly communicated and added that one year can turn into 10 years, and the public could be left with another blighted lot. He then argued that greater effort needs to be made to stabilize the building, and a tangible plan needs to be developed before the building is demolished.
- Celeste Morello supported the comments offered by Messrs. Steinke, Beisert, and Duffin.

- Jay Farrell emailed comments to oppose demolition of the building, stating that the ownership should be compelled to reconstruct 107 Chestnut Street using original stone elements within a reasonable timeframe.
- Sally Polk supported Mr. Beisert's comments.
- Vincent Cordisco opposed the application, suggesting it is demolition by neglect.
- Kathy Dowdell emphasized the need to protect 105 Chestnut Street, noting that the two buildings share a party wall. She argued that if 107 Chestnut Street is demolished it will be the death knell for the adjacent building and reiterated that the Historical Commission is charged with protecting these buildings. She then commented that the Department of Licenses & Inspections' declarations of unsafe or imminently dangerous do allow for an independent engineer to determine whether rehabilitation is possible or if demolition is truly the only option. She acknowledged that that process may not be possible in this case, but argued that rehabilitation is often forgotten as an alternative to demolition.
  - Mr. Orphanides countered that if someone would like to take responsibility for the building falling down, then demolition can wait. He reiterated that two engineers hired by the owner have determined that the building is in a state of collapse, and the Department of Licenses & Inspections has not disagreed, though the Department has not independently evaluated the building. He then commented that his client owns scores of other historic buildings throughout the City of Philadelphia and is not seeking to demolish them. He claimed that they have used this building until the front wall unexpectedly "blew out."

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

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Department of Licenses and Inspections has deemed the building Unsafe.
- To correct the violation, the applicant is seeking to demolish 107 Chestnut Street in its entirety.
- Any subsequent application for new construction would be subject to the Historical Commission's review.
- Two engineers' reports have determined that the building is in a state of collapse and must be demolished. The Department of Licenses & Inspections has not disagreed with the findings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building's Unsafe designation may be corrected through demolition; however, the requirements under Section 6.10.c.12 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, as outlined by the staff, should be followed. Those requirements include submitting annotated and dimensioned photographs of the façade; salvaging all stone sidewalk slabs and steps; salvaging the marble and other stone components of the storefront, including the columns and cornice; salvaging all front façade stone lintels and sills; salvaging brick from the outer wythe of the front façade to the extent possible; salvaging the masonry components of the cornice; numbering the salvaged components (except for brick) for reinstallation; storing those salvaged items safely offsite; and photographing all components that could not be salvaged and explaining the reasons for not salvaging them.
- The Historical Commission may choose to extend the one-year timeline for the building's reconstruction, provided the applicant submits such a request within the year.

- The demolition of 107 Chestnut Street would leave the adjacent building at 105 Chestnut Street vulnerable, and measures should be taken to safeguard it from damage or collapse.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the demolition of 107 Chestnut Street as necessary in the public interest, provided the building is documented and the historic materials are salvaged as outlined by the staff; the salvaged materials are stored offsite at a location identified to the Historical Commission and satisfying L&I's requirements; the demolished building is reconstructed within one year unless the Historical Commission grants an extension of the reconstruction period within the year; and the building at 105 Chestnut Street is safeguarded during the demolition. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 5.

| ITEM: 107 Chestnut Street<br>MOTION: Approval with conditions<br>MOVED BY: Mattioni<br>SECONDED BY: Hartner |     |    |         |        |        |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE  |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner  | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman   |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Edwards   |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)   |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey   |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)   |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Washington  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total   | 7   | 5  |         |        | 1      |

## **REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020**

### **ADDRESS: SW CORNER OF 13TH AND LOCUST STREETS**

Proposal: Relocate section of subway entrance; salvage and store section of subway entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia; Delaware River Port Authority

Applicant: Gregory Mastalerz, Sowinski Sullivan Architects

History: 1952; PATCO Speedline Subway Entrance

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Cast-Iron Subway Entrances Historic District, Contributing, 3/8/2019

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov)

### **BACKGROUND:**

In 2019, the Historical Commission designated the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic Historic District, which includes historic entrances, ranging in date from 1928 to 1955, located along several subway and trolley lines throughout the city. As part of that designation, the Historical Commission maintains jurisdiction over the cast iron railings, granite curbs, and any

historic auxiliary components, such as lamp standards, signage, and integral and free-standing light fixtures. The Historical Commission does not exercise jurisdiction over the steps, handrails, walls below the curbs, or any underground features.

This application proposes to reconfigure the subway entrance at the southwest corner of 13<sup>th</sup> and Locust Streets to provide ADA accessibility. The entrance was created in 1952 as part of the Locust Street Subway line, which is now part of the PATCO system. All of the station's entrances retain the original cast iron railings. The southwest entrance would be removed to allow for the installation of an elevator, and the railing would be salvaged and reused to replace non-original railings elsewhere within the PATCO/SEPTA transportation system.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Salvage portion of existing cast iron railing at southwest corner of 13<sup>th</sup> & Locust PATCO station and relocate it to 10<sup>th</sup> and Locust Streets.
- Demolish and infill existing stair.
- Construct elevator.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
  - The current subway entrance would be demolished to allow for the installation of an elevator leading to the concourse that would provide ADA accessibility at the station. Portions of the existing railings would be removed from their current location and reinstalled at a nearby PATCO entrance to replace non-original railings. Remaining portions of the entrance would be salvaged and stored for future use. Due to the salvaging and reuse of the railings, the work complies with this standard and is necessary in the public interest.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the unused portions of the railings are documented, photographed, and properly stored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1810 CHESTNUT ST**

Proposal: Construct 19-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1810 Chestnut Street Development LLC

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1923; Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House; Tilden & Register

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

On 15 March 2019, the staff notified the property owner of 1810 Chestnut Street that the Historical Commission would consider a nomination for the Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House and determine whether to designate the property as historic. At the time of notice, the owner had intended to sell the property and subsequently requested to continue the review of the nomination, which remains pending, while a sale of the building was finalized. The sale of the property to 1810 Chestnut Street Development LLC was recently finalized, and the property has remained under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction since March 2019.

At its July 2019 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application submitted by Cecil Baker & Partners on behalf of the new owner to construct a 14-story addition above the existing six-story building. The Historical Commission approved that application, owing to the extensive plans for the development of the property already in place at the time notice of the nomination was sent. The original proposal included an 18'-6" setback from Chestnut Street and a 24'-3" setback from Sansom Street. The current application proposes to significantly increase the Sansom Street setback to 70'-6" and to increase the height of the addition by five stories, bringing the total height of the overbuild to 19 stories. The addition would feature glass and metal window walls, smooth and textured fiber cement panels, poured concrete, and brick. Demolition would be limited to a portion of the elevator overrun at the roof and select portions of the building where structural columns would be inserted. The remainder of the historic structure would be retained.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct 19-story addition

**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.*

Though the addition is not compatible in massing, scale and proportion, the application proposes to retain much of the historic building's exterior envelope, including the primary Chestnut Street façade, Sansom Street façade, and east and west elevations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff defers to the Historical Commission to determine whether the application for the 19-story addition is in compliance with the July 2019 in-concept approval.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Historical Commission's 12 July 2019 approval of an in-concept application, provided the following:

- most of the existing elevator overrun's north elevation be retained, with glass permitted on the east elevation;
- the color of the elastomeric coating on the west elevation is darker in color; and
- all elements of the historic building are further considered.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1901-05 WALNUT ST**

Proposal: Modify entryway; install ATM

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Plaza, Inc.

Applicant: Richard Seitchick, Joe Freidman Construction Corp.

History: 1926, Rittenhouse Plaza, McLanahan & Bencker, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

Significant in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Rittenhouse Plaza stands prominently at the northwest corner of Rittenhouse Square. The 22-story, 19-bay apartment building was designed in an H-shaped plan by McLanahan & Bencker. The Walnut Street elevation is defined by two large, symmetrical wings that flank a central courtyard. The ground-story of each wing contains a commercial space featuring two storefront windows with a central decorative recessed entryway. This application proposes to make modifications to the easternmost entryway and to one storefront window on the 19<sup>th</sup> Street elevation.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Install glass door system to enclose eastern Walnut Street entrance;
- Remove non-original door to create ADA-compliant entrance;
- Install ATM at existing 19<sup>th</sup> Street window.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - This application proposes to enclose the easternmost entrance of the Walnut Street façade. The entrance is one of a pair of symmetrical recessed entryways on the Walnut Street elevation that features decorative marble paneling with bronze-framed windows and doors. With the installation of a new door system in the plane of the façade, the decorative features of the recessed entry would become interior space and the function of that space would be altered. The work does not comply with this standard.

