

**THE MINUTES OF THE 695TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 JULY 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON WEBEX
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined her:

| Commissioner | Present | Absent | Comment |
|---|---------|--------|---------|
| Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair | x | | |
| Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair | x | | |
| Mark Dodds (Division of Housing & Community Development) | x | | |
| Kelly Edwards, MUP | x | | |
| Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property) | | x | |
| Labaron Lenard-Palmer (Dept. of Planning & Development) | x | | |
| Josh Lippert (Department of Licenses & Inspections) | x | | |
| John Mattioni, Esq. | x | | |
| Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair | x | | |
| Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President) | x | | |
| 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:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- 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:

- Patricia Kinsman
- Raymond Ricketts

Randal Baron
Dustin Dove
Janice Woodcock
Chris Strom
Jim Duffin
Susan Babbitt
Meaad Aldosari
Ryan LeFevre
Vincent Cordisco
Kathy Dowdell
Vern Anastasio
John Wisniewski
Alex Balloon
Kevin Brett
Mary Spross
Madeleine O'Brien
Oscar Beisert
Patrick Grossi
Andrew Fearon
Susan Wetherill
K. Bird
Maria Sturm
Jason Greenspon
Blair Sweeney
Sheila Klos
Michael Mattioni
Eugene Desyatnik
John Scott
Angela Gervasi
Austin Coleman
Jeanne Curtis
Nikil Saval
Justin Spivey
Janis Vacca
Shelly Perron
Zofia Fernandini
Philippa Campbell
Whitney Martinko
Susan Feenan
Megan Thomson
Kyle Toth
Chris Carickhoff
Bob Malin
Michelle Schmitt
Andrew Miller
Jay Farrell
Matthew McClure
Paul Boni
Maggy White
Katie Park

Venise Whitaker
Mason Carter
Jennifer R.
Adam Margent
Mark Coggin
Nic Tenaglia
Nicholas Foreman
Kristen Lampe
Sean Narcum
Aron Martinez
Leah Silverstein
Nan Gutterman
Brad Maule
Brendan Krewer
Humberto Fernandini
Jenna Solomon
Nancy Pontone
Rachel Kaminski
Evan Schlesinger
Ryan Furlong
Lauren Aguilar
David Fecteau
David Setta
Joe Horan
Carolyn Devine
Kerry Bryan
Jennifer Bazydlo
Jordan Price
Susan Syrnick
Alex Hart
Dana Fedeli
Even Schueckler
Tom Witt
Lillian Candela
Jeff
Martha Cross
Suzanna Barucco
Ashley May
Aaron Wunsch
Graham Nelson
Ben Leech
Kimberly La Porte
Robert Schwarz
Justin Detwiler
Job King
Amy Lambert
J. Kavalier
Ashley Hahn
Steven Peitzman
Rebecca Setta

Devon Beverly
Jenna Schlesinger
Michael Stepnowski
Paul Steinke
Michael Greenle
Emily Smith
David Gest
Paul Chrystie
Phil Harter
Samuel Garigliano
Jonathan Doran
Michelle Shuman
Peter Angelides
Elizabeth Milroy
Chris Mejia-Smith
Sara Lepori
Mary McGettigan
Arielle Harris
Tina Geary
Harrison Haas
Regina Stepnowski
A.J. Thomson
Allison King
Celeste Morello
Lori Salganicoff

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 694TH STATED MEETING, 12 JUNE 2020

START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:06:00

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 694th Stated Meeting, held 12 June 2020.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Farnham stated that the staff received an email from former staff member Randal Baron regarding the meeting minutes for the review of 62 W. Queen Lane. Mr. Baron indicated that he felt that the public comment he had provided during the review was not reflected in the meeting minutes. Mr. Farnham noted that the meeting minutes are not intended to be a transcript, and that Mr. Baron's comments are reflected in the meeting recording, which is the complete record that can be referenced by the staff when reviewing work to the building.
 - Mr. Thomas acknowledged Mr. Baron's comments.
 - Ms. Cooperman stated that the staff should bear Mr. Baron's comments in mind when reviewing the construction drawings for 62 W. Queen Lane.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 694th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 June 2020. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: Minutes, 694th Stated Meeting | | | | | |
| MOTION: Adoption | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Thomas | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ANNOUNCEMENT

START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:10:30

Mr. Thomas announced that the Historical Commission will hold a special, remote meeting at 9:00 a.m. on 24 July 2020 to review an application to remove the statue of Christopher Columbus from Marconi Plaza.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 3101 AND 3143 W PASSYUNK AVE

Name of Resource: Point Breeze Gas Works

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 3101: City of Philadelphia Gas Works; 3143: Philadelphia Energy Solutions

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue and a portion of the property at 3143 W. Passyunk Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the sixteen identified buildings, sites, and structures, historically known as the Point Breeze Gas Works, satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, although some Criteria are not applied to all resources. The site is inaccessible to the general public, so aerial imagery was utilized in the nomination to

determine what remains of the complex. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development of the City, expanding its complex as the population of the City, and therefore the demand for gas, grew. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the majority of the identified resources collectively represent a public works that was executed in the Gothic Revival style between 1851 and 1859 with additions through 1899, with several later resources being designed in the Jacobean Revival style. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the earliest buildings of the Point Breeze Gas Works were built under the leadership of designer and engineer John Chapman Cresson. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Point Breeze Gas Works exemplifies the economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as one of the largest employers for Philadelphians in the mid-to-late nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination to allow time for the staff to visit and survey the site, which is publicly inaccessible, and report on its findings to the Committee on Historic Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue and 3143 W. Passyunk Avenue and remand it to the August 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ACTION: See below.

ADDRESS: 2501-61 N 15TH ST

Name of Resource: Thirteenth & Fifteenth Street Passenger Railway Company's Depot, Car House, & Stable

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TAC CG Philadelphia LLC

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2501-61 N. 15th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Thirteenth & Fifteenth Street Passenger Railway Company's Depot, Car House, and Stable satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the Thirteenth & Fifteenth Street Passenger Railway Company is an early and significant example of the evolution and development of passenger railway companies, and public transit in Philadelphia. The facility was expanded as public transit moved from horse cars, to cable cars, to motorized buses. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the expansion of public transit was one reason for the residential development of this area of North Philadelphia, exemplifying the historical heritage of the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2501-61 N. 15th 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 2501-61 N. 15th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and that the property should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ACTION: See below.

