THE MINUTES OF THE 697TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair	X		
Mark Dodds (Division of Housing & Community Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP	X		
Steven Hartner (Department of Public Property)	X		
Kevin Hunter (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		
Sara Lepori (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 Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:
Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
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:

DRAFT

Caitlin Livesey
Nicole Felicetti
Jen Wieclaw
William Millhollen
Andrew Ross, Esq.
De'Wayne Drummond
Brandon Browning
Randal Baron
Debbie Klak
June Armstrong
Nathan Farris, ESq.
Sami Jarrah
Robert Kramer
Ellen Kaye
Greg Maxwell
Blair Sweeney
Kasia Stein
Ian Litwin
Hunter Ye
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Marsha Moss
Tyler Murphy
Kathy M. Shelton
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Larry Spector
Yifei Yang
Changfeng Luo
Joseph Pyle, Scattergood Foundation
David Gest, Esq.
Amee Farrell
Mary McGettigan
Marc Kittner
John Gibbons
Stephen Miller
Bonnie Halda
Harrison Haas, Esq.
Hanna Stark
Nereida Maldonado
Brigitte Deleon
Bill Ritzler
Maggy White, Esq.
David Hollenberg
Solomon Stewart
J. M. Duffin
Molly Gallagher
Dana Fedeli
Benjamin She
Gabe Canuso
Steven Peitzman
Kim Vernick

DRAFT

Gary Vernick
Thomas.Farley, MD, Department of Public Health
Madelynn Doepping
Nancy Pontone
Tianyi Shao
Kate McGlinchey
Chris McBrien
Seth Cohen, VSBA
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Aaron Cohen
Paul Boni
Alison McFall
Angela Nadeau
Timothy Kerner
Kevin McMahon
Jay Farrell
Oscar Beisert
Laval Miller-Wilson
Tom Witt, Esq.
Marie Scarpulla
Adam E. Laver
Job Itzkowitz
Nicolette Paglioni
Agatha Sloboda
Stephen Perna
Aaron Wunsch
Alex Balloon
Anthony Cerone
Chris Mejia-Smith
Hanna Kim
Matthew Cleaveland
Mary Purcell
Chuxuan Zhang
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Kevin Edmundowicz
Annie Greening
Philip Scott
Lorna Katz
Yuxuan Wu
Jennifer Boggs
Carla Robinson
Dennis Carlisle
Matthew Atkins
Tyler A. Ray

DRAFT

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 696TH STATED MEETING, 14 AUGUST 2020

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:25

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff and members of the public if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 696th Stated Meeting, held 14 August 2020. No corrections were offered.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 696th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 August 2020. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Minutes, 696th Stated Meeting **MOTION: Adoption of minutes** **MOVED BY: Turner** **SECONDED BY: Edwards**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori(Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

RESOLUTION THANKING SUZANNE PENTZ FOR HER SERVICE TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:30

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that Suzanne Pentz resigned from the Architectural Committee recently, owing to some health setbacks. He reported that the Historical Commission appointed Ms. Pentz to the Architectural Committee on 13 April 1993, where she served as the Committee's engineer. Her 27-year tenure on the Architectural Committee may be the longest in the Commission's history. He noted that Ms. Pentz graduated from the historic preservation program at Cornell University and worked as the Director of Historic Structures at Keast & Hood, the gold standard of preservation engineering firms, from 1983 to 2010. During her time on the Architectural Committee, Ms. Pentz advocated for a common-sense approach to

DRAFT

preservation that respected both the rights of private property owners and the public's interest in historic structures. Ms. Pentz donated countless hours to the Historical Commission, not only during the Committee meetings, but also during numerous pro-bono structural assessments of historic buildings, often in the evenings and on the weekends. He asked the Historical Commission to please formally thank Ms. Pentz by resolution for nearly three decades of service to the Architectural Committee, Historical Commission, and City of Philadelphia.

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff and members of the public if they had any additions to the resolution thanking Suzanne Pentz for her service to the Architectural Committee. No additions were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance thanked Ms. Pentz for her service.
- Randal Baron thanked Ms. Pentz for her service.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the resolution thanking Ms. Pentz for her service to the Architectural Committee, Historical Commission, and City of Philadelphia. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Resolution thanking Suzanne Pentz **MOTION: Adoption of resolution** **MOVED BY: Mattioni** **SECONDED BY: Turner**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori(Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

DRAFT

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:12:20

ADDRESS: 1826 CHESTNUT ST
Name of Resource: Aldine Theatre
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Sam's Place Realty Associates LP
Nominator: Kevin Block, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1826 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Aldine Theatre, constructed in 1921, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the theatre has significant character, interest, or value as one of the last remaining first-run movie palaces in Philadelphia. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the Aldine was the work of prominent local builders William Steele & Sons. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Aldine represents the commercial development of Chestnut Street in the prestigious Rittenhouse Square neighborhood after the turn of the twentieth century.

Following the submission of the nomination and notification to the property owner, the nominator uncovered additional information not presented in the nomination, which is posted on the Historical Commission's website as additional information.