- Within the recessed entryway, the application proposes to remove a non-original door with a sub-frame and install a new ADA-compliant cased door within the existing bronze frame. The removal of the existing door and sub-frame and the installation of historically appropriate door that fits into the historic frame complies with this standard.
- This application also proposes to install an ATM at an existing window on the 19<sup>th</sup> Street façade. The non-original metal guardrail would be removed and the glazing would be replaced with an aluminum panel in a powder coated finish mounted within the existing frame. The work is reversible and complies with this standard.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the enclosure of the Walnut Street entryway, but approval of the remaining work, provided a historically appropriate door with no sub-frame is installed at the Walnut Street entrance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the Walnut Street entrance alterations, but approval of the ATM, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following:

- the ATM is installed at the third window on N. 19<sup>th</sup> Street rather than the second window;
- spandrel glass is inserted into the opening rather than an aluminum panel; and
- the iron railing at the window is retained and stored on site.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 4101-05 LUDLOW ST**

Proposal: Construct addition; renovate church building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. James Pentecostal Church

Applicant: Matthew Albitz, L2P

History: 1886; Monumental Baptist Church; David S. Gendell, architect; 1914

Individual Designation: 2/10/2017

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to adaptively reuse the interior of this church building and construct a four-story addition for use as a rock climbing gym. The building is currently vacant and in poor condition. The property was designated as historic in 2017, under several Criteria for Designation including Criterion I for potential archaeological significance. There was significant confusion as to the location of the archaeological potential and whether there was ever a cemetery at this site, and the Committee on Historic Designation voted to exclude Criterion I when it made its recommendation regarding Criteria for Designation because of that lack of clarity in the nomination. However, the Historical Commission voted to include Criterion I without further discussion to clarify the concerns of the Committee. Therefore, Criterion I for archaeology is applied to the entire designated parcel.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Convert church building interior for reuse as rock climbing gym.

- Construct four-story glass and metal panel addition on vacant land at Ludlow Street side of property.
- Repaint red brick façade
- Various other façade and roofing work, which is approvable at the staff-level.

#### **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 work 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 work to the exterior of the church building satisfies Standard 9. The proposed addition is clearly differentiated from the old, and has been located on the site such that the bell tower remains prominent and the roof slope will remain. The addition appears to be slightly lower in height than the peak of the main gable. The staff recommends that the applicant explore holding the addition back further a short distance so as to allow for the bell tower to turn the corner. The staff additionally suggests that metal panel may not be the most appropriate material for the side of the addition, and that other material options are explored.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - The proposed addition appears to allow for the retention of the Ludlow Street side façade, so that if the addition were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided a Phase 1A Archaeological Resources Survey is conducted, the existing red paint on the brick is removed rather than repainted, an alternative material is considered for the side of the addition, and holding the addition back a small distance to allow the bell tower to turn the corner is explored, 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:

- a Phase 1A Archaeological Resources Survey is conducted;
- paint removal versus repainting is reviewed with staff;
- the addition sits behind rather than connecting into the side of the bell tower;
- existing windows are repainted before an appropriate storm window system is installed;
- the sign band is not lit and does not have motion;
- proposed roof drainage is clarified; and,
- existing doors are retained, or replaced in a manner consistent with other doors on the tower.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:32:25

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission. She explained that the application was removed from the Consent Agenda to allow for a



discussion of the archaeological requirement of the approval, which has been agreed upon by the applicant and Douglas Mooney of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum.

- Attorney Craig Robert Lewis represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The archaeological requirement recommended by the staff and Architectural Committee is insufficient.
- All other revisions to the application are consistent with the recommendations of the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed work to the exterior of the church building satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The archaeological requirement for this project shall be as follows, pursuant to an agreement between the property owner and the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum: "Applicant shall conduct field investigations (Phase 1B/II) within any parts of the property where ground will be disturbed by the construction permitted by the permit. Applicant shall be permitted to either (1) perform such field investigation prior to the start of construction, or (2) provide archaeological monitoring during construction. In the event that intact burials or human skeletal remains are identified at the site, construction activities shall cease and applicant shall petition to the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas Orphan's Court Division for permission to recover and relocate those remains. Any remains found shall be respectfully disinterred by qualified archaeologist, and all remains shall be reburied in a new location. Applicant shall consult with the Monumental Baptist Church and take into account their wishes and recommendations when determining an appropriate location for reburial. A detailed report documenting the methods and results of the archaeological investigation shall be prepared and submitted to the Commission upon conclusion of field activities."

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application with the amended archaeological requirement outlined in the Historical Commission's conclusions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Lippert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ITEM: 4101-05 Ludlow St****MOTION: Approval with amended archaeological requirement****MOVED BY: McCoubrey****SECONDED BY: Lippert**

| VOTE                |     |    |         |        |        |
|---------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| Commissioner        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce) |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total               | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 4328 MAIN ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story mixed-use building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Baker Street Partners LLC

Applicant: Christopher H Carickhoff, AIA, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1925; demolished 2016

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a three-story mixed-use building with roof deck on Main Street in the Manayunk Historic District. The historically designated building on this site was demolished in 2016, after it was declared imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The Historical Commission approved a three-story commercial building with roof deck including two pilot houses on this site in 2017, and a revised design in 2019. That façade design was more industrial in appearance than the current proposal. That building was not constructed, and the property has since changed ownership. This proposed design features a painted panel storefront with red brick on the upper stories. The rear of the building will be visible from the Manayunk Towpath, and features a stone masonry base to account for floodplain requirements, with a painted panel storefront at the first story and vinyl siding on the upper stories.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story mixed-use building on Main Street in Manayunk.

**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 work 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 building is compatible with Main Street Manayunk Historic District's streetscape materials, massing, features, size, scale and proportion. The staff suggests that the applicant reconsider the use of vinyl siding for the side and rear.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the vinyl siding is changed to an alternative material, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the vinyl siding at the side and rear is changed to an alternative material such as stucco, the height of the pilot house is reduced, and metal panels are used instead of siding on the pilot house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1509 GREEN ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story rear addition; pilot houses; and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1918 Fairmount Ave LLC

Applicant: Joanne Thieu, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to add a three-story rear addition, roof deck, and pilot houses to 1509 Green Street, a row house constructed in 1859 and a contributing property to the Spring Garden Historic District. This scope also includes extensive interior work to rehabilitate the building for use as a 4-unit multifamily property.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish small rear addition, rear wall, and pitch roof of historic ell.
- Construct three-story addition to extend rear portion of three-story ell.
- Construct new flat roof over full ell (existing and new).
- Construct two pilot houses and roof deck on rear ell.
- Install mechanical units on front of main block and rear ell.
- Install new windows at rear of property both in existing openings and new construction.
- Construct two basement egress openings.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The brick on the main block rear wall and rear ell will remain in place, and the extension of the ell will be a compatible material in order to satisfy Standard 2.
- *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 extends the three-story portion of the ell and is compatible to the historic ell in height and width, satisfying Standard 9.
  - Drawings for the front pilot house do not provide sufficient information for review as there is no information included on a front roof deck. Owing to a lack of information, the pilot house and its future roof deck cannot be fully evaluated to determine if these elements comply with Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in 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 work removes a limited area of historic fabric and could be restored in the future, satisfying Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*
  - The proposed front pilot house could comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline if additional information about the front pilot house and roof deck were provided. A physical mock-up is also recommended to evaluate if roof deck and pilot are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the historic brick is maintained on the rear ell and the extension is a compatible material, the front pilot house is eliminated, rear pilot house and mechanical equipment are not visible from public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the historic brick is maintained on the rear ell, the extension is a compatible material, the front wall of the rear ell is not raised or built on, the front pilot house is eliminated, rear pilot house and mechanical equipment are not visible from public right-of-way, and chimney is not removed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 717 WALNUT ST**