ADDRESS: 1615-31 N DELAWARE AVE

Name of Resource: Bradlee & Co. Empire Chain Works

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: LMM Associates

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the remaining portion of the Bradlee & Co.'s Empire Chain Works, constructed between 1905 and 1910, is significant under Criteria for Designation C and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property is a "rare surviving industrial building at the Delaware River waterfront...that was associated with the maritime railroad and shipbuilding industries." Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the one-story shed building is representative of low-slung masonry industrial buildings of pilaster construction that were once commonplace throughout the River Wards and the larger region.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that 1615-31 N Delaware Avenue 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

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 Hazelhurt & 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.

ACTION: See below.

ADDRESS: 4649 UMBRIA ST

Name of Resource: Levering Smick Arbuckle House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Umbria Commons LLC
Nominator: Ridge Park Civic Association
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4649 Umbria Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the building and the original land associated with it preceded the neighborhood's development, and that several prominent owners over the course of a century contributed significantly to the neighborhood's growth and its current appearance.

This property is slated for redevelopment. The property owner plans to demolish the building and construct a multi-family residential building. The property owner began seeking permits for the project prior to the submission of the nomination or issuance of the notice to the property owner announced the consideration of the nomination. However, the timeline of permit applications is unclear at this time, but will be clarified before the July meeting of the Historical Commission.

Section 14-1005(6)(f) of the preservation ordinance governs the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the consideration of a designation. The provision prohibits the Department of Licenses & Inspections from issuing any building permit for any property being considered for designation "where the building permit application is filed on or after the date that notices of proposed designation have been mailed" unless the Historical Commission approves the building permit application or fails to complete its designation process within 90 days. The notices were mailed on 15 May 2020.

The question in this case is whether a building permit application vesting rights in the project was "filed" with the Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to 15 May 2020. If it was, then the Department may issue the permit without the Historical Commission's review and the project may proceed regardless of any designation.

ORIGINAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4649 Umbria Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, but it also recommends that the Historical Commission defer designating the property if it determines that a permit application for the new construction was filed prior to the issuance of the notice letters.

REVISED STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission decline to designate the property because permit applications for the demolition of the existing structure and new construction were filed prior to the mailing of the notice letters.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4649 Umbria Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

START TIME IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:11:40

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas presented the continuance requests and asked if any Commissioners or members of the public wished to comment.
- Oscar Beisert represented the Keeping Society, the nominator, for 3101 and 3143 W. Passyunk Avenue, 2501-61 N. 15th Street, 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue, and 527-37 W. Girard Avenue. He stated that he has no objection to a continuance for 3101 and 3143 W. Passyunk Avenue, and commented that the Keeping Society could be available for a site visit. He questioned the length of time of the continuance request for 2501-61 N. 15th Street. He commented that he has no objection to the continuances for 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue and 527-37 W. Girard Avenue.
- Attorney David Gest, representing the property owner of 2501-61 N. 15th Street, explained the request for continuance. He stated that the property owner did not receive notice of the proposed designation until after the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, so he was not present at that meeting. Counsel was retained at the beginning of March, and then the COVID-19 shutdown occurred, which resulted in a delay of being able to review the nomination, visit the site, and retain experts. He stated that there are several permits applications to redevelop this property. The owner received zoning permits to redevelop the property prior to receiving notice of the proposed designation. The property owner did file an application for demolition of the building, and received a permit in the context of the earlier zoning permit. The Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) then revoked the demolition permit because it realized that it had failed to refer it to the Historical Commission for review. The owner has appealed the revocation of the demolition permit to the Board of License & Inspection Review (BLIR). That appeal is currently pending, which is part of the reason for the continuance request, in that there is a desire to resolve the BLIR appeal first. Mr. Gest clarified that there are several permits. A zoning permit was received on 8 January 2020. The Committee on Historic Designation meeting was held on 15 January 2020. Written notice of the proposed designation was received on 17 January 2020. A demolition permit was received in June 2020 and later revoked. He stated that they would be willing to be heard in September, if that is preferred over October.
 - Mr. Thomas reiterated that the property would remain under the Commission's jurisdiction during any continuance period.
 - Leonard Reuter of the City's Law Department confirmed that Mr. Gest had been in contact and that Mr. Reuter is aware of the appeal to the BLIR. He commented that he understands why they are asking for additional time, owing to the appeal.

- Ms. Cooperman suggested a shorter continuance period, to allow for the Commission to review the status sooner and continue it again at that point if need be. She suggested the September meeting of the Commission, instead of October.
- Attorney Christopher Strom, representing the property owner of 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue, requested a continuance until the first in-person meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, owing to the complexity of the nomination and the anticipated need to display plans and diagrams.
 - Ms. Cooperman responded that, given the level of uncertainty at the moment regarding reopening, the Commission should impose a timeframe on any continuance so that the Commission can monitor the property. She suggested a continuance to the September meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.
 - Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted that it would not preclude Mr. Strom from requesting another continuance at that time.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Farnham noted that Kathy Dowdell emailed after close of business the evening prior with comments regarding the continuance of 2501-61 N. 15th Street. He stated that Ms. Dowdell's email was forwarded to the Commissioners this morning.
- Ms. DiPasquale conveyed an email from Kathy Dowdell regarding the date of the zoning permit for 2501-61 N. 15th Street. She conveyed a second email from Ms. Dowdell which asked about Civic Design Review for the property.
- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented that he supports the continuance request for 4649 Umbria Street.
- Jim Duffin commented that there should be no open-ended continuance requests.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the reviews of the nominations as follows: continue 3101 and 3143 W. Passyunk Avenue and remand it to the September meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation; continue 2501-61 N. 15th Street to the September meeting of the Historical Commission; and continue 527-37 W. Girard Avenue, 1615-31 N. Delaware Avenue, and 4649 Umbria Street to the August meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: Continuance of reviews of designation matters | | | | | |
| MOTION: Approval | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2020

ADDRESS: 2126 CYPRESS ST

Proposal: Partially demolish and reconstruct three-story structure; add fourth story and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Douglas Bollinger

Applicant: Sean Narcum, Peter Zimmerman Architects

History: Refaced, c. 1960 townhouse

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish most of a three-story non-contributing structure and construct a four-story house with deck. The fourth story would be set back from the front façade. Although the staff may approve demolitions of non-contributing structures in historic districts, it is forwarding this application to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to evaluate the proposed new construction. The Rules & Regulations state:

When reviewing applications for non-contributing buildings, structures, sites, and objects within an historic district, the Commission, its committees, and staff shall place particular emphasis on the compatibility of materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing with the historic district.

This application is therefore under review for the proposed building's compatibility with the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the second and third stories and roof of the existing building.
- Reconstruct second and third stories and construct a fourth story and deck.

- Install garage and entry doors; metal-clad casement windows at the second, third and fourth stories; deck at fourth story; and painted wood cornice.
- Stucco the facades.