The Committee on Historic Designation previously reviewed a nomination for the property in March 1986 and recommended against designation owing to the loss of architectural integrity of the interior and the front doors. The Historical Commission adopted the recommendation of the Committee at its April 1986 meeting and declined to designate the property. The staff notes that the interior of the property is not under consideration, and that the Historical Commission routinely designates properties that have alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1826 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 1826 Chestnut Street and remand it to the October 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ACTION: See below.

ADDRESS: 3701-15 CHESTNUT ST
Name of Resource: International House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: International House
Nominator: University City Historical Society & Docomomo US/Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3701-15 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criterion A for its association with the International House organization, the oldest institution of its kind in the United States to support international students. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the building is a significant example of Brutalist architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the architecture firm of Bower & Fradley influenced the architectural development of Philadelphia, contributing designs to the city from the 1960s to the present day. Under Criterion H, the nomination contends that the International House building occupies a unique location in the heart of University City and, together with Criterion J, stands as one of the first high-rises in the neighborhood that was constructed as part of the West Philadelphia Corporation and Redevelopment Authority's efforts for urban renewal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3701-15 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J, but not E and H. The influence of Bower & Fradley is limited. For a very large building, it has a limited impact on the streetscape. Owing to its setback and mid-block location, it cannot be considered an established and familiar visual feature like City Hall or the Art Museum.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 3701-15 Chestnut Street and remand it to the October 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Cooperman recused, owing to her position on the board of Docomomo.

ACTION: See below.

ADDRESS: 210-12 N 12TH ST
Name of Resource: Sigma Sound Studios
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 210 N 12th St Investment, 212 N 12th St Investment
Nominator: Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 210-12 N. 12th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Sigma Sound Studios satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, as the home to Sigma Sound Studios, one of the most influential recording studios in America in the late twentieth century, and the birthplace of "The Sound of Philadelphia" or "Philly Soul," a popular musical genre that fused soul, gospel, rhythm and blues, jazz, funk, and classical music. Additionally under Criterion A, the property is significant for its association with persons significant in the past, including both local and international music producers and recording artists. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social and historical heritage of the community, standing as a remnant of

the neighborhood's once-abundant stock of film exchanges, record labels, and other entertainment industry service buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 210-12 N. 12th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination of 210-12 N. 12th Street and remand it to the next 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/The Ardent Companies LLC
Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

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: 3412 AND 3414 HAVERFORD AVE
Name of Resource: Frame Twin
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 3412, George and Mary Drummond; 3414, Eugene and Linda Redford
Nominator: University City Historical Society
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 3412 and 3414 Haverford Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the buildings satisfy Criterion for Designation J, in part because they are representative of "the historical heritage of the neighborhood's initial period of development, as well as the economic and social history" of the community's founders. The nomination also contends that "the subject propert[ies] is representative of the early development of the Mantua neighborhood, as well as a once common house type that has largely vanished from the built environment of West Philadelphia."

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 3412 and 3414 Haverford Avenue satisfy Criterion for Designation J, and that the name of the resources should be changed to "Frame Twin."

RECUSAL:

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

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved to grant the continuances of the reviews of the nominations for 1826 Chestnut Street, 3701-15 Chestnut Street, and 210-12 N. 12th Street to the October 2020 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation; and 2501-61 N. 15th Street and 3412 and 3414 Haverford Avenue to the October 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Continuance of reviews of designation matters **MOTION: Adoption** **MOVED BY: Edwards** **SECONDED BY: McCoubrey**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman				X	
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10			2	

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:15:30

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and public for comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the revised application for 329 Lawrence Court. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent agenda **MOTION: Approval** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Edwards**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 AUGUST 2020

ADDRESS: 11 QUEEN ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Raymond J. Evers
Applicant: Laurits Schless, LHS Residential Design
History: 1775
Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:
This application proposes to demolish a non-historic two-story rear addition, and construct a three-story rear addition on a slightly larger footprint, and also construct a stair hall with deck on the existing two-story sloped rear addition. Visibility of the rear of the property is limited to the side when looking east on Queen Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Demolish two-story rear addition; construct three-story rear addition.
- Construct stair hall with deck on existing rear addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The proposed three-story rear addition, and stair hall with deck, are incompatible with the historic building in their features, size, scale, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:16:50

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The staff provided meeting participation information to the applicant via email for both the Architectural Committee meeting and the Historical Commission meeting. However, he did not attend either meeting.
- The proposed three-story addition would be visible from Queen Street.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed three-story rear addition, and stair hall with deck, are incompatible with the historic building in their features, size, scale, and massing, and therefore the proposed scope does not satisfy Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Sanchez seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 11 QUEEN ST **MOTION: Denial** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Sanchez**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