Proposal: Add front steps to basement and railings, alter window and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: RHS 218 LLC

Applicant: Raydrian Wyche, Wyche Construction

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a new front basement stair and main entrance to the lower basement level at 717 Walnut Street. The proposed change will create a separate rental space in this area of the building. The existing basement entryway is not code compliant for the intended use as a separate rental unit. The north side of the 700 block of Walnut Street currently has six buildings (including 717 Walnut St) with basement entry stairs of different forms. None of these basement entryways are recent additions to the buildings in this row.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct new, code compliant basement entrance to allow for entrance to separate rental space.
- Remove perpendicular basement entrance stair and construct new transverse stair.
- Remove basement window to create pass through entry space. Install new window in second basement window opening.
- Construct new set back entry way and door in basement area.
- Add guardrail extension to first-floor main entry stairs.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The addition of a new 4' wide basement stairs directly adjacent to the historic front entry stair negatively impacts the historic character of the façade; therefore it is not compatible with Standard 2. The enlargement and reconfiguration of the existing entrance, if similar to 713 Walnut Street, would be more compatible with Standard 2 (see attached Images 6 and 7).
- *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 size, mass, and position of the proposed basement stair does not meet Standard 9. In addition, the drawings suggest that the historic main entry stair (to the first floor) would be altered to accommodate a handrail extension. This would also not be compatible with Standard 9

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial as shown, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:38:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Engineer Chris Menna represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- John Manton expressed concerns about potential pedestrian issues related to changes to the basement entry.
- Paul Boni, speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association, noted his organization was not aware of the revised application until this meeting. Although the organization commented on the original application submitted, it does not have any comment on the revised version. Mr. Boni also inquired about the potential for the revised plan to intrude on the neighboring property.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The application has been revised in response to the Architectural Committee discussion and recommendations.
- The existing front basement stair will remain and be modified to meet code requirements to create a rentable basement unit.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The enlargement and reconfiguration of the existing entrance, as proposed in the revised application, satisfies Standard 2 and 9.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided that a full window is installed in the east basement opening, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ITEM: 717 Walnut St**  
**MOTION: Approval**  
**MOVED BY: McCoubrey**  
**SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer**

| VOTE                |     |    |         |        |        |
|---------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| Commissioner        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce) |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total               | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 62 W QUEEN LN**

Proposal: Rehabilitate building, construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ruggerio Plante Land Design/56-64 Queen Lane Associates LLC

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1810

Individual Designation: 3/29/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

The building at 62 W. Queen Lane was constructed about 1810 and an 1895 historic map documents the existence of a rear ell. The rear ell appears in 1950s and 1960s photographs but was likely demolished in the late twentieth century. A 1972 record from the Department of Licenses & Inspections indicates that the building required critical repairs, owing to violations. The building is in very poor condition today.

This application proposes to rehabilitate the surviving main block and construct a new two-story rear addition. The design of the rear addition includes a two-story hyphen that extends from the main block and connects to wider two-story section. The new hyphen is located in the general area where the demolished ell originally stood. A window well with enlarged basement window would be added for egress at the front façade.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Rehabilitate the historic main block.
- Construct a new two-story rear addition.
- Add egress window.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
  - The plans indicate the historic main block will be rehabilitated with historically appropriate materials and detailing. The proposed addition is located at the rear of the property where the historic ell originally stood.
- *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 architectural features and proposed materials of the new addition are compatible with the historic building. The mass, size, and scale of the rear ell are compatible while the addition's roof form differentiates it from the historic main block.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - If the proposed addition is removed in the future, the historic section would retain its essential historic form and integrity.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a structural engineer confirms that the structural integrity of the building will be maintained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 01:58:20

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Jim Cassidy represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Randal Baron spoke in support of the application and offered some suggestions.
- Oscar Beisert, of the Keeping Society, spoke in support of the application and commended Mr. Cassidy for his efforts in saving this building and making Germantown a better place.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The condition of the building is very poor, and the structural integrity of the building is a concern.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The plans indicate the historic main block will be rehabilitated with historically appropriate materials and detailing, satisfying Standard 2.



- The architectural features and proposed materials of the new addition are compatible with the historic building. The mass, size, and scale of the rear ell are compatible while the addition's roof form differentiates it from the historic main block. For these reasons, the application satisfies Standard 9.
- If the proposed addition is removed in the future, the historic section would retain its essential historic form and integrity, satisfying Standard 10.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided a structural engineer confirms that the structural integrity of the building and there is consideration of the reinstallation of a bulkhead door for the basement egress, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

| ITEM: 62 W Queen Lane<br>MOTION: Approval<br>MOVED BY: McCoubrey<br>SECONDED BY: Edwards |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 1935 DIAMOND ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: DSW74 LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1889; Willis G. Hale, architect; Demolished 2018

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Significant, 1/29/1986

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes construct a three-story mixed use building with three residential units and one commercial space at 1935 Diamond Street. The building that historically stood on the site was constructed in 1889 as part of an original row of 10 brick houses (1921-1939 Diamond Street) and attributed to architect Willis G. Hale. The building was demolished in 2018 as part of

the Department of Licenses & Inspections Demolition Program. Of the original 10 row houses, only four are extant, 1921, 1923, 1937, and 1939 Diamond Street.

Historically, the property featured an elevated front porch mirroring that of its neighbor to the west, pointed arch upper-floor windows, and an overhanging balcony.

The proposed building approximates the overall form and floor levels of the historic building, but with considerably simplified detailing. Owing to the property's zoning as CMX-2 (Commercial Mixed-Use), which allows for a combination of commercial and residential units within an area that is primarily residential, the proposed design features a cut down, ADA-accessible commercial ground floor unit.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct three-story mixed-use building with first-floor commercial space.
- Clad building in brick veneer, stucco, and fiber cement lap siding with an asphalt shingle roof.

**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 general massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the proposed new construction are compatible with the neighboring buildings and district. Historic design details and materials should be further explored to satisfy Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in 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 work satisfies Standard 10.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial as proposed. Details and materials should be further explored, including first floor entrance, third floor balcony, window openings, and cladding materials of the side and rear elevations, to satisfy Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval provided the lap siding is replaced with stucco, elements of the storefront system better align with the neighboring property and adjacent residential entrance, and the second-floor windows are better defined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:09:37

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission, noting that the applicants had made revisions following the Architectural Committee meeting to respond to the Committee's concerns and that application had been removed from the Consent Agenda at the request of a neighbor.

- Architects Rustin Ohler and Eric Quick represented the application

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Neighbor Judith Robinson explained that it was unfortunate that neighbors did not know that the historic building on this site was demolished. She noted that they saw the Imminently Dangerous violations on the property, but were not aware that it would be demolished. She questioned whether the demolition went through an emergency process and whether there are any reports on the demolition. She questioned why the Diamond Street corridor was designated if so many buildings are allowed to be demolished. She explained that she is a tour guide and that these properties are assets to the community and key to the history of the neighborhood. Regarding the proposed construction, Ms. Robinson opined that the commercial unit is incompatible with the residential district and questioned what kind of entity would occupy the space. She suggested that the applicants present their proposal to the community organization, with the understanding that its comments would be non-binding.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported Ms. Robinson's comments.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The historic building that sat on this site was declared Imminently Dangerous and was demolished in 2018 as part of the Department of Licenses & Inspections Demolition Program.
- The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed new construction.
- The Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over the use of the property.
- The applicant made revisions to address the Architectural Committee's concerns, including replacing lap siding with stucco, raising the sill of the storefront window and door to align with the base, introducing additional horizontals to the storefront to align with the windows of the neighboring property, and introducing more pronounced sills and brick soldier course headers to the second-floor windows.
- The stucco would not be stark white, but a tan or light grey to be compatible the historic district.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The general massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the proposed new construction are compatible with the neighboring buildings and district, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and district will be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

**ITEM: 1935 Diamond St**  
**MOTION: Approval**  
**MOVED BY: McCoubrey**  
**SECONDED BY: Hartner**

| VOTE                |     |    |         |        |        |
|---------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| Commissioner        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce) |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total               | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 2100-02 LOCUST ST**

Proposal: Replace 18 windows; legalize 11 windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joel and Stella Freedman

Applicant: Gregory R. Heleniak, Esq., Zarwin Baum

History: 1889; Henry Louis Jr. House; R.G. Kennedy

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

Located at the southwest corner of Locust and S. 21<sup>st</sup> Streets, 2100-02 Locust Street is a single-family dwelling, and is listed as a Significant building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

In July 2018, the Historical Commission's staff witnessed contractors completing the replacement of all windows on the property and the panning of the original window frames, and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a violation for the work.