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 inventory for the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District describes this building as having been refaced ca. 1960, identifying it as non-contributing. The proposed demolition does not destroy any historic or significant fabric.
 - Although the buildings immediately adjacent to and in front of the subject property are either three-stories or less, there are buildings on both ends of this block that appear to be four-stories, as is proposed by the applicant.
 - Overall, the staff is not opposed to the proposed design of the reconstruction and new addition. However, some rethinking of the details could help the project fit in better with the context of the block. Though the houses directly across the street from the subject property are finished with smooth-coat stucco, they also feature brick at the water table and in some cases at the sills. The staff has some concerns about the exclusive use of stucco to finish the façade. Additionally, the staff finds that the placement and proportions of the windows as proposed for the front façade do not effectively carry out the existing rhythm of street. Rethinking this detail could help the design better fit into the context of this block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the façade finish, as well as the proportions, placement and details of the fenestration, are reconsidered to better reflect the context of the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:42:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sean Narcum and attorneys Tom Witt and Harrison Haas represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revisions addressed the Architectural Committee’s recommendations.
- The larger windows as originally proposed are compatible with the streetscape and historic district. Nearby contributing buildings have similarly large windows.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The work proposed in the revised application with the larger windows from the original application satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application as revised, but with the larger windows depicted in the original application before revision, with the staff to approve details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 5.

| ITEM: 2126 Cypress St | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Approval, with conditions | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Mattioni | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | | x | | | |
| Dodds | | x | | | |
| Edwards | | x | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | | x | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | | x | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 7 | 5 | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 1505 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jodie L. Greco; 1918 Fairmount Avenue LLC, equitable owner

Applicant: Christopher Carickhoff, 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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1505 Green Street is a three-story, five bay, brick, Italianate/Greek Revival row house constructed in 1859. This application proposes to add a third story to an existing two-story ell, and construct a three-story addition at the rear of the property. The existing rear ell consists of three sections, an original two-story section with a pitched roof, a second two-story section with a flat roof, and a third one-story section. An 1858-60 historic map shows that the pitched-roof section of the ell dates to the building's original construction. The existing rear ell reflects its historic two-story height and general form but, according to building records, was altered in the 1960s and 1980s. A one-story rear addition that runs along the main block's rear

wall was added during the twentieth century. The rear ell and rear of the building are not visible from the public right-of-way.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the rear one-story addition.
- Demolish the roof and rear portion of existing ell.
- Demolish sections of the rear of the main block on the first, second, and third floors.
- Add a third story and extension to the existing ell.
- Construct a three-story ell.

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 rear ell will remain in place and all existing window openings of the rear ell should remain in place 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 third story on the existing ell requires the removal of the roof and chimney. The red brick of the historic ell should remain in place and the addition should be a compatible material in order to satisfy Standard 9.
 - The proposed general form and massing of the three-story addition satisfies Standard 9.
 - The proposed materials of both the existing addition and new addition do not 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 removes significant sections of the rear wall of the main block, therefore not satisfying Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:05:51

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Christopher Carickhoff represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application includes the following revisions:
 - A reduction of the amount of demolition to the main block.
 - An update to the rear ell to show historic brick exposed.
 - Updates to the new materials to ensure compatibility with the historic building.
 - Updates to the color scheme and materials to differentiate the new from historic.
 - A site plan that accurately shows the depth of the neighboring properties in relation to the new construction.
- The vertical pilasters located at the rear of both ells that may shade adjacent buildings owing to the extent of projection.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application primarily addresses the concerns of the Architectural Committee.
- The proposed changes are not visible from the public right-of-way.
- The vertical pilasters should be reduced in size.

ACTION: Ms. McCoubrey moved to approve the application as revised, provided the vertical pilasters are truncated near the planes of the rear walls, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 1505 Green St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Approval, with conditions | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Mattioni | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | x |

ADDRESS: 222-30 BROWN ST

Proposal: Remove front paving, side paving, and front planting area; install brick pavers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Holy Trinity Romanian Orthodox Church

Applicant: Tina Geary, InHabit Architecture and Design LLC

History: 1815, Architect William Strickland

Individual Designation: 11/29/1960

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

Holy Trinity Romanian Orthodox Church, originally St. John's P.E. Church, was designed by William Strickland and constructed in 1815. This application proposes alteration to the exterior landscape, focusing on the front and side areas of the church. No alternations are proposed to the church building or existing fencing as part of this application.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove monuments from front area of church and store for future re-installation.
- Remove existing circular driveway and front planting area along Brown Street; replace with brick pavers.
- Remove concrete walkways that run along the east and west sides of church; replace with brick pavers.
- Install concrete foundations for future brick walls along Brown Street; cover foundations with brick pavers.
- The existing fencing will not be altered or removed as part of this project.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 1: A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*
 - Historic photographs show that the front of church property has been used as a driveway and delivery area for over 150 years. The front landscape elements have been altered over time. The removal of the front planting bed and existing driveway and proposed installation of new brick pavers satisfies Standard 1.
- *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.*
 - Monuments located in the front area will be removed and safely stored during construction.
 - No distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces and spatial relationships will be removed as part of this project, satisfying Standard 2.
- *Standard 8: Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*
 - The applicant's drawings indicate that the area of construction will disturb property approximately one foot below grade. The exception to this is the perimeter along Brown Street where concrete footings will be installed 3'-3.5' feet

below grade. Area of disturbance along Brown Street shall be excavated carefully in order to satisfy Standard 8.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, and 8.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:22:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Tina Geary represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Doug Mooney, Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, submitted an email expressing concerns about excavation and Standard 8 as it applies to this project. In reviewing the revised proposal, he noted that, if the ground disturbance is limited to one foot below the surface, it is unlikely that intact burials will be impacted, but also stated that it is conceivable that previously disturbed skeletal remains could be encountered. Mr. Mooney recommended that the applicant consult with an archaeologist to evaluate potential impacts from the work to the property in advance of the start of work.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application includes the following revisions:
 - The removal of all plans for vehicular access.
 - The stated intention of the use of paved area as a gathering space for the congregation.
 - The removal of the plan to relocate monuments and objects. Instead, the planting area will be reduced in size to allow for a larger paved area in front of church.
 - An update to the method of installation of the brick pavers, which will be laid in a sand bed rather than on concrete.
 - The removal of the plan to install garden wall foundations along Brown Street.
- Lower brick areas of the church walls appear to be spalling in the application photographs).
- The existing steps and curbs to be removed are made of concrete and are not historic.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application primarily addresses the concerns of the Architectural Committee.
- The regrading and brick paver installation should be graded away from the church walls and steps to conduct water away from the building.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the application as revised, provided the excavation does not exceed 12 inches in depth and the earth and paving are graded away from building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, and 8. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 222-30 Brown St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Approval, with conditions | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Mattioni | | | | | |
| 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 |