ADDRESS: 329 LAWRENCE CT
Proposal: Remove roof deck; construct roof deck and access
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Ashley L. Hulsey and Marc R. Kittner
Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC
History: 1812
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:
This application proposes to replace the existing roof deck and access structure at the rear of the property at 329 Lawrence Court. It also proposes to install new or relocate existing mechanical equipment. The rear slope of the roof of this building was significantly modified many years ago.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Reconstruct existing roof deck and access structure at the rear.
- Install mechanical equipment.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Roofs Guideline: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof (such as heating and air-conditioning units, elevator housing, or solar panels) when required for a new use so that they are inconspicuous on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
    - The proposed location for the mechanical equipment is at the ridge of the main roof and the equipment may be visible from the public right-of-way in front of the house. The staff recommends that the applicant install this equipment in a less conspicuous location on the roof.
    - The proposed deck and access structure appear to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the mechanical equipment is installed so that it will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval, provided the mechanical equipment is invisible from the public right-of-way, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD

Proposal: Remove building, construct health center
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: Thomas Scattergood Foundation
Applicant: Joseph Pyle, Thomas Scattergood Foundation
History: 1813; Friends Hospital
Individual Designation: 1/14/1975
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes to demolish a historic building and construct a new municipal health center on the grounds of the historic Friends Hospital in the Frankford section of Philadelphia. Established by the Quakers in 1813 as the first private psychiatric hospital in the United States, the Friends Hospital complex is composed of numerous historic and modern buildings set on 99 acres. The local designation of Friends Hospital is largely undocumented and the buildings on the site were not classified as contributing or non-contributing. It appears that the hospital was designated in the early 1970s in response to the proposed Pulaski Expressway, a highway that would have connected the Betsy Ross Bridge to Route 309, cutting across the hospital grounds. In addition to its local designation, Friends Hospital is a National

Historic Landmark. The building proposed for demolition, known as Lawnside, was constructed in 1859 as the superintendent's house and is classified as contributing in the National Register designation. Any state or federal funding or other involvement in the health center project may trigger a Section 106 review, a federal preservation review, which may preclude demolition.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections is prohibited by Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance from issuing a demolition permit for a locally designated building except in two cases. The section stipulates that "No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building … unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building … cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted." The demolition of Lawnside is prohibited unless the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is necessary in the public interest and/or the building cannot be feasibly reused, the hardship exception.

The application documents the analyses the City's Department of Public Health has undertaken to select a site for Northeast Philadelphia Health Center. The City considered 44 sites and selected the Friends Hospital site. The application also includes analyses that the City, Scattergood Foundation, VSBA, and other consultants have undertaken to identify a site on the grounds of Friends Hospital that can accommodate the new health center. The project has very strict requirements for the new building and parking that involve security, ease of access by foot, mass transit, and car, drop off and pick up, parking, and flow through the building. The impact of the building on the historic site, especially potential impacts on view sheds, were also considered. The application presents three options for siting the new building, the preferred Option A as well as Options B and C. In order to accommodate a new 98 foot by 287 foot building and parking lot, the application proposes to demolish Lawnside. All three options include the demolition of Lawnside. The application claims that the project is necessary in the public interest; the area needs a new health center and this location and configuration is the best for that center.

The Historical Commission has been confronted with similar questions recently related to a church complex at 4th and Race Streets in Old City and the Lutheran Seminary in Mt. Airy. Both cases involve non-profit organizations seeking to construct new facilities. The church sought to construct a homeless shelter, but had an eighteen-century building standing within the construction zone. The Historical Commission ultimately approved a plan to move the historic building to create a space for the new facility. The seminary project is not as far along in the planning, but the Historical Commission did reject the seminary's suggestion when designating that the Commission list a house on the site as non-contributing so that it could be demolished for new construction. The Commission did conceptually support the plans for new construction, but suggested that the house could be integrated into the new project or relocated elsewhere on the large, open site.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish 1859 building known as "Lawnside"
- Construct health center

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated*

from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- The application proposes to demolish a historic structure, thereby failing to satisfy this Standard.
- Without the demolition of Lawnside, the application would meet this Standard.

- *Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance: No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building … unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building … cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
  - This application has demonstrated that the demolition of Lawnside for the construction of the health center is in the public interest, but it has not demonstrated that it is necessary in the public interest. It has likewise contended but has not demonstrated that Lawnside cannot be reasonably adapted for a new use. The feasibility of integrating Lawnside into the new construction or moving and rehabilitating Lawnside should be considered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that additional analyses should be undertaken to determine whether it is feasible to reuse Lawnside in its current location or at a nearby, new location on the large site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance, with the recommendation that additional analyses should be undertaken to determine whether it is feasible to reuse Lawnside in its current location or at a nearby, new location on the large site.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:23:35

RECUSAL:

