

**THE MINUTES OF THE 740TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 APRIL 2024, 9:00 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Ms. Washington, the Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined her:

| Commissioner | Present | Absent | Comment |
|---|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian) | | X | |
| Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation) | X | | |
| Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission) | X | | |
| Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian) | X | | |
| Erin Kindt (Department of Public Property) | X | | |
| Sara Lepori (Commerce Department) | | X | Arrived 10:27am |
| 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 | | |
| Matthew Treat (Department of Planning and Development) | 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 III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
- Alex Roederer
- Alina Herzberg
- Alison Petracek
- Amy Lambert

Andrew Biggin
Andy Wasserman
Anthony Mascieri
Audrey Gusick
Beth Johnson, Brighton Architecture and Design LLC
Bill Strehse
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
B. Webster
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNObegin
Catherine Myers
Claudia Becker
Courtney Disston
Daniel Trubman
David A. Schultz, DAS Architects
David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Dennis Carlisle
Eileen Javers
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Ballard Spahr
George Badey
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Ian Toner
Irene Chien
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Jay Farrell
Jay Rockafellow, DAS Architects
Jenn Patrino, Tierview Development
Joyce Lenhardt
Judy Neiswander
Justin Krik, Esq.
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Keith Scheurich
Kevin McMahon
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City Philadelphia
Krista Gebbia, CH Conservancy
Lawrence McEwen
Lea Litvin, LO Design
Leah Silverstein
Lia Gentile
Lisa Ernst
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Mary McGettigan
Mason Carter
Meredith Ferleger, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Michael Drury
Michael McIlhinney, Esq.
Michael Ramos
Mike Badey
Mike Stanton
Nancy Pontone

Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
 Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Civic Association
 Paul Boni, Esq., Society Hill Civic Association
 Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
 Rick Herskovitz
 Robert Powers
 Sacia Tan
 Steven Peitzman
 Sudev Sheth
 Tim Lux, Tierview Development
 Tina Marie Hartnett

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 739TH STATED MEETING, 8 MARCH 2024

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:20

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Washington asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 739th Stated Meeting, held 8 March 2024. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to adopt the minutes of the 739th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 March 2024. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 739th Stated Meeting of the PHC | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Adopt minutes | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Washington | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | | | | | X |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | | | | | X |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 8 | | | | 3 |

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

ADDRESS: 775 S CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD

Name of Resource: Piers 38 and 40 South
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Pier 38-40 LLC
Nominator: Keeping Society
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Southwark Municipal Piers 38 and 40, located at 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, as historic and list the property on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the piers, constructed between 1914 and 1915, satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the piers represent the establishment and enlargement of the Port of Philadelphia as a municipal program to spur commercial activity through the creation of a system of municipal piers along the Delaware River waterfront. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the piers represent an era of civic architecture inspired by the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago and possess distinguishing characteristics of the Beaux Arts style of architecture. Under Criterion H, the nomination states that the massive piers form an established and familiar visual feature of the Southwark neighborhood, the City of Philadelphia, and the Delaware River. The staff notes that the nomination would benefit from some editing and fact checking. The staff corrected some obvious errors, for example revising the name of Mayor Blankenburg's director of the Department of Public Works, who was Morris Cooke, not Frederick Winslow Taylor, on page 34. Other errors remain; for example, the statement on page 26 that the Benjamin Franklin Parkway was planned as early as 1906 and the groundbreaking took place in 1917 is incorrect. Planning, in fact, began in the nineteenth century and the official groundbreaking, the demolition of some houses in the boulevard's path, occurred in 1907.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, and J.

ACTION: See Below.

ADDRESS: 2313 GREEN ST

Proposal: Demolish garage, construct three-story residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Laura and Anil Nanda
Applicant: Lea Litvin, LO Design
History: 1908; garage built 1954
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing a non-historic garage and constructing a three-story residential building at the open rear area of 2313 Green Street. The new construction would face Wallace Street and would not connect to the historic building. The proposed building is planned as three stories tall and would contain five residential units. The proposed cladding material is a mix of red brick and gray metal standing-seam siding. Windows

are proposed as single-light openings. A garage with a roll down door would be located on the first level facing Wallace Street.