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 20 MAY 2020

ADDRESS: 1810 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Astoban Investments LLC
Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1810 Chestnut 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 architectural firm Tilden & Register designed the Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House in 1923-24 in Renaissance Revival style; the building’s style offered a sense of distinction and grandeur to a company with a legacy of auctioning the exclusive collections of Philadelphia’s elite.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1810 Chestnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1810 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, and that the period of significance should be revised to extend from 1923 to 2020.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:51:40

PRESENTERS:

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

- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Architecture firm Tilden & Register designed the building in the Renaissance Revival style in 1923 for Samuel T. Freeman & Co, which owned the building and operated as an auction house until 2020.
- The nomination lists the period of significance from 1923/24 to present.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The period of significance should extend from the date of the building’s construction in 1923 to when Samuel T. Freeman & Co. sold the building and it ceased operating as an auction house.
- Though it functioned as a warehouse, the building was designed with great architectural detail in the Renaissance Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- Significant Philadelphia architecture firm Tilden & Register designed the building in 1923, satisfying Criterion E.
- Samuel T. Freeman & Co.’s history is significant to the economic and social history of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1810 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, with a period of significance extending from 1923 to 2020, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 1810 Chestnut St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria D, E, and J; period of significance 1923 to 2020 | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 1700-06 N HOWARD ST

Name of Resource: Gillinder & Sons' Franklin Flint Works Decorating Plant

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Columbia Silk Dyeing Co., Inc.

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1700-06 N. Howard Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former decorating plant of Gillinder & Sons Franklin Flint Glass Works, which occupied the property from 1876 to 1914, is significant under Criterion for Designation J as exemplifying the heritage of the glass industry in Philadelphia and of manufacturing in Kensington. The nomination argues that the decorating plant is the last remaining portion of the larger Gillinder & Sons Franklin Flint Glass Works, which was one of the most significant manufacturers of decorative glass products in the United States, and one of a few surviving examples of the glass manufacturing industry in Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1700-06 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, but that the arguments may make a better case for Criterion A.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1700-06 N Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:55:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The former decorating plant of Gillinder & Sons Franklin Flint Glass Works occupied the property from 1876 to 1914.
- Gillinder & Sons was an important glass manufacturing company in Philadelphia and in the Kensington neighborhood.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The former decorating plant of Gillinder & Sons Franklin Flint Glass Works represents the history of the glass industry in Philadelphia and of manufacturing in the Kensington neighborhood, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that 1700-06 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on

the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: 1700-06 N Howard St | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Designate, Criterion J | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 324 N 13TH ST

Name of Resource: City Morgue
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: Roman Catholic High School
 Nominator: Celeste Morello
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 324 N. 13th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the former City Morgue has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development of the City, being the City’s third morgue by 1928 after the first two proved inadequate, and is associated with the life of a person significant in the past, Joseph W. Spelman, MD, the City’s first medical examiner, who began and concluded his work at this City Morgue beginning in 1956 and ending with his passing in 1971. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the building was designed by Philip H. Johnson, the architect for Philadelphia’s Department of Public Health, whose hospitals and public projects were examples of Progressive Era innovations in the early twentieth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 324 N. 13th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 324 N. 13th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:59:00

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The former City Morgue was constructed in 1928 as the City's third morgue.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The former City Morgue has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development of the City and is associated with the life of a person significant in the past, Joseph W. Spelman, MD, the City's first medical examiner, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building was designed by Philip H. Johnson, the architect for Philadelphia's Department of Public Health, satisfying Criterion E.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 324 N. 13th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: 324 N 13th St | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria A and E | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 5708 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Mitchell, Fletcher, & Co., Inc.

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: MMS Acquisitions LLC

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5708 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the “former store building of Mitchell, Fletcher & Co., Inc. reflects the historic built environment of Philadelphia in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries when the Flemish Revival and other Renaissance-inspired styles were used to disguise older housing stock and make new distinctive buildings in a row to appear as fashionable new buildings.” The nomination contends that despite alterations, the building is a “distinctive vernacular example of a commercial building in the Flemish Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.” The nomination also argues that the celebrated architect Addison Hutton was “well-versed in remodeling older buildings—usually residences, and the subject property is an important example of his commercial work, satisfying Criterion E.” Finally, the nomination suggests that the subject property is “representative of both the commercial and economic heritage of Germantown Avenue...as it evolved from an old German village...to a lush residential suburb and on to a dense residential neighborhood in the consolidated City of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5708 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, 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 5708 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:47:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jim Duffin spoke in support of the nomination.
- Dana Fedeli spoke in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building’s location adjacent to Vernon Park lends to its prominence along Germantown Avenue.
- The subject property was the home of grocer Mitchell & Fletcher’s first store outside of Center City Philadelphia.
- The subject property is a rare example of renowned architect Addison Hutton’s commercial work.
- The building’s unique features such as the wrapped pediment and stepped Flemish gable along the sides contributed to its rare and delightful architectural significance.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the building satisfies Criterion C because it exemplifies Philadelphia’s built environment in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, when revival style architecture such as Flemish Revival was applied to older buildings in an effort to disguise them as fashionable and new.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property is a unique example of the architect’s highly unusual interpretation of the Dutch Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The nomination establishes that the building is a rare and unique example of renowned Quaker architect Addison Hutton’s commercial work, therefore satisfying Criterion E.
- The nomination satisfies Criterion J by successfully arguing that the property served as grocer Mitchell & Fletcher’s first suburban store, exemplifying the evolution of Germantown Avenue’s commercial and economic heritage.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5708 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation C, D, E and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: 5708 Germantown Ave | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, E, and J | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 2528-32 N 4TH ST

Name of Resource: Germania Turn-Verein

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: True Light Pentecostal Church

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2528-32 N. 4th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building “possesses significant character, interest and value through its close associations with the Turner movement and, later, the labor movement,” satisfying Criterion A. The nomination also suggests that the building’s “central role in some of Philadelphia’s most important strikes and labor demonstrations, including the mass demonstration following union-member Carl Mackley’s death,” satisfies Criterion B. Regarding Criterion C, the nomination contends that the building is a rare surviving example of the Queen Anne and *rundbogenstil* styles. Finally, the nomination suggests that the building satisfies Criterion J because of “the importance of hosiery manufacturing and the labor movement to the cultural, political, economic, and social history of Kensington...”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2528-32 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2528-32 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:13:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Venise Whitaker supported the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.
- Mary Spross supported the nomination.
- Dana Fedeli supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The subject property was constructed in 1885 as a private gymnasium and meeting hall for Kensington’s German-American community.
- The nomination addresses the structure itself and does not make any argument for the historic significance of the undeveloped areas of the parcel.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination successfully demonstrates the property’s important association with the Turner and labor movements, satisfying Criterion A.