- Mr. McCoubrey recused, owing to his architectural firm's involvement in the project.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Joseph Pyle of the Thomas Scattergood Foundation, Dr. Thomas Farley and Sami Jarrah of the Department of Public Health, attorney Michael Sklaroff, developer Gabe Canuso, and architect Seth Cohen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The applicants explained the urgent need for a new municipal health center in the Lower Northeast part of Philadelphia. They explained that the Friends Hospital campus has been chosen out of 44 potential sites and seven finalists, and argued that the proposed footprint of the building in Option A is the only feasible positioning of the new building on the larger site. They opined that the siting of the proposed building requires the demolition of Lawnside, a contributing building to the National Historic Landmark-designated property, which has been vacant for 20 years, and no longer plays a role in the organization's mission. They argued that the reuse or relocation of the building is infeasible. In response to the Architectural Committee's recommendation for further study of alternatives to demolition, the applicants submitted supplemental information showing different alternative options on the site,

DRAFT

which they described as unacceptable, unsafe, and lacking accessibility. Option A, they explained, is ideal because it will be the first building on campus visible from the entry drive for those arriving by vehicle, SEPTA bus, or foot; provides efficient vehicular and pedestrian flow and traffic sequencing; maintains and restores landscaping and heritage trees along the entrance drive; and has favorable site contours and grading for accessibility and safety. Since a new health center is in the public interest, and the siting of the proposed building on the Friends Hospital campus with the footprint and location shown in Option A is the ideal position for the new building, they concluded that demolition of Lawnside is necessary in the public interest.

- Ms. Washington questioned whether the feasibility of other sites in the Lower Northeast were explored.
    - Mr. Farley responded that 44 other sites in the region were explored. Those sites were narrowed down to seven for site visits, and the Friends Hospital site was ultimately chosen from those seven. He opined that there are no other parcels close to the underserved populations.
    - Ms. Washington questioned whether Dr. Farley is aware of the Phil2035 plan for the Lower Northeast Planning District. She explained that she participated in those discussions as the Executive Director of the Frankford Community Development Corporation, and that in the discussions around the plan, which was developed through a thorough community engagement process, everyone was in favor of a municipal health center in the area, but the discussion focused on having a location closer to the Frankford Transportation Center (FTC), particularly on Frankford Avenue not just to support the needs of the health center but as a way to spur development along the commercial corridor. She opined that all the needs discussed by the applicants would be met at or near the FTC, such as the parcel at 5129-35 Frankford Avenue, and ideally would be collocated with a new supermarket. She questioned why the applicants have deviated from the plan, and why there have been no conversations with the community if the FTC was not feasible.
    - The applicants responded that the leads they got for properties near the FTC were determined to be infeasible.
    - Ms. Washington questioned specifically why the FTC sites were determined infeasible.
    - Mr. Jarrah responded that they engaged in a planning process and looked at available properties with the Department of Public Property and reached out early to the Planning Commission to talk about available properties. He explained that he cannot recall whether the specific sites Ms. Washington mentioned were reviewed, but that they looked at many available properties that were out of reach owing to parking and transit access.
    - Ms. Washington responded that FTC is the second-busiest transportation center in the city, second only to City Hall, is in a residentially-dense neighborhood, versus the Friends Hospital on Roosevelt Boulevard being closed off and literally in a gated community. She explained that she is a resident of the neighboring Northwood community and does not see how the Friends Hospital campus would be more ideal than the FTC. She explained

DRAFT

that she is disturbed that there was deviation from the Phila2035 plan and over the lack of community engagement in the selection of this site.
    - Mr. Jarrah responded that there is a community health center governance body that oversees the operations of the health centers and is made up of a majority of patient users who have been involved with community input. The board holds public meetings and invites testimony from the public. He noted that public input is part of the process moving forward.
    - Ms. Washington questioned when those meetings occurred, how they were publicized, who was invited or notified and how. She noted that the Historical Commission received a letter from Joe Menkevich stating that the Northwood Civic Association was not notified of the project, and that she herself is the director of the Frankford Community Development Corporation, and this is the first she is hearing of the plans, despite working closely with the Planning Commission and the Commerce Department. She stated that she does not see how the neighborhood partners were missed.
    - Mr. Jarrah responded that the purview of the Historical Commission is not the site selection, but the demolition of Lawnside and the construction of the new health center on the designated Friends Hospital campus.
    - Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission is not involved in the overall site selection, but that it is relevant if there are potentially other sites that could accommodate the health center because then the demolition of Lawnside would not be necessary.
    - Ms. Cooperman commented that if the Commission is being asked to approve the demolition of Lawnside in the public interest, then they need to make sure that the public interest has been served.
- Mr. Thomas noted that many of the issues raised in the public interest argument are economic, which would be better suited for a financial hardship application, which should include a thorough analysis and review by the Committee on Financial Hardship.
- Mr. Thomas noted that he serves on the board of advisors for the Tookany Tacony Frankford Watershed Partnership and is a former board member and is very familiar with the Friends Hospital site, traveling there by bicycle. He noted that the Friends Hospital campus is connected to the city's bicycle network, which is a convenient safe way to get there. He also noted that he appreciates all that the hospital has done to preserve the open space.
- Mr. Thomas noted that when one enters the Friends Hospital campus, one is overcome by a feeling of calmness and having arrived into a pleasant, safe, and beautiful place, which is the original purpose of the campus. He noted that Lawnside forms a kind of gatehouse, and expressed concern that what would now be facing Roosevelt Boulevard is a service entrance for a building which does not tell the story of the campus's history.
- Mr. Thomas opined that there are numerous other potential adaptive reuses of the historic building. He suggested that the applicants look for a-typical uses. He noted that the Commission cannot determine the potential for reuse without a financial hardship analysis.
    - Others disagreed and contended that financial factors must be considered to assess feasible alternatives to the proposed plan. For the Historical

Commission to find that a project is necessary, it must rule out other alternatives as infeasible, including financially infeasible.

