

**THE MINUTES OF THE 720TH STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 AUGUST 2022, 9:00 A.M.  
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 9:02 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Mark Dodds (Department of Planning and Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Patrick O'Donnell (Department of Public Property)	X		
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)		X	
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)		X	
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq. (Community Development Corporation)	X		

The meeting was held 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 II
- Nika Faulkner, Historical Commission Intern
- Mary Costello, Esq., Law Department

The following persons attended the online meeting:

- Lindsey Fernandez
- Paul Boni, Esq.
- Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr
- Patrick Madden
- David Traub
- Ben Manarski
- Jay Farrell

Gabrielle Canno  
Herb Schultz  
David Brown  
Susan Wetherill  
Tamar Fox  
Khan Shibly  
Mason Carter  
Mary McGettigan  
Joseph Perry  
Katie Low  
Steven Peitzman  
Nancy Pontone  
Michael Bucci  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance  
Lauren Thomsen  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance  
Jim Duffin  
Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association  
Evan Hall  
Wesley Noonan, sessa  
David Fecteau, PCPC  
Jessica Vitali  
Justino Navarro  
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
Hal Schirmer, Esq.  
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Oscar Beisert  
Justin Brooks  
Ralph Marano  
John Di Benedetto  
Dennis Carlisle  
Sergio Coscia  
Matt Taylor  
Whitney Covalle  
Deborah Gary, SPPAAA  
Jesse Bacon

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 719TH STATED MEETING, 8 JULY 2022**

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:25**

**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 719th Stated Meeting, held 8 July 2022. No comments were offered.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 719<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 July 2022. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 719th Meeting</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adoption of minutes</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total					

**CONTINUANCE REQUESTS**

**ADDRESS: 1010 S 10TH ST**

Name of Resource: First Italian Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the Presbytery of Philadelphia

Nominator: Bella Vista Neighbors Association

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:55**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the request to the Historical Commission. She stated that the representative of the church is out of town and unable to attend today's meeting, and is therefore requesting a one-month continuance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Granting a continuance under the circumstances is appropriate.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of 1010 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street to the September 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 1010 S 10<sup>th</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Continue to September 2022 PHC</b>					
<b>Moved BY: Thomas</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 8835 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: Julia Hebard Marsden House  
 Proposed Action: Designation  
 Property Owner: Chestnut Hill Hospital LLC  
 Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
 Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the former Julia Hebard Marsden house and stable, two buildings on the Chestnut Hill Hospital campus, at 8835 Germantown Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the buildings satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the house and stable are highly representative examples of the Colonial Revival “country houses” that appeared in Chestnut Hill following the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the buildings were designed by the nationally significant and Philadelphia-born architect Charles Barton Keen. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the residence and stable contributed to the neighborhood’s status as an elite residential enclave at the turn of the twentieth century.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the former residence and stable at 8835 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:06:02

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the review of the nomination to the October 2022 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. He stated that attorneys representing the property owner are in discussions with the nominator and would like additional time for those discussions before the Committee reviews the nomination.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Granting a continuance under the circumstances is appropriate.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of 8835 Germantown Avenue to the October 2022 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 8835 Germantown Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Continue to Oct. 2022 CHD</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 416-24 VINE ST**

Proposal: Demolish building; construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert W. McMillan

Applicant: Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture

History: 1940

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

**BACKGROUND:**

This application seeks final approval for the construction of a six-story building at 416-24 Vine Street. The existing 1-story building was constructed circa 1940 and is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing building and construction of a 70-unit, 65-foot-tall multifamily building with ground floor commercial space. The demolition of the existing non-contributing can be approved without a hardship or public necessity finding. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The property is located at the southwest corner of Vine Street and N. Lawrence Street. The surrounding buildings in this area of the historic district range in height from three to six stories and are clad in red brick. The new building's exterior design references nearby historic industrial buildings. The building's cladding is proposed as a combination of dark grey metal and cement fiber board. A lighter bronze color cement fiber board will be used on the first level. All windows will be aluminum clad on the exterior.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish non-contributing building.
- Construct new six-story building.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The massing, size, and scale of the proposed building are compatible with nearby industrial buildings in the historic district and surrounding neighborhood. Although the architectural features and detailing are a combination of historic and modern elements, in general they are compatible with the historic district. However, the exterior cladding and color scheme are not compatible with the historic district. If the color scheme and cladding materials are revised to be compatible, the application could satisfy Standard 9.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends approval, provided the exterior color scheme and cladding are revised to be compatible with the historic district, 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: 00:07:15**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the building permit application review to the September 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. He explained that the architect is requesting additional time to revise his architectural plans before they are presented to the Historical Commission.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant needs additional time to revise the application.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Given the circumstances, granting the continuance is appropriate.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the continuance of the review to the September 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 416-24 Vine St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approve continuance</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

## **REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2022**

### **AGENDA**

#### **ADDRESS: 2216 LOCUST ST**

Proposal: Construct third-floor rear addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jordan Brody

Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition with roof deck and pilot house on top of an existing two-story rear addition, a large portion of which dates to a 1981 reconstruction of the rear addition. The enlarged rear addition would be visible from Latimer Street at the rear, which is a service alley on this block. The proposed pilot house appears to sit on the rear wall of the main block. Existing window openings on the rear addition are proposed to be infilled or otherwise modified; however, most of these are not visible from the service alley at the rear and are on the 1981 reconstructed addition.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct additional story on existing two-story rear addition.
- Construct roof deck and pilot house on rear addition.
- Alter window openings on 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 works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The majority of the rear addition was constructed in 1981; therefore, this section of the rear addition is not historically significant, and its alteration meets Standard 9.
  - The proposed rear addition maintains the historic width of a rear ell rather than expanding to the full width of the property, satisfying Standard 9.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, 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 ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:08:35

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.