- The nomination supports the property’s central role in some of Philadelphia’s most important labor demonstrations, satisfying Criterion B.
- Regarding Criterion C, the nomination demonstrates that the building exhibits strong decorative elements influenced by German architecture.
- The nomination demonstrates the property’s association with hosiery manufacturing and the labor movement, both of which are important to the cultural, political, economic, and social history of Kensington.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2528-32 N. 4th Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A, B, C and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lenard-Palmer seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 2528-32 N 4th St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, B, C, and J | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Lenard-Palmer | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 231½-253 CHURCH LN

Name of Resource: Wallace Storage & Carpet Company
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: Church Lane Partners LLC
 Nominator: Kimberly La Porte
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 231½-253 Church Lane, located in the Germantown neighborhood of Northwest Philadelphia, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Historically known as the Wallace Storage and Carpet Company, it was constructed between 1927 and 1928. The nomination argues that George S. Kingsley, an architect notable for his warehouses and storage buildings, designed the façade in the fashionable Art Deco style of the period with an interior that embodied the latest engineering for this building type, satisfying Criterion C, D, and E. The nomination contends that the building

is a community landmark, with its historic clock tower visible from Germantown Avenue and the adjacent rail line, satisfying Criterion H.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 231½-253 Church Lane, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and H, but not Criterion E. The nomination presents no evidence that George S. Kingsley “significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation.”

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 WEBEX RECORDING: 02:23:53

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner.
- Kimberly La Porte represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, supported the nomination.
- Dana Fedeli supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building is viewed as a visual landmark by residents of the surrounding Germantown neighborhood and riders of the commuter rail line.
- The building historically known as the Wallace Storage and Carpet Company, was constructed between 1927 and 1928 and continued to operate as a storage company until 1981.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building was designed in the fashionable Art Deco style of the period with an interior that embodied the latest engineering for this building type, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The building is a community landmark, with its historic clock tower visible from Germantown Avenue and the adjacent rail line, satisfying Criterion H.
- The nomination presents no evidence that architect George S. Kingsley “significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation,” therefore does not meet Criterion E.
- The building’s period of significance should be revised to 1927-1981.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 231½-253 Church Lane satisfies Criterion for Designation C, D, and H with a period of significance from 1927 to 1981, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: ADDRESS: 231½ -253 Church Ln | | | | | |
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and H; Period of Significance to be 1927 to 1981 | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 5603-05 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Theodore Butcher Building
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: CH Pennsylvania Under-21 Holdings Inc.
 Nominator: Xue Fei Lin c/o Matt Wysong; Philadelphia City Planning Commission
 Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5603-05 Germantown Avenue, located in the Germantown neighborhood of Northwest Philadelphia, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Historically known as the Theodore Butcher Building, it was constructed in 1854 in the Italianate style. The nomination argues that 5603-05 Germantown Avenue embodies characteristics of the Italianate style, a popular revival style that came to dominate post-Civil War development along Germantown Avenue, satisfying Criterion D. In 1908, Chester A. Asher, founder of the Asher’s Chocolate Co., purchased the building and relocated his candy-making business there. The manufacturing plant remained until 1995, marking almost a century of commercial and family history at this location, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5603-05 Germantown Avenue, satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5603-05 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:28:03

- PRESENTERS:**
- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.

- No one represented the property owner.
- No one represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, supported the nomination.
- Dana Fedeli supported the nomination.
- Venise Whitaker supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building is historically known as the Theodore Butcher Building and was constructed in 1854 in the Italianate style.
- In 1908, Chester A. Asher, founder of the Asher’s Chocolate Co., purchased the building and relocated his candy-making business there. The company’s manufacturing plant remained at this location until 1995.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building embodies characteristics of the Italianate style, a popular revival style that came to dominate post-Civil War development along Germantown Avenue, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building was operated by the Asher’s Chocolate Co. from 1908 to 1995, marking almost a century of commercial and family history at this location, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5603-05 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation D and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: 5603-05 GERMANTOWN AVE | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria D and J | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

OLD BUSINESS

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, 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.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:33:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Vern Anastasio represented the property owner.
- Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Dana Fedeli opined that many wooden houses have been demolished in Fishtown. She supported the nomination.
- Fishtown resident John Scott supported the nomination, noting that the block represents several centuries of construction and remains intact despite active demolition in the area.
- Fishtown resident Venise Whitaker supported the nomination, stating that wooden houses need to be designated.
- Rachel Kaminski supported the nomination.
- Mary Spross questioned whether the property would be designated for its archaeological potential.
- Michelle Shuman supported the nomination.
- Arielle Harris supported the nomination, noting the importance of vernacular buildings.
- Jeanne Curtis supported the nomination, noting that the wood-frame construction is important to Fishtown's history, with only a few such buildings surviving.
- Andrew Fearon supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 10 JULY 2020

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Historical Commission found that:

- The designation of the building is limited to the main block as delineated in the nomination. However, the larger property holds archaeological potential.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Fishtown neighborhood has proven to contain high archaeological potential, and there is potential that archaeological resources remain underground at the property, satisfying Criterion I.
- The main block of the building represents the foundational development of Fishtown and is typical of the early nineteenth-century wooden houses constructed for the area's residents, satisfying Criterion J

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 1132 MARLBOROUGH ST | | | | | |
| MOTION: Designate, Criteria I and J | | | | | |
| Moved BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | x | | | | |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | x | | | | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | x | | | | |
| Total | 12 | | | | 1 |

EMERGENCY MATTER

ADDRESS: 1600-06 E BERKS ST

Proposal: Demolish building owing to necessity in the public interest

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1600 Berks LLC

Applicant: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr

History: 1885-90, St. Laurentius Church, Edwin Forest Durang, architect

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the St. Laurentius church building at 1600-06 E. Berks Street. A small section of the building at the rear extends onto the property at 1608-10 E. Berks Street. The application contends that the Historical Commission should approve the demolition as necessary in the public interest to abate a dangerous condition that poses a threat to public safety.

The applicant has provided an engineer's report by Jan Vacca of the Harman Group that indicates that the two towers or steeples are failing and have an 80% chance of collapse in three years and a 100% chance of collapse in 10 years. The report is attached. The Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, executive director of the Historical Commission, and the Commission's attorney met with the property owner, engineer, and attorney to further discuss the engineer's report. The Commissioner requested that the property owner provide a second engineer's report from an independent, qualified structural engineer. That report was not yet completed at the time of the writing of this overview. Owing to the extremely poor condition of the building and the likelihood of a catastrophic collapse, the Commissioner requested that the Historical Commission consider this matter as soon as possible and not wait for the next round of reviews in late July and early August. Therefore, this matter was placed on the Historical Commission's July 2020 agenda as an emergency matter.