- Mr. Thomas opined that the applicants should not scrap an entire scheme because it would require the demolition of one of the later additions to Lawnside, noting that partial demolition would be better than complete demolition.
- Mr. Thomas questioned the traffic pattern that loops back in Option A, noting that it appears that people are riding on the wrong side of the road.
- Mr. Thomas noted that the proposed building would be the first one visitors see when entering campus and that it will set the tone of the whole campus. He opined that the installation of service areas immediately adjacent to the entrance and to Roosevelt Boulevard are inappropriate, even if screened.
    - Mr. Cohen responded that the drawings are conceptual, but with respect to the service areas, they will be encased in a screened fence that shields the activities, along with significant landscaping along Roosevelt Boulevard to serve as a visual and audible buffer. He opined that they will help maintain the sense of calm and tranquility by restoring additional trees along the drive. He explained that the new building is intended to be a background building, while its location makes it readily accessible and allows for adequate time to orient oneself whether by foot or car.
- Ms. Washington commented that safe pedestrian access will be a problem at the Friends Hospital site owing to the dangerous Roosevelt Boulevard, which has terrible traffic flow and is very unsafe for pedestrians. She noted that most of the population is not going to be traveling by bicycle, but many will be traveling by foot from the neighboring communities of Northwood, Frankford, and the surrounding residential community.
- Ms. Cooperman expressed concern over the relationship not just of this project to Lawnside but to the overall property of Friends Hospital campus, which is characterized by its open space and sense of place of refuge. She argued that construction a very large building at the entrance, which is a crucial threshold experience of a park, fundamentally changes the character of this property. The whole property, not just a single building, is the designated resource. She noted that she appreciates the effort to maintain heritage trees, but opined that planting supplemental trees and putting up an attractive screen fence will not compensate for constructing a large building at a crucial viewpoint in the experience of the landscape of the property.
- Mr. Mattioni referred to the Architectural Committee's recommendation and the feasibility of the reuse or relocation of Lawnside on the larger site, noting that it is a very large property, which would seem to be able to accommodate the new construction as well as the retention of Lawnside. He stated that he does not feel there has been an adequate answer or exploration of why Lawnside cannot be dealt with in a more appropriate way. He also argued that Ms. Washington's and Ms. Cooperman's questions have not been adequately answered. Ms. Turner agreed. Mr. Mattioni noted that the Commission is being asked to approve conceptual plans that include the demolition of a property that has been allowed to fall into disuse and disrepair by the very people who are asking for the approval.
- Mr. Thomas noted that this is not an issue of preservation versus the essential services the hospital provides and seeks to provide. The Historical Commission is

looking for how to do both. He noted that preserving the character of this property also impacts the patients that they serve.

- Mr. Reuter clarified that this in-concept application proposes both the demolition of the historic Lawnside and the new construction of a two-story building in the location and footprint shown in Option A. He noted that the Commission has not encountered many public interest arguments for in-concept applications. He explained that the Commission is tasked with balancing the public interest of preserving the Lawnside building versus creating this hospital building in this precise location and will reach a determination as to whether the demolition of Lawnside is necessary to achieve that purpose. In order to make that determination, the Commission must determine whether there are feasible alternatives that would achieve that same public interest. Financial factors can be considered when reviewing claims of necessary in the public interest. A separate review by the Committee on Financial Hardship is not necessary.
- Mr. Thomas noted that they have discussed the flow of traffic around a box on a site plan, but have not addressed if the shape of the building can be adjusted. He questioned whether, assuming the top of the drawing as north, the northeast corner can be adjusted so that Lawnside can remain. He noted that many times historic buildings are incorporated into new construction, and that the concept of how to allow the new and old to coexist needs to be addressed. He noted that the application needs more analysis to show more potential designs for the shape of the building itself. He reiterated that partial demolition of a wing or rear addition of Lawnside is preferable to complete demolition.
- Mr. Farnham clarified that the applicants are asking whether they have demonstrated that this project is necessary in the public interest. He noted that the project is limited to the demolition of Lawnside and the construction of a two-story building with the footprint and driveway system shown in the Option A. The footprint, massing diagram, and floor plans are included in the submission to the Historical Commission. Exterior façade materials and detailing have not been submitted.
- Mr. Thomas noted that the question has come up as to whether the footprint is adjustable. He argued that Lawnside should not be demolished unless the applicants can show that this is the only shape and location that is possible. He opined that, since the proposed building is not directly in front of the main hospital building, it could be seen as a flanking building, but reiterated that minor adjustments could be made to the driveways, entrances, in a manner that is respectful to the historic building but still accomplishes the hospital's goals. He noted that there is room in the general proposed location to adjust the new construction to avoid demolishing all of Lawnside.
- Mr. Farnham noted that the architect submitted floorplans and described the interior flow at the Architectural Committee meeting. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that those floorplans were included in the submission to the Historical Commission as well.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that there are also broader concerns about the larger framework for the selection of the location of the new facility, and that there is public interest in that more generally. Ms. Washington agreed, noting that there is the public interest of the healthcare needs but also the total impact of the development on the surrounding neighborhood.