In July 2019, the Historical Commission reviewed an application to replace nine of the illegal windows with appropriate windows and to legalize the installation of the remaining windows and metal panning. At that meeting, the Historical Commission denied the application, finding that 2100-02 Locust Street is a prominent corner property and the windows that were installed are on highly-visible street frontages, not secondary elevations; that the finish of the metal windows and panning is shinier than the historic painted wood windows; that the replacement windows were installed within the original frames and build down the window opening; that legalizing the inappropriate replacement windows would be unfair to other property owners who have sought the Commission's approval and complied with historic preservation standards and would set a

bad precedent; and that the Historical Commission could consider a replacement schedule, but that ultimately all windows would need to be replaced.

This application proposes to replace the windows at the basement, first, and second floors, and to retain and legalize the metal windows and panning at the third and fourth floors. The staff notes that, while the previous application would have removed non-historic infill at the tops of three basement windows, the current proposal retains the build-down of these windows owing to the confirmed and assumed presence of mechanical equipment. This application proposes to install two-over-two, double-hung windows in the remaining space below the infill. As such, three of the proposed basement windows do not replicate the historic appearance. The staff suggests that the bottom sash of the replacement windows in openings with existing mechanical infill replicate the proportions of the historic windows, with the meeting rails aligning with those of the historically appropriate windows. This would allow the mechanical infill to be removed in the future and a new top sash to be installed without the replacement of the bottom sash.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Legalize replacement of historic wood windows with metal windows and metal cladding at third and fourth floor.
- Replace illegal windows with historically-accurate windows at the first, second, and three basement window openings.
- Install double-hung wood windows below non-historic infill in three basement window openings.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
  - The property owners did not demonstrate that the windows that were removed were beyond repair. The new metal windows do not match the old in design, texture, or materials. The new

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the restoration of the windows at the basement, first, and second floors, provided the bottom sash and meeting rail location of the three basement windows replicates the historic appearance, but denial of the legalization of the remaining windows, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Historical Commission's July 2019 decision.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the windows at the basement, first, and second floors, provided the bottom sash and meeting rail location of the three basement windows replicates the historic appearance, but denial of the legalization of the remaining windows, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Historical Commission's July 2019 decision.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:21:00

**PRESENTERS:**

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

- Attorney Gregory Heleniak and architect Janice Woodcock represented the application.

#### DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Heleniak asserted that the application is a compromise position that accomplishes the goals of the Historical Commission by replacing windows at basement, first and second floors, and opined that such a replacement was in keeping with Standard 6. He opined that the compromise was a good-faith effort to comply on the part of his clients, who had already gone to great expense in replacing all of the windows, and that to replace them again would be wasteful and constitute a hardship. He opined that the windows that were there were in poor condition. He also noted that, if the Historical Commission is not inclined to approve the application, they request an approval today for replacement of all windows on all floors to expedite the process.
- Ms. Woodcock agreed with Mr. Heleniak that the proposed compromise is in spirit of historic preservation standards because it corrects the types and the windows closest to the public view and restores the most character-defining windows. She explained that the original replacement was a mistake, and opined that the Historical Commission should be reasonable.
- Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee felt that all the windows should be replaced and not just the basement, first, and second floors, in order to satisfy the Standards and to be consistent with other instances of windows being improperly replaced.
- Mr. Thomas noted that the Historical Commission sometimes offers dispensation for windows above the fourth floor, which tend to be less visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Thomas asked whether the client would consider a timetable to complete the window replacement in stages.
  - Mr. Heleniak responded that the house is on the market and the client is looking to resolve the problem in a timely manner. He requested the Historical Commission approve either the current application, the legalization of just the fourth floor windows, or an approval of full window replacement with appropriate windows. He noted that there had been some discussion at the Architectural Committee about the possibility of legalizing the fourth-floor windows, and that his client would be open to that compromise.
  - Mr. McCoubrey responded that, overall, the Architectural Committee was reluctant to make a compromise, but that the applicant is correct, if some concession would be made, it would be for the fourth floor. He explained that the first, second and third floor windows align and are similar, whereas the windows in the dormers and gables are slightly smaller and less visible from the street. Mr. Thomas agreed that the fourth-floor windows are different in arrangement and size.
- Mr. Lippert noted that the reason the application is before the Historical Commission, and for a second time, is that the applicant failed to secure proper permits in the first place. He noted that there was some awareness that permits were needed, because permits were secured for sidewalk work in May 2018.
  - Mr. Heleniak agreed, reiterating that his client made a mistake and was not aware of the need for Historical Commission approval.

- Mr. Thomas explained that this is a very important, prominent building. He noted that the Historical Commission does occasionally compromise, but typically for areas that are less visible from the public right-of-way, such as rears.
  - Mr. Heleniak reiterated the desire for the Historical Commission to compromise by legalizing the fourth-floor windows. Ms. Woodcock opined that it would be difficult to distinguish the profile of the fourth-floor windows from the street.
  - Ms. Woodcock opined that the value of the Historical Commission is to be thorough and that the public often asks for the Historical Commission to be thorough, but that preservation not to be used as punishment.
- Mr. Thomas questioned what company installed the windows, noting that if they were familiar with Philadelphia, they would know this is a historic district and that permits were necessary for window replacement.
  - Mr. Heleniak responded that he does not know.
- Mr. Heleniak asked the Historical Commission to approve a full window restoration, if it agrees with the Architectural Committee's recommendation and declines to accept a compromise
  - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff could approve a full restoration of the windows at any time with the proper shop drawings.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Boni commented that the application does not provide evidence one way or the other to support the claim that the replacement without the Historical Commission's approval was a mistake and not intentional. He also objected to the applicant's assertion that the requirement to replace the windows constituted a hardship if there is no financial information submitted.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The windows at 2100-02 Locust Street were replaced without the Historical Commission's review or approval and without a building permit.
- 2100-02 Locust Street is a prominent corner property, and the windows that were installed are on highly-visible street frontages, not secondary elevations.
- The third-floor windows align with those of the first and second floor and are part of the same massing of the building.
- The metal windows and panning, which were installed within and over the original frames, do not replicate the finish or dimensions of the historic windows.
- The staff could approve a full replacement and restoration of all the windows with the appropriate building permit application and window shop drawings, without referral to the Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The installed windows do not replicate the historic windows in design, texture, or materials, and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application proposing the legalization of the replacement windows at 2100-02 Locust Street, but to approve the restoration of the windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

**ITEM: 2100-02 Locust St****MOTION: Denial of legalization, approval of window restoration****MOVED BY: McCoubrey****SECONDED BY: Cooperman**

| VOTE                |     |    |         |        |        |
|---------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| Commissioner        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce) |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total               | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 135 S 18TH ST**

Proposal: Install and replace signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Realty Assoc

Applicant: Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1913; McIlvaine &amp; Roberts, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace existing signage at the ground floor and install new signage at the third story.

The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed an application for branding-related improvements in the fall of 2018. At that time, signage proposed for the rooftop and for the third story at the S. 18<sup>th</sup> and Walnut Street facades was denied.

The current application proposes to limit the new signage to the Walnut Street side at the third story. Black painted steel letters with LED backlighting would be installed through the mortar joints.

The ground floor signage proposed for replacement would maintain the size and appearance of the existing signage; only the letters would be changed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.



**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, in particular a template for the sign and lighting installation to the building façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 2225 SPRUCE ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story multifamily building at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wizard Way LLC

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a three-story multifamily building with roof deck in the rear yard of 2225 Spruce Street. A portion of the rear yard area from 2223 Spruce Street has been consolidated into the lot of 2225 Spruce Street. The building will front onto Manning Street, which has a mixture of apartment and single-family entrances, rear yards, parking spaces, garage doors, and rear walls of buildings on this block, all of varying heights and setbacks. The proposed building is clad in painted brick. The ornamental window surround is inspired by the cornice detail at 2223 Spruce Street.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

- Construct three-story multifamily building fronting Manning Street.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 building is compatible with the historic district's materials, massing, size, scale and proportion. The window surround details differentiate the building from the old. The staff suggests that the applicant consider the inclusion of a cornice to define the roofline.