The Archdiocese of Philadelphia closed St. Laurentius parish in 2014 and relocated the parishioners to nearby Holy Name of Jesus Church. Sidewalk protection and other measures to protect the public from the building have been in place since at least 2014. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building Unsafe in April 2015. Concerned about the fate of the building, neighbors nominated it for designation. The Historical Commission designated the property on 10 July 2015 over the objections of the owner at the time, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia as well as the parish responsible for the property, Holy Name. The owner claimed that the building was in very poor condition and designating it would be a hardship for the parish.

About the time of designation, the owner entered into an agreement in which a developer would rehabilitate the church for multi-family residential use. The developer obtained a zoning permit for the new use in 2016. Despite the promise of the repair and rehabilitation of the church for residential use, a group of community members appealed the zoning permit, holding up the redevelopment project for years. After defending the zoning permit in court for several years, the developer eventually capitulated and walked away from the project. Other prospective buyers who might have rehabilitated the building came and went, scared off by the lengthy litigation. Eventually, the Commonwealth Court upheld the zoning permit in 2019, but the building had deteriorated significantly during the intervening time. Throughout the litigation, the building suffered from minor collapses of the exterior stone. The Department of Licenses & Inspections inspected the building regularly and required additional sidewalk protection measures and engineering reports. In 2019, the Archdiocese undertook some repairs to stabilize the building's masonry envelope. In early 2020, the current owner purchased the property from the Archdiocese.

In 2016 and 2017, the Historical Commission reviewed a nomination proposing to designate the interior of the church, including a series of murals depicting events in Catholic and Polish history. At the January 2017 meeting, the nominator withdrew the nomination, fearing that a designation might prevent the building from successfully being rehabilitated. Since that time,

community members have been seeking to remove the artistically and culturally significant murals and stained glass windows from the church and relocate them for preservation, display, and interpretation at the National Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa near Doylestown, Pennsylvania. The current owner is reportedly supportive of that effort.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:46:30

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Mattioni recused from the review, owing to his law firm's representation of a party involved in the matter.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Matt McClure, engineers Janis Vacca and Mark Coggin, property owner Humberto Fernandini, and economic consultant Peter Angelides represented the application.
- Attorney Michael Mattioni represented parties who have an agreement with the property owner to remove artifacts from the building.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure introduced his team. He stated that he is presenting an application to demolish the church, which is necessitated by a need to protect public safety, not a development project. He reserved his right to submit a financial hardship application at a later date.
- Mr. McClure explained that the streets around the church on three sides are very narrow and a school is located to the west of the church. The steeples are 135 feet tall, much wider than the 30 and 50-foot wide streets. The school supports the application.
- Mr. McClure stated that the structural problems with the towers have been well known for at least seven years. Several engineer's reports have highlighted the problems. Mr. McClure stated that his client purchased the church in January 2020 with the intent of rehabilitating the church. However, that is not possible. There is a very real potential for a complete structural failure. The towers pose an imminent risk of collapse. There is no feasible way to repair the towers. Demolition needs to begin immediately to abate the dangerous condition. Owing to the need to demolish the towers in a short time frame, the only way to do so is to demolish the entire church. He explained that the safest way to remove the towers is to do so from the south, to ensure that the towers do not collapse into the street.
- Mr. McClure stated that he and his team as well as the owner are all new to this matter, which has been ongoing for many years. They bring new eyes and new intentions.
- Ms. Vacca stated that she has been a structural engineer for more than 40 years. She listed several rehabilitation projects she has undertaken. She stated that there is a 100% chance of collapse of the towers within 10 years and an 80% chance in three years. She stated that four other engineers who have inspected this church in recent years have recommended demolition. The north façade with the towers have significant cracking on the façade. Ms. Vacca referred to her report. The level of the cracking of the interior plaster is frightening. The cracking is indicative of horizontal displacement and of displacement outward. She stated that it was important to inspect the backup schist masonry, not just the exterior brownstone façade. She

explained that they removed plaster at the cracks in the interior to inspect the structural stone behind it. She stated that the 35-inch thick masonry walls behind the plaster, the structural walls, had cracked through. The western wall of the northwestern tower had displaced outward two inches. Each tower weighs about 500,000 pounds from the watertable upward. The timber steeples add to that weight. She stated that they used a boroscope to inspect the mortar between the structural stone and the façade stone. She stated that the mortar had deteriorated from years of freezing and thawing. She stated that the repairs that had sought to anchor the façade back to the structural stone had not been successful. She stated that the timber in the steeples is in good condition but the connection between the timber and the masonry was designed in such a way that the east and west walls of the towers are not stable. The diagonal masonry of the turrets may have tied the towers together, but that masonry has lost any bond. Ms. Vacca stated that the only repairs undertaken at the church related to the façade, not to the structural integrity of the towers. She stated that the towers need to be demolished down to the watertable. There is no feasible way to repair the towers. She stated that the demolition might need to proceed below the watertable, depending on the condition of the mortar. She stated that the backup structure is made up of small stones and is therefore dependent on the mortar, which has decayed from freeze/thaw cycles. The cracks in the structural stone are the basis for the conclusion that a cataclysmic failure will occur. Ms. Vacca stated that the demolition will be very challenging. She stated that the towers are 135 feet tall, 75 feet above the watertable. The towers weigh 500,000 pounds above the watertable. The temporary repairs that were undertaken will not prevent a collapse. The nearby power lines add complexity to the demolition. Ms. Vacca stated that the towers must be demolished from the south, from the sanctuary. If one wanted to save the nave, it would require time for design and money for the erection of a steel structure, which is not feasible. She concluded that the towers are in danger of imminent collapse.

- Mr. Thomas asked about the possibility of partial demolition. Ms. Vacca stated that partial demolition is infeasible. She stated that designing and installing a steel structure that would allow partial demolition would take from six to nine months and would be very expensive. She stated that they do not have that much time. The towers must be demolished before the next freeze/thaw cycle. The building should be demolished as quickly as possible in the safest way.
- Mr. Coggin, a structural engineer, provided his credentials. He stated that he has reviewed all of the other engineer's reports prepared on this building. He stated that the building was deteriorating long before the first report in 2013. He summarized the reports. He stated that improper repairs have been undertaken to the masonry at the building. He stated that earlier reports called for demolishing the towers and the entire building. Earlier reports noted deteriorated masonry, cracks, displacement, bowing, and other problems with the towers. The towers are like tubes that gain strength from the turrets at the corners. However, the masonry at the turrets is deteriorated. The timber steeples are not connected to the towers. The towers are displacing and cantilevering out. He noted that the reports note continuing deterioration and active façade movement. Earlier reports stated that the towers should be repaired or demolished. He stated that the July 2019 repairs were minimal and only attempted to pin some of the façade stone to the backup stone. The repairs did not address the structural problems with the towers. The massive window openings are a detriment to the structural stability of the towers. All of the lancet windows show cracking, which is a sign of structural failure.