DRAFT

- The applicants noted that many issues have been raised that could be addressed, and questioned the best path forward procedurally, noting that time is of the essence. The applicants, the Commissioners, Mr. Farnham, and Mr. Reuter discussed the appropriate next steps, ultimately suggested the possibility of continuing the application for one month and supplementing it in the interim.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mr. Farnham noted that two emails were sent over night directly to Chairman Thomas from architectural historians Aaron Wunsch and Michael Lewis in opposition to the demolition of Lawnside. He noted that it is a violation of the City's ex parte law to communicate with Commissioners directly on matters before the Commission.
- Laval Miller-Wilson supported the construction of the new health center and the demolition of Lawnside. He noted that he serves on the board of the Ambulatory Health Centers, which includes health center patients and holds public monthly meetings. He explained that the board has a neighborhood advisory committee for each of the eight health centers. He encouraged the Commission to prioritize safety and accessibility for the new health center and to approve the demolition of Lawnside. He argued that the City has identified the need for this area, and that the Friends Hospital location was selected through a long and thorough search, and that the project and demolition is clearly in the public interest.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance expressed understanding of the organization's mission and the need for a new health center in the Lower Northeast. He supported the staff and Architectural Committee's recommendations. He explained that he recognizes the spatial constraints having to do with pedestrian access and vehicular circulation, but questioned whether it would be feasible to consider a slightly smaller footprint. He acknowledged that such a proposal would likely involve losing some space and might require an additional floor level, but noted another VSBA-designed community center at Broad and Morris has three floors of services. He stated that he would invite consideration of smaller footprint with greater height. If the footprint and siting is inflexible, he continued, he does not feel there has been sufficient evidence or argument presented that shows that Lawnside is financially infeasible to mothball, restore, or relocate. He noted that Friends Hospital actively uses Greystone, which is another historic residential building. The assertions so far are not compelling and amount to a financial hardship claim without the supporting evidence required in a financial hardship application.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance explained that it is good that the application is in-concept, because it requires further study as to how not to overly disrupt the historic landscape and Lawnside. Mr. Steinke noted that there have been claims by Mr. Pyle and others of economic hardship with respect to rehabilitating Lawnside, which they themselves have neglected. He noted that there has been no mention of Universal Health Services, which is the operator of the facility. He explained that Universal Health Services is a healthcare giant based in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, which has 400 hospitals, behavioral health and ambulatory services facilities scattered through the United States and United Kingdom. He opined that they are a private for-profit company with billions in annual revenue, and would seem to have access to revenue that the rehabilitation of a small residential building should not be an impediment.

- Randal Baron suggested that, if one accepts the general location and footprint of the proposed building, it seems possible that by adjusting between Option A and Option B, it would be possible to shift the building towards the entrance drive and avoid Lawnside, without changing anything about the size of the building or the vehicular circulation. Secondly, he suggested that Lawnside could be reused as a group home, for which there is a tremendous need, and for which location on the grounds of a hospital would be viewed as a positive because it would also avoid the opposition frequently encountered in residential neighborhoods. Mr. Baron finally addressed the additional paving proposed for parking spaces. He noted that the Historical Commission has a long history of requiring the preservation of lawns, such as at the Naval Home, and suggested that the parking should be redesigned to move it more out of view.
- Jim Duffin echoed Mr. Baron's comments, noting that it seems possible for the proposed building in its general proposed location and footprint to be shifted, angled, or stepped in such a way that the driveway and circulation remain the same, but that Lawnside is retained and the new and old buildings are able to co-exist. He also noted that the $1 million cost mentioned by the applicants includes the relocation of Lawnside, not just its rehabilitation.
- Benjamin She opposed the demolition of Lawnside, and opined that the insistence on free-flowing car access is detrimental to pedestrian access, especially given the site's isolation from the neighboring community. He questioned whether it would be possible to move the parking to the main parking lot, and suggested providing separate pedestrian and vehicular access.
- Steven Peitzman agreed with previous comments. He noted that he is particularly interested in accessibility, and that this is a relatively isolated location with a cemetery on one side. He noted that many patients would have to cross Roosevelt Boulevard to get to a bus stop or to home, so this would be a largely automobile dependent facility. He noted that, as a partly-retired physician who volunteers at a clinic for the underserved, he is particularly sympathetic to the need for additional primary care facilities. Nevertheless, this campus is meant to be a beautiful and therapeutic tool, and is a National Historic Landmark, and while that does not have bearing on the local designation necessarily, it is the highest level of recognition of a historic property in the nation.
- Debbie Klak noted that she is a community preservationist and activist in the area and past president of the Historical Society of Frankford. She opposed the demolition of Lawnside because it takes away the integrity of the National Historic Landmark. When viewed from Roosevelt Boulevard, the campus has an expansive front lawn and all the subsequent hospital buildings built after the main building are to the rear. She also agreed with Commissioner Washington that the community was not informed of these plans. She suggested locating new construction behind the main building or looking elsewhere around the Frankford Transportation Center as suggested in the Phila2035 plan.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society of Philadelphia supported the construction of a public health center in the Lower Northeast, but argued that public health should not be used to justify bad planning. He agreed with Commissioner Washington that this proposal entirely ignores the town setting of the neighboring Frankford Transportation Center, which would be more accessible by foot to the neighboring