**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 that:

- a natural brick is used rather than a painted one;
- the window surround detail is fabricated in a composite material resistant to rot;
- the window detail is set back in the openings to reveal the side of the brick;
- the height of the building is reduced as much as possible;

- the parapet is eliminate and a railing is used instead.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1618-22 CHESTNUT ST**

Proposal: Paint building, add rooftop structure, windows and signage, rehabilitate storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gazit Horizons LLC

Applicant: Luca Segato, Eimer Design

History: 1933; WCAU Building; Harry Sternfeld, architect

Individual Designation: 8/6/1981

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to renovate a 10-story Art-Deco style building with office space in the upper floors and retail space at the ground floor. It proposes to construct one-story rooftop structure and pergola on a lower portion of the building, behind the taller front portion of the building. It proposes to cut new window openings and install windows in the side facades, continuing the existing window pattern and replicating the existing window type. The application proposes to restore the entrance area at the western edge of the storefront and replace non-historic doors. The application proposes to paint the façade of the building. Historically, the building was faced with random, small blue glass chips set in a stucco-like bed. From a photograph included in the application, it appears that about 30% of the façade surface was blue glass and 70% gray stucco. At some point before the designation, the façade was stuccoed, obscuring the blue glass chips in a coating of smooth stucco. At that time or later, the new stucco surface was painted blue as an homage to the hidden blue glass chips. The application proposes to paint the façade a grey-white color. The application proposes to add signage on the side facades and on a tower at the peak of the front façade. The building originally had a light mast at the peak of the front façade. Most of the mast was removed before designation. This application proposes to add signage to the truncated light mast. The application also proposes interior work, which is not within the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct one-story rooftop structure and pergola.
- Cut new window openings and install windows.
- Restore entrance and replace doors.
- Paint façade.
- Add signage.

**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.*

- Standard 6 requires that the replacement element match the historic color. The blue color, first from the glass chips and now from the painted stucco, is arguably its most distinctive feature.
- The restoration of the blue glass door surround and the new doors comply with Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed new doors, windows and penthouse/ pergola are compatible with the buildings materials, massing, size, scale and proportion.
  - The change in color for the building from its original blue to gray-white would remove a character-defining feature of this building and one of its primary Art Deco characteristics. However, the impact of the change in color is mitigated by the fact that the building has been stuccoed. Moreover, the original background material, the stucco bed of the blue glass, was grey.
  - The proposed signage on the side facades is extremely large and not in character with the building.
  - The WCAU sign on the truncated light mast creates a false sense of history.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of all aspects of the application except the signage and paint, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the signage and paint and approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, with the following conditions:

- A paint analysis and investigation is conducted to determine the building's original accent colors and to more closely match the blue color of the original finish;
- The storefront doors match as closely as possible the original design;
- The plane of the overbuild of the stair at the west façade as well as the plane of the pergola are set back behind the plane of the parapet.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

## **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 20 MAY 2020**

### **ADDRESS: 40-42 S 2ND ST**

Name of Resource: Vacant Lot

Proposed Action: Rescind Individual Designation

Property Owner: Posel Enterprises

Nominator: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application requests the rescission of the individual designation of the property at 40-42 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The property was individually designated on 7 October 1976. At the time, a four-story, commercial building stood on the site. The building was constructed in 1891 for H.O. Atwood, the proprietor of Atwood's Furniture. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building imminently dangerous in 1987 and the Historical Commission approved its demolition on 30 April 1987. The building was subsequently demolished. The property has been used as a surface parking ever since. The property was included in the Old City Historic District, which was designated on 12 December 2003, with a classification of non-contributing. The Old City Historic District inventory does not indicate that the property has any historical, architectural, or archaeological significance.

Section 5.14.b.1 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations authorizes the Commission to remove entries from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places when the qualities that caused the original entry on the Register have been lost or destroyed. In this case, the building was designated for its architectural qualities, which were lost when the building was legally demolished. There is no longer a basis for the individual designation. It is what the Commission calls a "phantom designation." The Commission routinely removes phantom designations. Rescinding the individual designation will have no impact on subsequent regulation of the property, which will be treated as an "undeveloped site" with or without the phantom designation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 40-42 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 40-42 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:37:45

#### **RECUSAL:**

- Ms. Long recused because her husband works at the law firm representing the property owner.

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Matt McClure represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert asked if the Historical Commission ever used a phantom designation to regulate subsequent new construction.
  - Mr. Thomas responded that the Historical Commission does not have full jurisdiction over new construction on vacant lots in historic districts if the lot was vacant at the time of the designation of the historic district.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Historical Commission is asserting full jurisdiction over the police station on vacant lots in the Diamond Street historic district, but is not in this case. He asked for an explanation.
  - Mr. Reuter explained that the building in question on S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street was individually designated and then demolished before the Old City Historic District was designated. The buildings on Diamond Street were never individually designated, but were only designated as part of the historic district, and were demolished after the Diamond Street Historic District was designated. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections demolished the Diamond Street buildings because they posed a public safety hazard.
- Paul Boni asked via an email why the applicant was requesting the rescission now and what the benefit of a rescission would be.
  - Mr. McClure responded that his client has no current plans for the property and is requesting the rescission has a housekeeping matter, to ensure that the property's record with the Historical Commission is clear.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission individually designated the property at 40-42 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street on 7 October 1976.
- The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building imminently dangerous in 1987 and the Historical Commission approved its demolition on 30 April 1987. The building was subsequently demolished.
- The property was included in the Old City Historic District, which was designated on 12 December 2003, with a classification of non-contributing. The Old City Historic District inventory does not indicate that the property has any historical, architectural, or archaeological significance.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Historical Commission may remove the entry for 40-42 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 40-42 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent. Ms. Long recused.

| <b>ITEM: 40-42 S 2nd St</b><br><b>MOTION: Rescind individual designation</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Hartner</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE  |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner  | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)   |     |    |         | X      |        |
| Mattioni  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)   |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total   | 11  |    |         | 1      | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 744-46 S 8TH ST**

Name of Resource: Columbus Hall

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mama Y's LLC

Nominator: Celeste Morello and Eugene Desyatnik

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 744-46 S.8thStreet and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that building, historically known as Columbus Hall, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the building has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, as a purpose-built meeting hall for the "Societa' di Unione e Fratellanza Italiana" (Italian Union and Brotherhood Society). Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the building exemplifies the cultural, political, social and historical heritage of the community, as members of the Society were the civic leaders in this "Little Italy" community and assisted with the arrival of new Italian immigrants into South Philadelphia at the end of the nineteenth century.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 744-46 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 744-46 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 02:59:20

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. Chantry stated that the property owner had participated in the review of the nomination by the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination. She stated that she is the only nominator. She clarified that her assertion in the nomination that Philadelphia's Christopher Columbus statue is the first in the United States was based on Richard Juliani's book "Building Little Italy." She stated that the Columbus Monument Foundation was founded at Columbus Hall in 1874 in preparation for the Centennial Exposition. As a result, all money collected by donations went towards the statue that went into Fairmount Park and eventually into Marconi Plaza, where it stands today. She stated that the statue is the oldest and most intact. A Columbus statue in Boston from 1849 was recently damaged. Philadelphia's statue is from approximately 1875. She commended the property owner on his rehabilitation of the building.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Columbus Hall opened in 1898 and was constructed for the Societa' di Unione e Fratellanza Italiana.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, as a purpose-built meeting hall for the Societa' di Unione e Fratellanza Italiana, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building exemplifies the cultural, political, social and historical heritage of the community, as members of the Society were the civic leaders in this "Little Italy" community and assisted with the arrival of new Italian immigrants into South Philadelphia at the end of the nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion J.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 744-46 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

| <b>ITEM: 744-46 S 8<sup>th</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria A and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 1822 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Elon Dunbar House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 19<sup>th</sup> & Sansom Corp.