- Architect Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised design, including location of the pilot house, height of the addition, and window design, reflects the recommendations of the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The majority of the rear addition was constructed in 1981; therefore, this section of the rear addition is not historically significant, and its alteration meets Standard 9.
- The proposed rear addition maintains the historic width of a rear ell rather than expanding to the full width of the property, satisfying Standard 9.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 2216 Locust St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Edwards</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 704 PINE ST**

Proposal: Construct rear additions and detached garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lisa & Greg Millhauser

Applicant: Matthew Price, CANNO design

History: 1810; c. 1961, new sash, door, and transom

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct rear additions and a two-story garage at the rear of 704 Pine Street. The existing rear of the building is the result of numerous alterations over the years, as documented in the application materials. This application proposes additional alterations to the already-altered rear, expanding it in footprint and in height. At the far rear of the property along Addison Street, this application proposes the construction of a two-story structure, with garage and living space above. This side of Addison Street at the rear is lined with garage structures. The restoration or replacement of some front façade features is proposed as part of this application, which can be reviewed by the staff. Many of the existing front façade features, including windows, door, and transom, date to a 1961 renovation.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct rear additions.
- Construct two-story detached structure at rear.
- Restore and replace front façade features.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
  - Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1961 renovation, such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The majority of the rear of this building is the result of numerous alterations over the years; therefore, the rear is not historically significant and its alteration meets Standard 9.
  - The proposed detached two-story structure along Addison Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, and scale of other garages on Addison Street, satisfying Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*

- The proposed rear additions and detached rear structure does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the fourth-floor office addition is redesigned to be lower and narrower, brick is used for both stories on the front elevation of the Addison Street structure, and the existing front railing is restored rather than replaced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:18:20

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Gabrielle Canno represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The fourth-floor office addition was redesigned to be lower but not narrower.
- The garage façade was redesigned in accordance with the Architectural Committee's recommendations.
- The front railing is proposed for retention rather than removal in the revised application.
- Visibility of the rear of the building at 704 Pine Street from the public right-of-way is significantly limited.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1961 renovation, such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- The majority of the rear of this building is the result of numerous alterations over the years; therefore, the rear is not historically significant and its alteration meets Standard 9.
- The proposed detached two-story structure along Addison Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, and scale of other garages on Addison Street, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed rear additions and detached rear structure does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 704 Pine St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Mattioni</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST**

Proposal: Construct 10-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Flamingo Bay Investments LLC

Applicant: Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture

History: 1870; Furness & Hewitt; Refaced c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish a non-contributing building and construct a 10-story, mixed-use, commercial, and residential building at 2204 Walnut Street in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The overall height of the building would be 117 feet. The upper stories would be set back 10'-2" from the lower front façade at the fifth floor and an additional 5'-3" at the seventh floor. Floors one through six will be clad in a buff color brick and floors seven through ten will be glass reinforced cement panels in a similar color.

In 2019, the Historical Commission approved a two-story rooftop and rear addition for the existing four-story building. The addition would have been set back from the front façade.

In May 2022, the Historical Commission reviewed an application proposing the demolition of the existing building on the property and the construction of a new building. While the demolition was approved, the Historical Commission voted to deny the new building for the following reasons:

- The historic buildings in the immediate area of 2204 Walnut Street are between three and five stories in height. At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is too tall and therefore not compatible with the streetscape or historic district.

- The colors of the historic buildings in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District are typically muted earth tones. The proposed building is white. The color of the proposed building is too bright.

Since the last review, the color of the proposed building has been adjusted and is now more of an earth tone like the extant building. The design of the upper stories has been revised, but the building's height has not changed. The party walls have been articulated.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish non-contributing building.
- Construct 10-story building.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - At 10 stories and 117 feet tall, the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape or historic district. The historic buildings in the immediate area are between three and five stories in height. The application does not comply with Standard 9. The height of the proposed building should be reduced to a maximum of six stories, with the upper two stories set back from the front façade.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the demolition but denial of the new construction, 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:** 00:27:30

**RECUSAL:**

- Ms. Washington recused because the organization for which she works has retained the attorney representing this application for an unrelated matter.