community and would likely not require demolition of any historic buildings. He noted that Friends Hospital is one of the most beautiful and intact historic properties along Roosevelt Boulevard, and that a key factor in its National Historic Landmark designation is the landscape. He opined that construction in the proposed location disrupts the historic landscape and destroys the most visible historic building on the campus, as well as the overall historic feeling of the campus from the public right-of-way. He noted that one of the key recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Historic Preservation was to integrate preservation into the larger planning process across City agencies, which this application fails to do. He urged the Historical Commission to deny the application and for the applicants to explore alternatives.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed project is limited to the demolition of Lawnside and the construction of a two-story building with the footprint and driveway system shown in Option A. Exterior façade materials and detailing have not been submitted.
- The proposed project is In Concept only, and would require a final review with more complete information, including architectural plans, façade materials, and other details.
- Lawnside is a prominent building on a calm, tranquil, and verdant campus, and acts as a gatehouse to the entrance drive, setting the tone for the whole campus.
- Construction on the proposed site of Option A, including the demolition of Lawnside and the placement of service areas immediately adjacent to Roosevelt Boulevard and the entrance, would change the historic character of the property.
- Schemes that incorporate Lawnside into the new construction, even if they involve the demolition of rear additions to Lawnside, should be explored.
- Additional uses for Lawnside should be explored.
- Slight changes to the floorplan of the new construction to avoid impacting Lawnside, without substantially modifying the proposed vehicular paths should be explored.
- To demonstrate necessity in the public interest, the applicants must demonstrate that other locations do not present feasible alternatives.
- The application should not be approved unless the applicants can show that this is the only feasible footprint and location for the new health center.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The review of the application should be continued to the next meeting of the Historical Commission to allow time for additional analyses and supplemental submissions.

ACTION: Ms. Edwards moved to continue the review to the 9 October 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 4641 E ROOSEVELT BLVD MOTION: Continue to the October 2020 meeting of the Historical Commission MOVED BY: Edwards SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey				X	
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11			1	1

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 AUGUST 2020

ADDRESS: 1617 WALNUT ST
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Rosenberg Family Partners
Nominator: Staff of the Historical Commission
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

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

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1617 Walnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:37:45

PRESENTERS:

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

DRAFT

- Gary and Kim Vernick represented the property owner. Mr. Vernick strongly opposed the designation of the property and presented a series of photographs and other documents to show that the ground-floor level had been changed several times.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination. He then noted that the property is classified as significant in the Center City West National Register Historic District. He urged the Commission to designate the property.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building was designed in 1921 in the Renaissance Revival style by the architecture firm of Seeburger & Rabenold.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building stands as an early twentieth-century commercial representation of the Italian Renaissance Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1617 Walnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, and to designate it at as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Mattioni abstained.

ITEM: 1617 WALNUT ST **MOTION: Designate, Criterion D** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Hartner**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni			X		
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11		1		1

DRAFT

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 232-36 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 15-story or eight-story building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Marie F. Cerone
Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
History: 2000; Martin Jay Rosenblum, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:
This application for final approval proposes to construct a 15-story tower at the southeast corner of Walnut Street and S. 3rd Street. The existing single-family residence on the property was constructed in 1999 and is non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The application proposes full demolition of the three-story brick residence and garage and construction of a 15-story, 184' tall building. The proposed building will house a hotel and a first-floor commercial space.