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1822 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. Constructed in 1858 for Elon Dunbar, the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the popular Italianate style, the most popular style of the Civil War Era, satisfying Criterion C. Additionally, the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, including its low-pitched roof with wide eaves supported by decorative brackets, and tall two-over-two segmentally-arched double-hung windows with dramatic carved hoods and projecting sills, satisfying Criterion D. With its brownstone upper floors and commercial ground floor, the property represents both the residential development of the upper-class Rittenhouse neighborhood in the mid-nineteenth century, and the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the early decades of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J. The building at the rear of the property, known as 1821 Sansom Street, is considered to be non-contributing for the purposes of this nomination.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1822 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination for 1822 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with the amendment that the period of significance be extended to 1933 so as to incorporate the residency of Charles Haseltine and the addition of the storefront in



the 1920s, reflecting the commercial development of Chestnut Street, and with the boundary limited to the historic building fronting Chestnut Street, including its rear ell.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:07:28**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission, along with a site plan showing the areas to be included and excluded from the designation.
- Attorney Carl Primavera represented the current property owner. Attorney Reed Slogoff represented the equitable owner. They supported the nomination and site plan as presented by the staff.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The rowhouse at 1822 Chestnut Street was constructed in 1858 for Elon Dunbar.
- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the popular Italianate style, the most popular style of the Civil War Era.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, including its low-pitched roof with wide eaves supported by decorative brackets, and tall two-over-two segmentally-arched double-hung windows with dramatic carved hoods and projecting sills.
- With its brownstone upper floors and commercial ground floor, the property represents both the residential development of the upper-class Rittenhouse neighborhood in the mid-nineteenth century, and the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the early decades of the twentieth century.
- The commercial storefront dates to the 1920s and is significant to the property's transition from residential to commercial.
- The property was owned and occupied by Charles Haseltine, a famous art dealer, during the early twentieth century, and his residency is significant to the history and significance of the property.
- The building at the rear of the property, known as 1821 Sansom Street, has had numerous alterations that make it unrecognizable as a former carriage house, and is not considered a historically significant part of the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property reflects the environment in an era characterized by the popular Italianate style, satisfying Criterion C.
- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The property represents both the residential development of the upper-class Rittenhouse neighborhood in the mid-nineteenth century, and the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the early decades of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J, and that the period of significance should be extended to 1933 to account for this transition and resulting alterations, as well as the occupancy of art dealer Charles Haseltine.
- The boundary of the designated portion of the property is limited to the width of the parcel (26 feet) by 131 feet 6 inches in depth from Chestnut Street, to include the historic building fronting Chestnut Street, including its rear ell, as presented by the

staff at the meeting. The remaining 103 feet 6 inches from Sansom Street, which include an existing one-story building known as 1821 Sansom Street, are excluded from the designation.

**ACTION:** Mr. Lippert moved to find that the nomination for 1822 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with the amendment that the period of significance be extended to 1933 so as to incorporate the residency of Charles Haseltine and the addition of the storefront in the 1920s, reflecting the commercial development of Chestnut Street, and with the boundary limited to the historic building fronting Chestnut Street, including its rear ell, as presented by the staff. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 1822 Chestnut St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Lippert</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  |     |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 1824 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Edward H. Trotter House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 19<sup>th</sup> & Sansom Corp.

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1824 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. Constructed in 1859 for Edward H. Trotter, the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the popular Italianate style, the most popular style of the Civil War Era, satisfying Criterion C. Additionally, the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, including its low-pitched roof with wide eaves supported by decorative brackets, and tall two-over-two segmentally-arched double-hung windows with hoods and projecting sills, satisfying Criterion D. With its brownstone upper floors and commercial ground floor, the property represents both the residential development of the upper-class Rittenhouse neighborhood in the mid-nineteenth century, and the commercial

development of Chestnut Street in the early decades of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J. The building at the rear of the property, known as 1823 Sansom Street, is considered to be non-contributing for the purposes of this nomination.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1824 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1824 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with the amendment that the period of significance be extended to 1933 so as to incorporate the residency of Charles Haseltine and the addition of the storefront in the 1920s, reflecting the commercial development of Chestnut Street, and with the boundary limited to the historic building fronting Chestnut Street, including its rear ell.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 03:12:40

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission, along with a site plan showing the areas to be included and excluded from the designation.
- Attorney Carl Primavera represented the current property owner. Attorney Reed Slogoff represented the equitable owner. They supported the nomination and site plan as presented by the staff.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- 1824 Chestnut Street was constructed in 1859 for Edward H. Trotter.
- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the popular Italianate style, the most popular style of the Civil War Era.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, including its low-pitched roof with wide eaves supported by decorative brackets, and tall two-over-two segmentally-arched double-hung windows with hoods and projecting sills.
- With its brownstone upper floors and commercial ground floor, the property represents both the residential development of the upper-class Rittenhouse neighborhood in the mid-nineteenth century, and the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the early decades of the twentieth century.
- The commercial storefront dates to the 1920s and is significant to the property's transition from residential to commercial.
- The property was owned and occupied by Charles Haseltine, a famous art dealer, during the early twentieth century, and his residency is significant to the history and significance of the property.
- The building at the rear of the property, known as 1823 Sansom Street, was constructed in 1907 and subsequently altered, and is not considered a historically significant part of the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property reflects the environment in an era characterized by the popular Italianate style, satisfying Criterion C.

- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The property represents both the residential development of the upper-class Rittenhouse neighborhood in the mid-nineteenth century, and the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the early decades of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J, and that the period of significance should be extended to 1933 to account for this transition and resulting alterations, as well as the occupancy of art dealer Charles Haseltine.
- The boundary of the designated portion of the property is limited to the width of the parcel (26 feet) by 140 feet in depth from Chestnut Street, to include the historic building fronting Chestnut Street, including its rear ell, as presented by the staff at the meeting. The remaining 95 feet from Sansom Street, which include an existing one-story building known as 1823 Sansom Street, are excluded from the designation.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination for 1822 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with the amendment that the period of significance be extended to 1933 so as to incorporate the residency of Charles Haseltine and the addition of the storefront in the 1920s, reflecting the commercial development of Chestnut Street, and with the boundary limited to the historic building fronting Chestnut Street, including its rear ell, as presented by the staff. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 1824 Chestnut St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  |     |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 315 and 317 N 33RD ST**

Name of Resource: Marot-McIlvain Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owners: 317: Kevin Kelliher and Cameron Kelliher

315: Caroline Millett

Nominator: Benjamin Leech, University City Historical Society

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 315 and 317 N. 33rd Street, located in West Philadelphia's Powelton Village, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The three-story residential twin, the former Marot-McIlvain Residence, was constructed circa 1860 in the Italianate Villa Style. The nomination states that the property meets Criteria C and D for its distinct architectural form and style, and also represents the least altered Italianate Villa style building with a central tower in the Powelton neighborhood. The nomination further contends that the property meets Criterion J, for its close association with the Marot and McIlvain families, two of Powelton Village's historically notable families.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 315 and 317 N. 33rd Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 315 and 317 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 03:17:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- George Poulin, University City Historical Society, represented the nomination.
- Kevin Kelliher represented the property owner of 315 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> St. Mr. Kelliher stated the owners oppose the nomination citing concerns about the financial implications of designation and Historical Commission requirements of future building rehabilitation. He requested information about the nomination notice date stating that this activity occurred at the time of his purchase of the property on 8 November 2019. Ms. Mehley confirmed that notice letters were sent to the owner of record according to the Office of Property Assessment, Caroline Millett, on 5 November 2019.
- No one represented the owner of 317 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 315-317 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street is the least altered Italianate Villa style building with a central tower in the Powelton Village neighborhood.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building is notable for its distinct Italianate Villa architectural form and style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The building is closely associated with the Marot and McIlvain families, two of Powelton Village's historically notable families, satisfying Criterion J.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination for 315 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J and to designate it as historic, listing the property on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 315 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE  |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner  | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)   |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total   | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination for 317 N. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J and to designate it as historic, listing the property on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| <b>ITEM: 317 N 33<sup>rd</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 807-11 BAINBRIDGE ST AND 620-24 S 8TH ST**

Name of Resource: Church of the Crucifixion and parish building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: The Rectors of the Church of the Crucifixion