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sergio Coscia and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. McCoubrey said the Architectural Committee appreciated the color change and slight adjustments to materials and configuration. He added that the Architectural Committee concluded that the mass and bulk of the revised design is the same as the version previously denied by the Historical Commission and significantly larger than the version approved by the Commission in 2019. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the revised design would tower above the neighboring buildings. He noted there are taller building at end of block, but the immediate neighbors are three to five

- stories. Mr. McCoubrey concluded that this 10-story building would be significantly taller, and the party walls would be highly visible.
- Mr. Thomas stated there are tall buildings in other areas of the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District. He noted that taller buildings are usually on corners. Mr. Thomas pointed out that the upper addition would be highly visible from all viewpoints along this block of Walnut Street.
  - Ms. Cooperman said that the Historical Commission determined in a previous meeting that this height is not approvable, and she sees no reason to deviate from the earlier decision.
  - Mr. O'Donnell stated this section of Walnut Street is wider than the section to the east. He pointed out several buildings within a two-block radius that are taller.
  - Mr. Thomas responded that he also noted the presence of taller buildings in the area, but they are not in comparable situations to this one. He said that additions should not be highly visible from the street level and the width of the street on this block would make the visibility of this proposed 10-story building even more visible.
  - Mr. Mattioni said he recalled the major comment from the previous meeting was the building color. He commented that the contrast was better. Mr. Mattioni stated that he does not think that the proposed height is too tall at this location. He added that he agreed with Mr. O'Donnell's comments.
  - Ms. Edwards stated that the urbanist in her appreciates adding density to the block. She commented that, overall, she likes the design.
  - Mr. McCoubrey reiterated that the Architectural Committee concluded that this is a significant overbuild; the Historical Commission already approved two stories but not six.
  - Mr. Thomas said the only issue seems to be the height.
  - Mr. McCoubrey added that the highly articulated balconies are not consistent with the district.
  - Mr. Thomas observed that the balconies are set back, and this is a new building and livability is important. He asserted that this element is not incompatible with the Standards for new construction.
  - Mr. McCoubrey said the Architectural Committee's primary concern was the massing and relationship to other buildings in the row.
  - The Commission members discussed this stretch of Walnut Street and potential future development surrounding this building. A few members concluded that the area will likely change with new, larger buildings and this may alter the appropriateness of this building's height and density.
  - Ms. Cooperman acknowledged that there are taller buildings in the vicinity and more to come likely, but, if role of the Historical Commission is to enhance the appreciation for Philadelphia's important historic environment, then this large building in this location diminishes the appearance of the neighboring historic buildings.
  - Mr. Phillips said he wished to echo the comments of Commissioner O'Donnell. He pointed to a project for 262 S. 16<sup>th</sup> Street that he presented to the Historical Commission. In that situation, the important design point was a consistent cornice line. Mr. Phillip said that height alone should not be the key concern. The question is whether the proposed building would distract from the historic buildings.
  - Mr. Coscia stated that they had met with representatives of the Preservation Alliance and Center City residents Association (CCRA) and he noted that CCRA would like the building to be taller with more setbacks. He is concerned about the continuance recommended by Mr. Steinke because further discussions with CCRA may lead to a 12-story building, which the Historical Commission will likely reject. Mr. Coscia said

they can look at the articulation on the side walls again and once again pointed out the challenges of this location. He asked Mr. Phillips to weigh in on the idea of the continuance.

- Mr. Phillips said he is always in favor of dialogue with the community. He said that he agrees with Mr. Coscia that it is not clear what may result from speaking with the community about the design. Mr. Phillips said he would not oppose a continuance but would prefer it not be longer than a month. He restated Mr. Coscia's caution that they are constricted by the lot size, height, and setback so he does not want to lead anyone on or suggest by agreeing to this continuance that there will be significant changes. However, they are willing to give it a try.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia opposed the current application. He stated he is not opposed to redevelopment of this site. Mr. Steinke pointed out this block is in a transitional zone between central business district and the Rittenhouse Fidler residential core. He pointed out that this is a conflict between zoning and the desire to preserve the historic low-rise scale of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. Mr. Steinke suggested that the applicant request a continuance so that a better design solution can be sought for this project. He noted that a continuance would allow more time for CCRA and the Preservation Alliance to work with the applicant on a better solution.
- Jim Duffin, board member of Center City Residents Association, stated they are concerned about the development. He stated that organization does not have objections to overbuilds, particularly along this portion of Walnut Street, but is opposed the current application.
- Whitney Covalle, resident of 2200 block of St. James Place, opposed the application.
- Oscar Beisert opposed the application.
- Steven Peitzman opposed the application.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites opposed the application.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to table the application for one month, to the September 2022 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 2204 Walnut St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Table for one month</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Mattioni</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 1822 CHRISTIAN ST**

Proposal: Construct third floor addition, pilot house, and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jesse Bacon and Tamar Fox

Applicant: Michael Bucci, g\_space LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Christian Street/Black Doctors Row Historic District, Contributing, 7/8/2022

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a third-story addition, green roof, deck, and pilot house on the building at 1822 Christian Street. The building is a contributing historic resource to the Christian Street/Black Doctors Row Historic District. The application proposes to remove a section of the existing roof and construct a third-story addition at the third-floor rear. A green roof, a pilot house, and deck would be constructed above the third level. The green roof at the front of the building would be constructed on top of the existing roof and would add a parapet wall to the top of the existing cornice. The rear of 1822 Christian Street is not visible from the public right-of-way.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish a section of third-story roof.
- Construct a third-story addition.
- Construct a green roof, roof deck, and pilot house.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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



- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed green roof would include a new parapet wall that would rise above the historic cornice at the front of the building. This alteration would change the historic character of the front façade and would not be compatible with the historic building; therefore, it would not meet Standard 9.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
  - The new parapet, and potentially the pilot house, would be visible from the public right-of-way along the 1800 block of Christian Street; therefore, this addition would not meet the Roofs Guideline.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:16:15

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Michael Bucci and property owner Tamar Fox represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant met with the staff onsite to conduct a mockup of the revised setbacks of the front curb, deck railing, and pilot house. The pilot house was not visible from the public right-of-way, and the front curb and deck railing were determined to be inconspicuous.
- The revised application reflects the comments provided by the Architectural Committee.
- The existing deck, which predates the historic designation of the property, is highly visible and will be removed as part of this project.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised design and setbacks of rooftop features is now compatible with the historic building, satisfying Standard 9.
- The revised setbacks of the rooftop features allow for the green roof and deck to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying the Roofs Guideline.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 1822 Christian St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 8110 FRANKFORD AVE**

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Sons of Union Veterans

Applicant: Joseph Perry, Grand Army of the Republic Civil War Museum

History: 1805; Lewis-Pattison House

Individual Designation: 2/4/1982

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:**

This application proposes to make accessibility modifications to a c. 1805 building in northeast Philadelphia as it is converted from a residential building to a Civil War museum. The application proposes to remove the existing concrete sidewalk and stoop and to install a new extended concrete stoop and ramp to the front entrance. The application also proposes to slightly modify a c. 1915 rear frame addition to accommodate a new accessible restroom by decreasing the slope of the roof and infilling the rear windows. The existing side windows of the addition, which are visible from Frankford Avenue, would be retained, and new siding installed to match the existing.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application in June 2022 and made several recommendations for how to improve the design, including by limiting the railing to the sloped portions of the ramp, cladding the sides of the ramp in brick or stone, providing grass/landscaping in the center of the U shape created by the ramp, and installing a slip-sheet

between the existing historic stoop and the new landing. The application presented to the Architectural Committee at its July 2022 meeting addressed some of the concerns by calling for a stone veneer on the exterior of the ramp and the installation of grass in the U shape at the center of the ramp but continued to call for railings at all sides of the ramp and for the new stoop to be cast directly over the existing stone stoop with no comment about a slip-sheet. The Architectural Committee provided additional feedback at both their May and July 2022 reviews, including that the applicants explore the option of a 1/20 sloped walkway. Following the Committee meeting, the applicants revised the application to show a sloped walkway leading to an extended stoop.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Install ADA ramp
- Modify rear addition to accommodate ADA restroom

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - The proposed ramp is set away from the historic building and could be removed in the future without causing damage if there is a change in use that no longer requires accessibility.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*
  - While the exterior ramp would be visible from the public right-of-way, there are limited alternative locations where an accessible entrance could be provided, and the installation of the ramp does not impact the historic features of the building.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the stone veneer is compatible with the historic structure and the railings are required by code, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:23:41

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Joseph Perry and architect John Di Benedetto represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the revised application.
- Oscar Beisert asked if there is a more Colonial-style railing that could be used.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application addresses the concerns of the Historical Commission and Architectural Committee members at their previous meetings.
- In addition to the revised sloped walkway in place of a ramp, the revised application also calls for the replacement of the roof on the rear shed and the inclusion of a slip membrane on the existing historic stoop, as suggested by the Architectural Committee.
- Coloring the concrete of the sloped walkway a darker grey color would make it less obtrusive.
- The inclusion of pickets in the railing would be more in keeping with the character of the historic property.
- The use of a black-painted, graspable square-section railing would be more appropriate than a pipe railing.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application satisfies ADA requirements and does not negatively impact the historic property, satisfying Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the concrete is grey and the railing is black iron with square-section posts and a cap rail and balusters, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Accessibility Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 8110 Frankford Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Approval as revised, with conditions</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Mattioni</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

## **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 20 JULY 2022**

### **ADDRESS: 920-22 N 19TH ST**

Name of Resource: Bishop Ida B. Robinson House  
Proposed Action: Designation  
Property Owner: Center City Real Estate Group LLC  
Nominator: Nika Faulker, Historical Commission intern  
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 920-22 N. 19<sup>th</sup> Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property is significant under Criterion for Designation A for its association with Bishop Ida B. Robinson, founder of the Mount Sinai Holy Church of America and an influential figure in the history of Black churches in Philadelphia, as well as Father Divine, founder of the International Peace Mission Movement. Ida B. Robinson owned the property from 1923 to 1946. The International Peace Mission Movement owned the property from 1948 to 1991.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 920-22 N. 19<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 920-22 N. 19<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:47:10

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Faulkner presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. Chantry noted that the Historical Commission staff sent the requisite notice but did not receive a response from the property owner.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination and the ongoing effort to recognize underrepresented communities.