Although the existing building is non-contributing to the historic district, the lot is considered contributing for archaeological potential.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Demolish existing building.
- Construct 15-story, 184' tower, revised to eight-story, 100' tower.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *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 should engage an archaeologist to assess property for archaeological potential in order to satisfy Standard 8. An initial assessment has not been submitted with application.
- *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 massing, size, scale, proportions, and height of the proposed tower are not compatible with the historic district. The Historical Commission rejected a tower for the adjacent site to the east recently, asserting that a tall building was not appropriate for the context, especially the Merchants Exchange building and other nearby, historically significant buildings and collections of buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 8 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:04:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. She noted that the Historical Commission had received considerable correspondence on the application that had been forwarded to the Commissioners.
- Architect Rich Villa, attorney Amee Farrell, and property owner Anthony Cerone represented the application.
    - Ms. Farrell disputed the presumptive level of jurisdiction the Historical Commission enjoys over this review. She noted that the Historical Commission has listed it for final review, as though it has plenary jurisdiction, but she and her client believe it is actually a Review and Comment application. Ms. Farrell said that this site meets the definition of an undeveloped site under Section 2.23 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. She continued that even though it is within the Society Hill Historic District, it is not individually designated as historic. Ms. Farrell pointed out that the historic district nomination did not attribute historical, cultural, or archaeological value to the site or structure and no building or structure stood on the site at the time of the 1999 designation. She noted that the property was described as a parking lot and non-contributing.
    - Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission amended the Society Hill Historic District inventory a couple of years ago to classify several sites as contributing owing to archaeological potential including this site. He asserted that this is not a Review and Comment, but a full jurisdiction review, and the site would be considered a developed site, owing to the inventory's indication of its archaeological potential.
    - Mr. Villa presented the application to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mary Purcell, vice president of Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the application.
- John Gibbons, on behalf of Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the application.
- Lorna Katz Lawson, on behalf of Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the application.
- Alex Balloon supported the application.
- Benjamin She supported the application.
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia, supported the application.
- Paul Steinke Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, opposed the application.
- Kasia Stein supported the revised application.
- Chris Mejia-Smith supported the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Based on the Architectural Committee's feedback, the applicant submitted a revised application for Commission review. The application was revised as follows:
    - Building overall height was reduced by 84'.
    - Upper cornice height was reduced from 174' to 89'.
    - Main exterior material was changed to brick.
    - Top window treatment of the arch was changed to a true half round.
    - Building was set farther back from Walnut Street than originally proposed.

- The existing front foundation wall will be used to avoid any new excavation north of that wall.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Owing to the significant degree of change presented in the revised design, the application should go back to the Architectural Committee for a new review and recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to remand the revised application to the Architectural Committee at its 22 September 2020 meeting. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 232-36 WALNUT ST **MOTION: Remand revised application to 22 September 2020 meeting of Architectural Committee** **MOVED BY: Mattioni** **SECONDED BY: McCoubrey**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington	X				
Total	12				1

DRAFT

REPORT FROM THE STAFF ON CONTINUANCES OF NOMINATIONS

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:48:25

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission resolved to end the practice of continuing the reviews of nominations to the "next in-person meeting" at the August 2020 meeting, and directed the staff to begin to notify property owners that the Historical Commission would restart the reviews of nominations that had been continued in that manner. He stated that the staff is beginning to implement the Historical Commission's directive and would like to take this opportunity to provide the Commission with an accounting of the reviews of nominations that were continued or suspended owing to the COVID-19 shutdown, as well as those that had been postponed indefinitely for other reasons. He presented information about

continued and postponed reviews. He stated that the staff requests that the Historical Commission direct it to draft rules related to continuing the reviews of nominations.
- The Commissioners discussed the staff memorandum and agreed with the timetable set forth for restarting designations paused owing to the pandemic and with the proposal to draft rules delegating some nomination continuance authority to the staff, with an initial draft to be reviewed at the November Historical Commission meeting.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 2000 E WESTMORELAND ST
Name of Resource: Henry Whitaker's Sons' Mill
Property Owner: Westmoreland Lofts LP
Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company, Inc.

ADDRESS: 1432-48 S 29TH ST, 2922-28 AND 2930-36 DICKINSON ST
Name of Resource: St Gabriel's Roman Catholic Church Complex
Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company, Inc.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:03:10

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Mehley presented the nominations to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- Steven Peitzman inquired if these properties are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He suggested that properties nominated for the National Register should also be listed on the Philadelphia Register.
    - Ms. Mehley confirmed that neither building is listed on the Philadelphia Register.

DISCUSSION:
- Mr. Thomas noted that building owners often pursue listing on the National Register their properties as a means of qualifying for federal tax incentives for preserving historic properties.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that she was pleased to see buildings such as St. Gabriel's and work by architect Edwin F. Durang being more recognized by the National Register in recent years.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- They concur with the presented documentation, including the criteria and statements of significance, for the Henry Whitaker's Sons' Mill and St. Gabriel's Roman Catholic Church Complex nominations.

The Historical Commission concluded that:
- Both nominations are worthy of inclusion of the National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:10:35

ACTION: At 1:12 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. Hartner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Adjournment **MOTION: Adjourn** **MOVED BY: Mattioni** **SECONDED BY: Hartner**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
Hartner (DPP)	X				
Hunter (DPD)	X				
Lippert (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Sánchez (Council)					Left meeting at 1:06 p.m.
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Turner, Vice Chair	X				
Washington					Left meeting at 1:05 p.m.
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.

DRAFT