Nominator: Scott Welden, Bella Vista Neighbors Association

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 807-11 Bainbridge Street and 620-24 S 8<sup>th</sup> Street and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Church of the Crucifixion and parish building satisfy Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the buildings are associated with the life of a person significant in the past, Archdeacon Henry L. Phillips, who began his ministry in 1877 and turned the Church of the Crucifixion into a leader for social outreach programs for the surrounding black community. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the church and parish building are the work of Isaac Pursell, a prolific Philadelphia-based church architect whose work has significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Church of the Crucifixion exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as an early provider of shelter and refuge for some of the city's poorest black residents, who were able to benefit from the Church's mission work.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 807-11 Bainbridge Street and 620-24 S 8<sup>th</sup> Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the properties at 807-11 Bainbridge Street and 620-24 S 8<sup>th</sup> Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, E, and J, and that the end of the period of

significance should be revised according to information to be provided to the Historical Commission.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:27:15**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Sean McCauley, Property Manager for the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania, represented the property owner. He opposed the designation, and stated that it is always the Diocese's desire to not have its properties designated unless it volunteers them. He noted that windows and doors have been altered on the facades over the years, and stated that it is a challenge to go back to the government to change stained glass windows. He stated that there is no intention to demolish these buildings, but that the Diocese is looking into adaptive reuse options. He made it clear that the Diocese is not opposing the designation owing to the building's association with the African American community, but rather the opposition has to do with its operation and continued ministry at this location and not having restrictions placed on the façades.
- No one represented the nomination.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination. He commented that the Historical Commission does not regulate the content of stained glass windows, but only the form and shape of the windows.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The period of significance should end in 1932, being the year that Henry L. Phillips retired as Archdeacon.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The buildings are associated with the life of a person significant in the past, Archdeacon Henry L. Phillips, who began his ministry in 1877 and turned the Church of the Crucifixion into a leader for social outreach programs for the surrounding black community, satisfying Criterion A.
- The church and parish building are the work of Isaac Pursell, a prolific Philadelphia-based church architect whose work has significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City, satisfying Criterion E.
- The Church of the Crucifixion exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as an early provider of shelter and refuge for some of the city's poorest black residents, who were able to benefit from the Church's mission work, satisfying Criterion J.

**ACTION:** Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 807-11 Bainbridge Street and 620-24 S. 8<sup>th</sup> Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, E, and J, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an



amended period of significance to end in 1932. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

| <b>ITEM: 807-11 Bainbridge St and 620-24 S 8<sup>th</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, E, and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Turner</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 1208 WALNUT ST**

Name of Resource: The Strathmore  
Proposed Action: Designation  
Property Owner: Millennium Hotel Group, LLC  
Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff  
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1208 Walnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the building reflects the environment at the turn-of-the-century, when this and several other large hotels and apartment buildings were built in the same style for nearby sites. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the French Renaissance Revival style of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the building was designed by prominent early twentieth-century Philadelphia architect Carl P. Berger, an architect whose work has significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City and Commonwealth.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1208 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1208 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:41:00**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. Chantry stated that the staff has been in contact with two representatives of the property owner via email.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Architect Carl Berger's work has not significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation, and therefore Criterion E should be excluded.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building reflects the environment at the turn-of-the-century, when this and several other large hotels and apartment buildings were built in the same style for nearby sites, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the French Renaissance Revival style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.

**ACTION:** Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1208 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

|  |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>ITEM: 1208 Walnut St</b>                |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria C and D</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: Turner</b>                    |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b>              |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner                               | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman                                  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)                                | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey                                  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)                        |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington                                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                      | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 1601 S 13TH ST**

Name of Resource: The Church of the Reconciliation

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. John's Baptist Church

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1601 S. 13<sup>th</sup> Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church complex satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church and Sunday School building embody distinguishing characteristics of both the Romanesque Revival and Italianate styles of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the complex is the work of two significant architects, Samuel Hall Day in 1892 and Charles Oelschlager in 1899. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the building currently occupied by St. John's Baptist Church exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community, as part of development of South Philadelphia's ethnic and religious diversity, particularly the Italian Protestant community but also the Southeast Asian immigrant community.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1601 S. 13<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1601 S. 13<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J, and that the period of significance should end in 2000.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 03:45:25

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. Chantry stated that the staff attempted to contact the property owner but did not receive a response.
- Patrick Grossi and Kevin Block represented the nomination.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Architect Charles Oelschlager's work has not significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation, and therefore Criterion E should be excluded.
- The period of significance should be revised to end in 2000 rather than the present.
- The church was at one time known as the First Italian Baptist Church of Philadelphia, a fact which the nomination does not mention, and which should be added to the final nomination.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The church and Sunday School building embody distinguishing characteristics of both the Romanesque Revival and Italianate styles of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- The church building exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community, as part of development of South Philadelphia's ethnic and religious diversity, particularly the Italian Protestant community but also the Southeast Asian immigrant community, satisfying Criterion J.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1601 S. 13<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance to end in 2000. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

| <b>ITEM: 1601 S 13<sup>th</sup> St</b><br><b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria D and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE  |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner  | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Long (DHCD)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Mattioni  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)   |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total   | 12  |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 2100 DIAMOND ST**

Proposal: Construct two-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property

Applicant: Michelle Shuman, Capital Projects Division

History: 1875; Buildings demolished c. 1997

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**BACKGROUND:**

This application proposes to construct a new building for the 22<sup>nd</sup> Police District, located on vacant lots within the Diamond Street Historic District. The Diamond Street Historic District was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1986. At the time of the designation,

buildings classified as contributing in the district inventory, which were in very poor condition, stood on these blocks. Not long after the designation of the district, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited these buildings as “imminently dangerous” and the blocks of houses were demolished, resulting in the vacant lots that are present today. In 2001 and again in 2018, proposals were reviewed by the Commission to amend the historic district boundaries to exclude these vacant lots. Owing to community opposition, the Commission took no action in 2001, and denied the application to amend the boundary in 2018. Therefore, the Commission retains plenary jurisdiction over the review of building permit applications for these lots which have been vacant for approximately 20 years and are located at the far western edge of the historic district.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct two-story building and associated parking lots and public plazas.

**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 work 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 building is compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic district. It is located at the far western end of the district, and as such, it is not seen within the context of the traditional red brick and brownstone rowhouses that defines the district to the east. The building façade incorporates ornamental brickwork found on residential buildings in the district but with a gray brick. The overall massing, size, and scale appears to be appropriate for the historic district.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval provided renderings showing additional color schemes, the introduction of depth to the façade, and sections to show rooftop mechanical equipment, are provided for review by the Commission, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING:** 04:07:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Project Manager Michelle Shuman and architect Stephen Bartlett represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Chantry offered to summarize the Historical Commission’s purview. She stated that the Historical Commission is not deciding whether it is good public policy to build this police station at this location at this time, but whether the proposed building is architecturally compatible with the historic district.

- Ms. Chantry addressed a concern raised prior to the start of the review via Webex's Q&A which questioned if moving the matter to the end of the agenda was an attempt to minimize public comment. She stated that it was done for just the opposite reason. By moving the matter last on the agenda, the Commission could spend as much time as needed, and hear from all interested parties, without needing to end the review owing to an obligation to move onto other matters.
- Ms. Shuman provided information about the proposed building. She stated that it is part of a comprehensive reexamination of police buildings, and they looked to see how public buildings can serve the community. She explained that it will be the first police building with a dedicated community room, and the lobby will offer amenities for the public. She clarified that this building would replace the existing police station building for the district. She noted that the area is currently vacant lots. She described proposed streetscape improvements to buffer the parking. She explained that the project has not yet gone through zoning, and there will be public meetings as part of that process. She stated that the Art Commission reviewed the revised design and that the landscape portion will be slightly further developed as a result of that review, and the signage will be improved.
- Mr. Bartlett provided a general overview of the project by discussing each page of the application materials. He discussed the design changes, such as the addition of depth and color to the façade, which were made as a result of the Architectural Committee review.
  - Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that the revised design reflects the recommendations of the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Thomas commented that all application materials are available online for public review one week in advance of the Commission's meetings.
- Ms. Edwards responded to the general sentiments of the public comment. She stated that many of the concerns raised are not within the purview of the Historical Commission, and asked if the matter should be tabled. She commented that it appears that the process to date has not been satisfactory for the public, and suggested that the Commission discuss that. She stated that it sounds like the City needs to go back to the drawing board with this project.
- Mr. Thomas stated that he read through all of the public comment received via email. He summarized that the public is concerned about the larger issues, not about the color of the brick or the architectural details. He stated that, while a discussion of the architectural details would be very appropriate on another project, at this time, the Commission has to recognize where it is and what is going on right now. He stated that this is an extraordinary time where we are living through an important moment in history that requires the Commission to go outside the boundaries of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Standards). He opined that the process to date has been flawed, and that he needs to look at the big picture, rather than at whether the brick is the right color. He stated that this site is within an historic district, where there is a cultural landscape and one can question if this is the right use of the property. He suggested that the Commission ask Public Property and City Council to take another look at this proposal.
- Mr. Mattioni clarified that the Historical Commission process is not flawed, and it does not have to do with historic designation, but rather is another example where money has been squandered on a project that will make little sense in retrospect, similar to the proposal for a new location of the central police department. He reiterated that the problem is not that the Commission's system did not notify the