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

The Historical Commission found that:

- Ida B. Robinson set a precedent for women in leadership positions within the Church.
- The International Peace Mission Movement utilized the building as a residence and community kitchen.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property is associated with Bishop Ida B. Robinson, founder of the Mount Sinai Holy Church of America and an influential figure in the history of Black churches in Philadelphia, who owned the property from 1923 to 1946, satisfying Criterion for Designation A.

- The property is also associated with Father Divine, founder of the International Peace Mission Movement, which owned the property from 1948 to 1991, satisfying Criterion for Designation A.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 920-22 N. 19<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 920-22 N 19<sup>th</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate; Criterion A</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 2095 AND 2100 E WILLARD ST**

Name of Resource: Amber Mills/C.H. Masland & Sons/Masland Duraleather Company  
 Proposed Action: Designation  
 Property Owner: Richmond Mills LP  
 Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia  
 Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 2095 and 2100 E. Willard Street and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the properties, which are currently jointly owned and historically associated with one another, are significant under Criterion for Designation J as part of the industrial heritage of the Kensington neighborhood. The complex was constructed in phases between 1886 and 1925 for C.H. Masland & Sons' Amber Mills, a carpet manufacturer, which operated at the site from 1886 to 1928. Between 1914 and 1928, the Amber Mills recalibrated to serve a new Masland family enterprise, the Masland Duraleather Company, which operated out of the properties from 1914 to 1978.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2095 and 2100 E. Willard Street satisfy Criterion for Designation J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2095 and 2100 E. Willard Street satisfy Criterion for Designation J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:51:27

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Historical Commission staff sent the requisite notice but have not heard from the property owners.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The properties at 2095 and 2100 E. Willard Street are currently jointly owned and historically associated with one another.
- The complex was constructed in phases between 1886 and 1925 for C.H. Masland & Sons' Amber Mills, a carpet manufacturer, which operated at the site from 1886 to 1928. Between 1914 and 1928, the Amber Mills recalibrated to serve a new Masland family enterprise, the Masland Duraleather Company, which operated out of the properties from 1914 to 1978.
- The bridge between the two properties is not called out explicitly on the map of structures, but is an important feature of this property, as it was a common feature in this type of factory complex.
- The cladding on the bridge is not historic.
- Industrial buildings in Kensington often had steel sash windows whose glazing was replaced with galvanized metal when panes were broken.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The properties at 2095 and 2100 E. Willard Street are significant under Criterion for Designation J as part of the industrial heritage of the Kensington neighborhood.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2095 and 2100 E Willard Street satisfy Criterion for Designation J, and to designate them as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 2095 and 2100 E Willard St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate; Criterion J</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 3001 W SCHOOL HOUSE LN**

Name of Resource: Woodside Stable and Carriage House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: William Penn Charter School

Nominator: East Falls Historical Society

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate a building on the property at 3001 W. School House Lane. The nomination contends that the carriage house/stable of the former Woodside estate of Edward T. Steel, constructed circa 1889, is significant under Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the building is significant as part of the development of country seats along School House Lane in the nineteenth century. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the building is the work of prestigious Victorian-era architect Addison Hutton, who redesigned the Woodside mansion as well as Steel's city residence at 1334 Walnut Street.

The Historical Commission designated the property at 3001 W. School House Lane in 1984. At the time, the property, a large estate, was known as Woodside. It included a large house, carriage house, cow shed, log tool shed, and gardener's cottage. In 1985, the property owner applied to demolish the buildings to construct sports playing fields. The Historical Commission delayed but did not have the authority at the time to prevent the demolition. The house and three outbuildings were demolished in 1986. The carriage house, the currently nominated building, was retained, not demolished, and incorporated into a building with athletic facilities. After the demolition, the Historical Commission rescinded the designation of the entire property. This nomination proposes to redesignate the carriage house, but not the remainder of the property.



**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation E but not Criterion A. The staff contends that an altered, decontextualized carriage house does not have the capacity to represent the development of country seats along School House Lane in the nineteenth century.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the carriage house building, a portion of the property at 3001 W. School House Lane, satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:01:15

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Steven Peitzman represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Mr. Farnham noted that the Historical Commission sent the requisite notice letters and also sent a reminder email to a representative of the property owner but did not receive a response.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Nancy Pontone supported the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer spoke.
- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The existing carriage house/stable at 3001 W. School House Lane was constructed circa 1889 on the Woodside estate of Edward T. Steel.
- The Woodside estate, which included at the time a large house, the existing carriage house, a cow shed, log tool shed, and gardener's cottage, was designated and listed on the Philadelphia Register in 1984.
- In 1985, the property owner applied to demolish the buildings on the Woodside estate to construct sports playing fields. All but the carriage house was demolished. The Historical Commission subsequently rescinded the designation of the property.
- The nomination proposes to redesignate the carriage house, but not the remainder of the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The carriage house was designed by prominent local architect Addison Hutton, satisfying Criterion E.
- The carriage house of the former Woodside estate of Edward T. Steel represents the development of country seats along School House Lane in the nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion J rather than Criterion A as cited in the nomination.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the carriage house building, a portion of the property at 3001 W. School House Lane, satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 3001 W School House Ln</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate; Criterion E and J</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Mattioni</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 704 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Philadelphia Evening Telegraph Building/Las Vegas Lounge

Proposed Action: Reclassify

Property Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to reclassify the property at 704 Chestnut Street from Contributing to Non-contributing in the Chestnut Street East Historic District. The application argues that the building at the site was greatly altered, resulting in a significant loss of architectural character. The top two floors and shaped parapet of the five-story building were removed between 1923 and 1959, probably in 1930s, when alterations were completed for a restaurant. The storefront area has been altered many times and retains no original features.