- Mr. McClure asked Mr. Coggin if he agreed with Ms. Vacca. Mr. Coggin stated that he agrees with Ms. Vacca's report on the building. He stated that the building is a danger to the public and has been considered as such since 2013. The towers have significant structural problems and, when they collapse, the collapse will be catastrophic. Mr. Coggin stated that the towers should be demolished before the next freeze/thaw cycle. Mr. Coggin stated that he inspected the interiors of the towers, climbing to the highest accessible levels in both towers. He stated that he inspected the areas where Ms. Vacca had removed the interior plaster to expose the structural cracks. He also noted that the brownstone was laid in such a way that water penetrates it and it deteriorates and spalls away. He stated that the stones also shear at the bedding planes. There is no integrity between the backup and cladding.
- Mr. Fernandini, the property owner, stated that he purchased the church to save it. However, his engineers convinced him that the towers are beyond repair. He stated that the most important issue is safety. He stated that the stained glass windows, murals, and other artifacts will be salvaged and transferred to a museum.
- Mr. Angelides, an economic consultant, stated that he analyzed the project as though there were no time constraints. He determined whether it would make economic sense to stabilize and repair the building if there were no need to act immediately. He observed that it would not make economic sense to stabilize the building, remove the towers, and reuse the building. Stabilizing the building to allow demolition of the towers from the north would require a significant steel structure that would be expensive. That work and other work, like roofing over the sections where the towers were located would cost at least \$2 million, maybe much more. Then the building would need to be rehabilitated for the new use. Rebuilding the towers would cost an additional \$2 million. The new use would likely be residential. Rehabilitating an old building for a new use is already expensive. This project would have added costs, at least \$2 million. The apartments that would result would be compromised, owing to the constraints of the building. The units would be less attractive than comparably sized new units, and therefore produce less income. There is no space for onsite parking. The reuse of this building is not economically feasible.
- Ms. Sanchez asked why repairing the towers is not feasible. She asked why the façade cannot be pinned.
 - Mr. Coggin responded that the pinning of the cladding to the backup could be undertaken, but that would not solve the structural problems. The problem is with the backup masonry material, which supports the towers and is failing. The pinning would not address the overall stability of the towers. The pinning would not prevent a collapse. The corners of the towers have no structural integrity.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that pinning and pointing the façade will have to impact on the structural problems. The towers will still fail.
- Mr. Thomas asked about the structural condition of the main body of the church.
 - Ms. Vacca stated that she did not review the main body of the church.
- Mr. Thomas asked about funding sources like tax credits.
 - Mr. McClure stated that they did not look at tax credits and other funding opportunities because the building is about to collapse. He stated that they do not have time to assemble funding sources. The building must be confronted immediately. He pointed the Commission to Commissioner Perri's letter, which states that the structural problems and threat of collapse must be addressed immediately, before school starts and the next freeze/thaw cycle. There is no time to seek such funding, which might take years to obtain. Such funding might

have made a difference in 2013 or 2015, if there had been no litigation. That time has passed.

- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission is not reviewing a financial hardship application.
 - Mr. McClure agreed. He stated that they included financial information because some have asked for it, but the application is a request for approval as necessary in the public interest.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that he sent a letter to the Historical Commission indicating that his client, Holy Name of Jesus Parish, has no opposition to the application.
- Ms. Cooperman excused herself from the meeting at 2:13 p.m. When she left, she sent a Webex Chat to all panelists announcing her departure and stating that “I agree we need input from Architectural Committee and we don't have sufficient information today.”
 - Mr. Farnham reminded the Commissioners not to use the Webex Chat feature to discuss the merits of a matter under consideration because the Commissioners are required to deliberate in public. He then read Ms. Cooperman’s Chat for everyone participating to hear.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- A.J. Thomson started by thanking Ms. Cooperman, who “served” as part of his “panel” when he and his team submitted the nomination to designate this property five years ago. He referred to the engineers’ testimony today as “very credible.” He stated that “Venise Whittaker and her misguided people” stopped the redevelopment of the property with a law suit. He stated that immigrants sacrificed to build this structure. He asked the Historical Commission to compel the owner to hire a new engineer of the Commission’s choosing to verify the results of the other engineers. He concluded that the Commission must be right if it approves the demolition of this building; it must do its due diligence.
- Andrew Miller, a neighbor, stated that the owner was aware of his obligations when he purchased the property and that there is time to stabilize the building. He stated that the Historical Commission must vote no on this application.
- Dana Fedeli opposed the demolition of the church. She stated that the former owner repaired the building. She stated that, even if the towers were removed, the remainder of the building could be saved. She questioned the motives of the applicant and consultant. She claimed that this is not an emergency. She discussed the zoning of the property. She questioned the review process.
- Dustin Dove questioned the motives and intentions of the property owner. He opposed the demolition.
- Evan Schlesinger, a near neighbor, stated that the safety of the people who live right around the church is taken into consideration. He stated that the neighbors prefer preservation and know that demolition can go wrong. He asked the Historical Commission to collect more information and consider alternatives.
- Jim Duffin stated that he understands the need to consider this on an expedited manner. He contended that the Commission and advisory committees can call special meetings. He stated that the application needs a full vetting. A special meeting of the Architectural Committee should have been called.
- Jeanne Curtis stated that she was involved with the nominations of the exterior and interior of St. Laurentius and has been involved in research and academic study of the church. She spoke about how the building reflected the original parishioners. She