- proper people. He suggested that the Commission table the application and send it back to the drawing board.
- Ms. Washington asked if tabling the nomination would simply be passing the buck. She suggested that the Commission instead use what is within its purview to deny the project, including the building's stark contrast to the neighboring properties, and the use of the space as compared to the typical dense residential use of the district. She suggested that the Commission use what is within its purview rather than tabling and passing the project on to another department.
    - Ms. Edwards suggested that the Commission vote to deny the project.
    - Ms. Washington responded that that is the direction she is moving in, and that a denial can be based on the Standards owing to its incompatibility within the historic district.
    - Mr. Mattioni agreed that it does not fit in with the residential context of the community.
    - Ms. Turner agreed.
  - Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission could look at how the building does not meet the Standards, but there are also social justice issues to confront.
    - Mr. Mattioni asked if that is a question before the Commission, because the Commission has said in the past that it is not to consider uses of buildings. He agreed that this project needs community input, and that the applicants should go back to the community to seek such input.
  - Ms. Edwards asked if a motion to deny the application could be based on a lack of sensitivity to the neighborhood context.
    - Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission is governed by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, but that a property is not necessarily a tax parcel. Rather, a property can be a district, so one could say that this is an inappropriate treatment for a historic district because of incompatible scale and use of open space.
    - Other Commissioners agreed.
    - Mr. Reuter commented that the Commission is bound by the Standards, but that there are seven other review criteria that do not involve the Standards. He agreed that everything discussed could be incorporated into a motion. He stated that the Commission's review goes beyond the Standards, but that, if the Commission is going to approve an application, it must meet the Standards and Guidelines. He stated that the impact of new construction on an historic district can go beyond the aesthetic issues, and that Ms. Washington's proposal is within the Commission's authority.
    - Mr. Thomas stated that this is a building and a site plan that does not fit into the historic district.
  - Mr. Mattioni clarified that the Historical Commission did not fail in its notification to the public. He explained that the Commission cannot provide notice until an application is submitted for review, so it could not have done anything regarding notice until the application was received by the staff. He stated that it is not a lack of notice on the part of the Historical Commission or its staff, and that the Commission's scope of authority is defined by law. He stated that that does not mean that it should not take other things into consideration when it is appropriate to do so, but it needs to be careful once it gets to the outer limits of its authority. He stated that there are sound reasons within the Standards which can be used to deny this application. It can be denied on those grounds, with a subscript that the Commission is troubled by the lack of community involvement.

- Mr. Thomas responded that he is not claiming there was a lack of notice on the part of the Commission, but rather that the Commission received an application that it believes is lacking in that it came to the Commission without first initiating public involvement.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if the Commission must provide a reason for denying an application. She noted that the Commission's discussion provides abundant explanation as to what it finds inadequate in the application.
  - Mr. Reuter responded that there is no need to provide a reason for a denial, and that the Commission can simply deny an application without comment. He noted that the discussion will be summarized in the meeting minutes.
- Ms. Long excused herself from the meeting at 1:56 p.m.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Ms. Chantry summarized all written public comment received prior to the meeting. She stated that 102 email comments had been received prior to close of business the day prior, which were emailed to the Commissioners and placed online for public review. She stated that she received 21 additional email comments since that time. She summarized all comments, stating that they question the construction of a new police station in a primarily African-American neighborhood. They question the spending of public money on policing instead of social services. They question the City's engagement with the community regarding the planning and design of the station. She stated that all are valid questions, especially at this moment, but are outside the purview of the Historical Commission.
- Judith Robinson, representative of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Ward Registered Community Organization (RCO), spoke in opposition to the application. She questioned if this public building is the highest and best use on the historic corridor. She asked for a Town Hall meeting before decisions are made. She stated that no meetings have been held with the community, and the community was not aware of this proposal. She asked for more park and less parking.
- Jacqueline Wiggins spoke in opposition to the application. She referenced her written comment already provided to the Commission. She commented that there has been only one meeting, with the Saint Elizabeth RCO, which is insufficient for such a large police district. She stated that no other RCOs were notified. She commented that the district needs housing and school facilities, not a police station. She asked that the Commission deny the application. She commented that architecture has to do with the environment and that means more than a physical environment, and culture plays a critical part to a planned environment. She commented that a community room is not enough. She asked if the project can move forward even if the Historical Commission denies the application.
- Klyde B. spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that it would be irresponsible to discuss brick detailing in the context of this current moment.
- Sally Polk spoke in opposition to the application. She commented that there needs to be a Town Hall meeting. She commented that the community does not want another police station. She commented that her friends are experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder owing to the behavior of the Philadelphia police, and that the police should not be rewarded with a new police station. She asked the Commission to deny the application.
- Adam Bleiman spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that the presence of this building in the neighborhood would be a slap in the face and an intimidating symbol. He commented that it is not a good use of the land or money.



- Oscar Beisert spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that it is in the middle of a beautiful street that was originally lined with townhouses. He commented that it does not fit in and the neighborhood deserves something better and residential.
- Jim Duffin spoke in opposition to the application. He commented that the Philadelphia City Planning Commission sends notifications to RCOs but that the Historical Commission is not required to notify RCOs. He suggested that the Historical Commission consider using the same method as the Planning Commission when an application falls within an RCO's boundaries.
- Gail Loney spoke in opposition to the application. She referenced her written comment already provided to the Commission. She stated that she is a block captain, and commented that her RCO was not notified. She commented that this process has apparently been going on since 2018, based on her research, yet the community has not been involved. She commented that the community may be poor, but that does not mean that they should not be involved. She commented that the area needs housing. She asked for a series of community meetings, and that the community is asked what it wants and needs. She suggested that the existing police station be rehabilitated. She commented that she would rather see the lot remain a green space. She asked if there is a requirement that projects should have already had public input. She asked if presenters are on the honor criteria. She asked if the question of ethics should be a consideration.
- Emmaline Goodwin commented in opposition to the application. She commented that community members have not been involved or even aware of the proposed police building.
- Alyssa Ciampaglia commented in opposition to the application. She asked that everyone consider not going through with the construction. She commented that police budgets should be cut. She commented that the building would not be good for the community.
- Ms. Schmitt of the staff reported that, in addition to written public comment received prior to the meeting, an additional nine emails were received since the start of the meeting. All were of a similar content to what was summarized for the public comment at the start of the review.

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

The Historical Commission found that:

- Many interested parties opposed the construction of the police station.
- The City of Philadelphia had not engaged the public sufficiently in the discussion of the proposed police station.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed police station is not compatible with the historic district.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the application for 2100 Diamond Street. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7-2-1. Mr. Mattioni abstained.

| <b>ITEM: 2100 Diamond St</b><br><b>MOTION: Denial</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Long (DHCD)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Mattioni   |     |    | X       |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  |     | X  |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 7   | 2  | 1       |        | 3      |

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 05:39:59**

**ACTION:** At 2:46 p.m., Mr. McCoubrey moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

| <b>ITEM: Adjournment</b><br><b>MOTION: Adjourn</b><br><b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Mattioni</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Commissioner   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Cooperman  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Edwards  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Hartner (DPP)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Lippert (L&I)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Long (DHCD)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Mattioni   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| McCoubrey  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Sánchez (Council)  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Stanford (Commerce)  |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Turner, Vice Chair   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Washington   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total  | 10  |    |         |        | 3      |

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video 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).

DRAFT