The application notes that the Historical Commission set a precedent when it amended the classifications of two similar buildings from Contributing to Non-contributing at the time it designated the district in November 2021. The Historical Commission changed the classifications of the properties at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street at the request of the property owner for the same reasons as cited in this request, loss of architectural character. The Historical Commission found at the time of the designation of the district, when it classified the properties at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street as Non-contributing, that:

The buildings at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street were originally five stories in height and altered to two stories in the first half of the twentieth century. The building at 705 Chestnut Street was reclad in 1942, and both properties had additional alterations to their storefronts over time. The building envelopes have been substantially altered from their historic form and are no longer able to represent their historic character.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that, in light of the precedent set by the Historical Commission's changes of the classifications of the properties at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street, where upper floors were removed and storefronts altered, the property at 704 Chestnut Street should be reclassified from Contributing to Non-contributing in the Chestnut Street East Historic District.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission retain the Contributing classification of the property at 704 Chestnut Street in the inventory of the Chestnut Street East Historic District.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:14:02

**RECUSAL:**

- Ms. Washington recused, owing to the fact that the organization for which she works has retained the attorney representing this application for an unrelated matter.

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Phillips introduced himself and stated that the reclassification application for 704 Chestnut Street and the overbuild application for 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, next on the agenda, are interrelated. He noted that his structural engineer is in attendance and can comment on the condition of the building and engineer aspects of the applications. He also indicated that he would like the Historical Commission's comments on the overbuild regardless of the outcome of the reclassification application.
- Mr. Phillips stated that he is seeking to reclassify 704 Chestnut Street from contributing to non-contributing, owing to the significant changes to the building that resulted in the removal of its character-defining features. He presented images and photographs of the building at several points in its history. He stated that the five-story building dating to 1896 was cut down to three stories in the twentieth century, resulting in the loss of all character-defining features. He also noted that the storefront has been replaced several times. He showed photographs of nearby buildings that retain their architectural character. He stated that the building that remains at 704 Chestnut Street is a "stump" and should be reclassified as non-contributing.
  - Mr. Thomas agreed that it is a "stump," but he noted that it does retain some of its architectural ornament between the windows at the second and third floors. He stated that the "stump" building is a complete building.
- Mr. Phillips pointed out that the staff recommended reclassifying the property to non-contributing. He stated that the two bay windows at the second and third floors, the surviving historic elements of the 1896 building, do not contribute to the district. He added that the proposed new development will invigorate the area.
- Mr. Mattioni opined that the case made by Mr. Phillips is very compelling. He concluded that the surviving section of the historic building does not contribute to the historic district.

- Ms. Cooperman disagreed and stated that the Committee on Historic Designation concluded that enough of the historic building survives and that the surviving two floors have a relationship to the building to the west. She stated that the surviving segment of the historic building is an “aesthetic whole.”
- Mr. O’Donnell agreed with Mr. Mattioni and stated that, at best, only 40% of the visible portion of the historic building survives. He stated that the building has lost its architectural integrity and therefore lost its historic significance. He concluded that Mr. Phillips has made a strong argument for reclassification.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the remaining two floors of the historic building at 704 Chestnut Street reflect the character of the historic district. He noted that the period of significance of the historic district runs from 1842 to 1965. The alterations to the building were likely made in middle of that period. Commenting on Mr. O’Donnell’s observation that only 40% of the historic façade survives, or three of five floors have been altered or removed, Mr. Steinke observed that 66% of the surviving building, two of three floors, is historic. Mr. Steinke acknowledged that two of five floors were removed, and the ground floor was entirely altered. He claimed that most storefronts are altered and replaced over time. With regard to the properties at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street, which the Historical Commission reclassified from contributing to non-contributing, he stated that their upper floors were removed, and their remaining facades were altered. He concluded that the building at 704 Chestnut Street should be restored and repurposed.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that the south side of the 700-block of Chestnut Street is one of the most important in the historic district. He added that it was an important location for printers and engravers. He stated that the removal of the upper floors was completed during the period of significance of the historic district. He noted that the Historical Commission has designated buildings that have had floors removed. Mr. Beisert objected to the proposed overbuild.
- Mason Carter stated that the altered building contributes to the historic district and should be restored.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that his organization always objects to the reclassification of buildings regardless of the circumstances. He stated that the owner should have objected to the classification at the time the historic district was designated.
  - It was pointed out that the owner of this property did appeal the designation of the historic district, which lead to this review.
- Hal Schirmer observed that the current storefront projects out from the plane of the façade, which may indicate that an older storefront survives behind it. He suggested rebuilding the missing floors.
- Katie Low introduced herself as a neighbor and stated that the Historical Commission was breaking its rules by considering an amendment to the classification. She stated that the Historical Commission designated this historic district recently and should not be amending the classifications. The owner should have addressed the classification when the historic district was considered for designation. She stated that amending the classification would be a violation of the Historical Commission’s rules. She concluded that this is politics, not preservation.
  - Mr. Farnham objected to Ms. Low’s contention that the Historical Commission was breaking its rules by considering this application to amend the classification. He stated that both the City’s historic preservation ordinance and the Historical

Commission's Rules and Regulations authorize the Historical Commission to review applications proposing the amendments of historic districts including amendments to classifications of properties. He stated that the historic preservation ordinance would likely be deemed unconstitutional if it did not provide an avenue to amend designations. He concluded that the Historical Commission was obligated to review this application and is in complete compliance with the ordinance and Rules and Regulations.