- suggested that building should be recorded inside and out. She suggested that all alternatives be considered. She offered her research.
- John Scott commented on the earlier litigation and the recent zoning change. He said that the towers are “non-structural stone walls.” He asserted that the building can be reused.
 - John Wisniewski noted that there have been concerns about the structure since 2013, but it is still standing. He reported that he wrote the interior nomination, which was later withdrawn. He asked the Historical Commission to consider the architectural, cultural, and religious significance of the church. He thanked the owner for cooperating with the removal of the windows and murals. He asked the Commission to act judiciously.
 - Justin Spivey, an engineer, stated that he has been retained by the Preservation Alliance. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that he would ask questions of Mr. Spivey. Mr. Steinke suggested that the Architectural Committee should review this application. Mr. Steinke noted the letter that he sent to the Historical Commission when he first learned of this application. Mr. Steinke asked Mr. Spivey about his qualifications, which Mr. Spivey provided. Mr. Steinke asked Mr. Spivey to present his findings.
 - Mr. Spivey stated that he inspected the building from the exterior using binoculars. He stated that some action is needed to stabilize the building. Mr. Spivey stated that a building collapse is not imminent. He observed that seven years of reports have called immediate action and yet the building has not collapsed. He said that the structure has “reserve strength.” He stated that the structures of the towers is timber, which is in good repair. He stated that recent repairs on the exterior have not re-cracked. He said that no one has done a complete, hands-on examination of the exterior. Mr. Spivey stated that the recent repairs have slowed the process of deterioration by preventing water infiltration. Moreover, the cracks have not reopened since repaired. He stated that the remainder of the structure, outside the towers, appears to be very stable. Mr. Spivey claimed that there are options other than demolition. He stated that scaffolding will need to be erected whether the towers are demolished or repaired. He claimed that the scaffolding could be upgraded to structural scaffolding for little money. He claimed that the scaffolding could be structural and could hold up the towers. Structural scaffolding would allow time for more analysis and could be used for deconstruction or repair. He stated that it is feasible to deconstruct the towers down to the watertable and reuse the rest of the building. In conclusion, he suggested that there are anchoring systems like Cintec that could be used to repair the towers.
 - Mr. Steinke asked the Historical Commission to remand this application to Architectural Committee and also asked the Historical Commission to order the property owner to immediately install structural scaffolding.
 - Kevin Brett stated that he is an attorney for a corporation but is here today on his own. He accused Mr. McClure of “alarmism.” He claimed that documents show that the current owner has wanted to demolish the church since late 2019. He accused Mr. McClure of “false-alarmism.” He stated that the owner, Historical Commission, and Department of Licenses & Inspections should jointly issue a request for proposals for redeveloping the property.
 - Mason Carter suggested sending this application to the Architectural Committee. He seconded Mr. Spivey’s suggestion regarding scaffolding. He observed that the property is not cited as Imminently Dangerous.

- Rachel Kaminski stated that she is concerned about the environmental impact of the demolition of the church. She stated that she is concerned about dust. She asked the Commission to vote no on the application until dust and other safety concerns are addressed.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

- At the end of the public comment, Mr. Reuter, the Commission's attorney, explained why the Historical Commission was appropriately hearing this matter today, without referral to the Architectural Committee. He stated that the Rules & Regulations do not require applications proposing demolition as necessary in the public interest to be reviewed by the Architectural Committee. He stated that, in light of Commissioner Perri's letter indicating the urgency of this matter, the application merited forwarding to the Commission as soon as possible. Finally, he noted that under Administrative Law, bodies may waive their rules, especially in emergency circumstances. The Historical Commission is rightly hearing this application and may make a final decision today. He added that the Historical Commission has the authority to refer the matter to the Architectural Committee. He disagreed with Mr. Duffin that the Architectural Committee has the authority to unilaterally call its own special meeting. He suggested that the Historical Commissioners read Commissioner Perri's letter. He noted that the Commissioner has indicated that this matter is urgent. He concluded that the Commissioner has police powers in this matter and could order the demolition of the building without the Historical Commission's input.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections can also order the owner to repair the building.
- Mr. Reuter stated that the City has been involved in enforcement proceedings regarding this property for years. He stated that all of the protections and repairs were undertaken at the Department's orders. He stated that the City has been pursuing enforcement in the court for years. Mr. Reuter stated that the Department, Historical Commission, and Law Department have been involved in this property every day for years. He stated that the City has not been absent, but has been trying to compel the property owner to bring this property into compliance. The Department and Historical Commission have met with the former and current owners and have pressed for repairs and engineers' reports.
- Ms. Edwards asked if the Department would be responsible for next steps with regard to ensuring that the building is safe if the Historical Commission denied the application.
 - Mr. Reuter responded in the affirmative and noted that the applicant could appeal.
- Mr. Thomas suggested that the Historical Commission should deny total demolition and suggest that the owner find a means for removing the towers and stabilizing the building.
- Ms. Stanford stated that the building is not Imminently Dangerous. She suggested looking at all alternatives.
- Ms. Turner agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey agreed.
- Mr. Thomas recommended denying the application and referring it to the Architectural Committee for review.
- Mr. Reuter responded that the Historical Commission cannot condition the denial of an application, for example deny it and refer it to the Architectural Committee. He

suggested that, if the Commission intends to deny this application, it should first hear from the applicant, who would like to rebut.

- Mr. Farnham asked the Historical Commission not to take a final action on the application without hearing from the applicant and the members of the public who have not spoken.
- Mr. McClure stated that he respects the process and the diligence of the Historical Commission, but respectfully request that the Commission make a decision no later than its August meeting, owing to the public safety hazard that this building poses. He also stated that both of his engineers “vehemently, vehemently disagree” with Mr. Spivey’s conclusions, especially about structural scaffolding.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission should make a decision no later than its 14 August 2020 meeting. If it has not made a decision by that time, the Department of Licenses & Inspections may need to take matters into its own hands.
- Mr. Thomas asked if the matter needed to be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Reuter stated that it does not. He explained that making a determination of necessity in the public interest requires the Historical Commission to determine if feasible alternatives exist. Financial information may provide a basis for determining if feasible alternatives exist. A full Committee on Financial Hardship meeting is not necessary for such a determination. Feasibility determinations should consider costs.
- Mr. Farnham observed that the email and Webex Q&A comments on this application have been incorporated into the record.

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved that the Historical Commission continue the application for 1600-06 E. Berks Street to its 14 August 2020 meeting and refer it to the Architectural Committee at its 28 July 2020 meeting for a recommendation. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: 1600-06 E BERKS ST | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Continue to August PHC meeting and remand to July AC meeting | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Edwards | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | | | | | x |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | x | | | | |
| Mattioni | | | | x | |
| McCoubrey | x | | | | |
| Sánchez (Council) | x | | | | |
| Stanford (Commerce) | x | | | | |
| Turner, Vice Chair | x | | | | |
| Washington | | | | | x |
| Total | 9 | | | 1 | 3 |

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 06:09:54

ACTION: At 3:18 p.m., Ms. Turner moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

| ITEM: Adjournment | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Adjourn | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Turner | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | x | | | | |
| Cooperman | | | | | x |
| Dodds (DHCD) | x | | | | |
| Edwards | x | | | | |
| Hartner (DPP) | | | | | x |
| Lenard-Palmer (DPD) | x | | | | |
| Lippert (L&I) | 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.