- Steven Peitzman objected to the reclassification.
- Mary McGettigan stated that the Commissioners who do not have backgrounds in architecture or architectural history or historic preservation are not qualified to express opinions about whether this building contributes to the historic district.
  - Mr. Thomas interrupted Ms. McGettigan and stated that her comment was extremely inappropriate. He explained to her that the Historical Commission is explicitly and deliberately comprised of Commissioners of various backgrounds so that they can represent all points of view of Philadelphians. He stated that it was unfair to criticize Commissioners and claim that their opinions are invalid. He stated that the Commissioners are intended to represent various positions, not just historic preservation. They represent affordable housing, real estate development, and other social and economic positions and communities.
- Wesley Noonan-Sessa stated that this building is a good candidate for a "facadectomy."
  - Mr. Thomas pointed to the Curtis Institute building on the 1600-block of Locust Street as a successful "facadectomy" project.
- Jim Duffin stated that the façade could be deconstructed and then reconstructed in its historic form.

#### **ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Phillips stated that the persons who claimed that his client, the owner of the properties, should have participated in the review of the nomination but did not are mistaken. He stated that he filed a timely appeal of the designation on behalf of his client in the Court of Common Pleas to contest the inclusion of the properties in the historic district. He explained that he withdrew the appeal after the City's Law Department suggested that he could apply to amend the designation and then appeal that decision, if necessary, instead of proceeding directly to court. Therefore, this application to reclassify the property is a direct outgrowth of the property owner's participation in the designation review.
- Mr. Phillips asked the staff to display the historic district nomination on the screen. He pointed out a photograph of the south side of the 700-block of Chestnut Street and noted that most of the buildings are in excellent condition and are worthy of contributing classifications. He then asserted that 704 Chestnut Street is not. He then moved to photographs of the buildings at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street and noted that they were cut down from five stories to two and were altered at the storefronts. When the owner requested that the Historical Commission change their classification from contributing to non-contributing, the Historical Commission agreed. He noted that the buildings at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street were also altered during the period of significance, yet the Historical Commission reclassified them.
- Mr. Phillips stated that two floors of bay windows is not enough for the Historical Commission to mandate the preservation of the building at 704 Chestnut Street. He added that he has a structural engineer ready to testify about the condition of the

building, which is poor. He concluded that the building should be reclassified as non-contributing.

- Mr. McCoubrey responded that the developer should retain the building, restore the façade, and construct an overbuild on it. He noted that the Historical Commission would review the proposal to ensure that it was compatible with the building and district.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that “character-defining features” is a phrase that relates to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and to the review of building permit applications. It is not relevant to a designation discussion. She concluded that the remnant of the historic building was created during the period of significance and is representative of the historic district.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building that was constructed at the site in 1896 was five stories tall with an ornate pediment or shaped parapet.
- The top two floors and the ornate pediment were removed in the twentieth century.
- The storefront has been replaced several times.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Despite the alterations to the building, the property at 704 Chestnut Street retains sufficient character and qualities to warrant a contributing classification in the inventory of the Chestnut Street East Commercial Historic District

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to deny the request to reclassify the property at 704 Chestnut Street from contributing to non-contributing in the inventory of the Chestnut Street East Commercial Historic District. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4.

<b>ITEM: 704 Chestnut St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Deny reclassification request</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards		X			
O'Donnell (DPP)		X			
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)		X			
Mattioni		X			
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington				X	
Total	6	4		1	2

**ADDRESS: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST**

Proposal: Demolish building, construct addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Herb Schultz, Studio HS4

History: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

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

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. Currently, both buildings, at 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District. In parallel with this application, the applicant is requesting that the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission reclassify the property at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing to the historic district. If the Historical Commission declines to reclassify 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, then it cannot approve the demolition without a finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building has no feasible reuse.

The addition would be constructed at 704 Chestnut Street and would extend onto the six-story historic building at 700-02 Chestnut Street. The addition would be 13 stories tall, with seven new stories on the six-story historic building. The historic building is 76'-4" tall to the roof. The enlarged building would be 160'-3" to the roof and 171'-7" to the top of the mechanical penthouse.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish the three-story building at 704 Chestnut Street;
- Construct an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - If the building at 704 Chestnut Street is classified as contributing, the demolition of the building will destroy historic materials and features, and therefore will not satisfy Standard 9.
  - If the addition is constructed, it will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and will not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... or of a building ... located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district,*

*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.*

- If the building at 704 Chestnut Street is classified as contributing, the demolition of the building cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance 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.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and, depending on the outcome of the reclassification review, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the in-concept application, pursuant to Standard 9 and, depending on the outcome of the reclassification review, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code, the prohibitions against demolition.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 03:23:01

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and architect Herb Schultz represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Phillips stated that this is an in-concept application. His clients are at the beginning of the project and are looking for feedback on their initial plans. He acknowledged that the decision a few minutes ago to decline to reclassify 704 Chestnut Street will impact their plans. Mr. Phillips asked for comments on a facadectomy as well as a deconstruction and reconstruction at 704 Chestnut Street. He stated that their ultimate goal is to unify the two buildings and construct an overbuild. He observed that Jones Restaurant at 700-02 Chestnut Street has closed and both buildings are struggling with vacancies. He stated that this section of Center City has faced some challenges. He noted that the area is zoned CMX-5, the most permissive zoning. This area needs additional height and density. He stated that this is a corner property, and several nearby buildings are tall. He asked the Historical Commission to balance economic growth and urban growth with historic preservation.
- Mr. Schultz, the project architect, introduced himself. He stated that the application has been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that they increased the size of the setback terrace at the corner and added a setback along 7<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that he also added information about materials. He summarized the architectural plans. He stated that he has engaged a structural engineer. He displayed plans and renderings.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Architectural Committee thought that the proposed overbuild overwhelmed the historic building at the corner and opined that, while a smaller overbuild may be appropriate, the setbacks would need to be increased significantly. He stated that the overbuild would tower over the building at



- the corner as well as the historically significant block, which is four and five stories tall, generally.
- Mr. Lech asked about the height of the overbuild versus the height of the Public Ledger Building, to the east across 7<sup>th</sup> Street.
    - Mr. Schultz stated that the height of the overbuild would be comparable to the height of the Public Ledger Building and the Curtis Building to the south. He showed an image comparing the heights.
  - Mr. McCoubrey asked about the appearance of the west-facing wall.
    - Mr. Schultz displayed an elevation drawing and explained that it would be a party wall with some setbacks and windows. He stated that he could add articulation to the blank sections of the wall.
  - Mr. Thomas suggested that the architect look at the Curtis Institute building on the 1600 block of Locust Street to see how the historic facades were incorporated and the setbacks reduced the masses of the facades. The Royal Theater project on South Street might also provide guidance. He suggested that they might be able to preserve the façade at 704 Chestnut Street and building new structure behind it. He said that they may need to place a temporary structure on Chestnut Street to hold the facade up while they demolish the building behind it and construct a new building.
    - Mr. Schultz noted that he worked on the Rittenhouse Club, where the façade was held up with a temporary structure while a new building was constructed behind it.
  - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that they include the adjacent buildings in their drawings so that the Historical Commission can understand the scale and context. He stated that a large setback will be needed at Chestnut Street. He added that the proposed height is much too tall.
  - Mr. Thomas stated that the John Wanamaker House is also a good example. He said that the tower does not appear to emerge from the historic façade.
  - Mr. McCoubrey stated that he was the architect of the Curtis building. It is a 10-story building in a three and four-story neighborhood. The design hides the tower. It incorporates two historic buildings and changes in floor level.
  - Mr. Phillips stated that Ionic Street at the rear is a service alley.
    - Mr. Thomas stated that it might be able to be cleaned up and used for an entrance. He stated that that was done with the building at the southwest corner of 17<sup>th</sup> and Chestnut Streets at the Bonwit Teller Building.
  - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that setting a taller tower at the southwest corner of the site might work.
  - Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants can propose major work behind the façade of 704 Chestnut Street as long as they keep and perhaps restore the façade. You also have options at the storefront. The building at the southwest corner of Chestnut and Juniper may provide so guidance at the first floor.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the façade at 704 Chestnut Street should be retained and the upper floors perhaps reconstructed. He stated that the Alliance is not opposed to a reasonable overbuild. However, the setbacks should be increased, perhaps with additional height set back. He stated that the Alliance is not opposed to the concept. The design should not be driven by maximizing the zoning envelope, but by an integration of old and new. The Historical Commission

should look for a reasonable, replicable model going forward, given that overbuilds are becoming more prevalent.

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that he is not opposed to an overbuild, but this design needs a lot of work. The Historical Commission should look for a middle ground and require the restoration of the historic facades at 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites objected to the term “overbuild,” saying that it is too trendy. What is proposed should be called a “vertical addition.”
- Katie Low stated that she lives in the neighborhood. She stated that the design needs additional work. She also stated that the neighborhood is challenged because landlords do not try to make their buildings hospitable and habitable.

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Thomas reminded the audience that the application requested an in-concept review, which cannot lead to a building permit but only requests advice. He stated that the Historical Commission had offered its advice, which will be reflected in the minutes, and did not need to take a formal action.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:02:30**

**ACTION:** At 1:05 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Adjournment</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adjourn</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Mattioni</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				2

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission are presented in action format.

Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.

- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, [www.phila.gov/historical](http://www.phila.gov/historical).

### **CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION**

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- (i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.