Views of the proposed new building are largely obscured by surrounding buildings, fencing, and landscaping. The most visible area of the building would be the north and west elevations. The north elevation would be visible from a driveway entry along Wallace Street. The west wall would be visible from Wallace Street during part of the year or if one or more trees were removed from the adjacent property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish a non-historic two-story garage.
- Construct a three-story building with a roof deck.

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, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The 1954 garage building was constructed outside of the historic district's period of significance (1901-1950) and is not physically connected to the historic building. Therefore, it is not considered contributing to the property and may be demolished, meeting Standard 9.
 - The size and scale of the proposed building is compatible with the historic building and district, meeting Standard 9.
 - The proportion and features of the window openings and single-light windows are not compatible with the overall historic district and do not meet Standard 9.
 - While the red brick is compatible with the historic district, the dark standing seam siding is not. Although much of the new building will not be seen from the public right-of-way, owing to the visibility of the standing seam metal on the north and west walls. The application does not meet 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.*
 - Since the new construction is separated from the historic building, the application satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided additional brick is added to the west elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:55

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance requests to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Brett Feldman represented the property at 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard and explained reasons for the continuance request.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to continue the review of 775 S. Christopher Columbus Boulevard to the September 2024 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and 2313 Green Street to the May 2024 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| ITEM: Continuances | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Approve continuances | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Washington | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | | | | | X |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | | | | | X |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 8 | | | | 3 |

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MARCH 2024

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:14:25

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 208-10 Rex Avenue and 2200-04 Locust Street. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: Consent Agenda | | | | | |
| MOTION: Adopt Architectural Committee recommendations for Consent Agenda | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Washington | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | | | | | X |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 9 | | | | 2 |

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 6915 GERMANTOWN AVE

Proposal: Construct four-story apartment building on subdivided parcel
 Review Requested: Final Approval
 Owner: Tier View Development
 Applicant: Zach Jones, CANNO Design
 History: 1798; Joseph Gorgas House
 Individual Designation: 5/28/1957
 District Designation: None
 Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The property at 6901 Germantown Avenue, located at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane, includes a late-eighteenth-century stone structure, the Joseph Gorgas House, and a large parking lot at the side and rear. The property’s large open space historically functioned as a side and rear yard. Aside from a wood-frame shed or stable building at the rear of the stone house, historic maps show that no other structures existed on the site. The property was recently subdivided along the western edge of the Joseph Gorgas House to create 6903 Germantown Avenue, which was then consolidated with the neighboring property at 6915 Germantown Avenue. This application proposes to construct a four-story, multi-unit building on this newly consolidated lot with frontages on Germantown Avenue and Gorgas Lane.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this project in December 2023 and then significantly revised the design for the January 2024 meeting of the Historical Commission. This submission responds to feedback offered at those meetings by increasing the setback from the front corner of the Joseph Gorgas House compared to what was originally proposed and using materials that better respond to the historic structure.

This proposal specifically responds to comments from the Historical Commission, which

encouraged the design team to use early twentieth-century apartment buildings in the area as inspiration, breaking up the façade with vertical and horizontal lines.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story, multi-unit building on a consolidated parcel that includes a portion of a designated property.

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 new work does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
 - The new work is differentiated from the old and is compatible in materials, but not in massing, size, and scale to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - The application partially satisfies this Standard.
- Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction:
 - *Recommended: Considering the design for related new construction in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district and setting.*
 - *Recommended: Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationships of solids to voids, and color.*
 - *Recommended: Distinguishing the addition from the original building by setting it back from the wall plane of the historic building.*
 - *Recommended: Locating new construction far enough away from the historic building, when possible, where it will be minimally visible and will not negatively affect the building's character, the site, or setting.*
 - The façade facing Germantown Avenue is closer to the street than is typical for residential buildings in the neighborhood.
 - The proposed building does not defer to the Joseph Gorgas House and is sited closer to Germantown Avenue than the historic structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new construction is set farther away from the Joseph Gorgas House, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:16:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Carey Jackson Yonce represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society suggested cladding the wall neighboring the Joseph Gorgas House entirely in brick.
- Mason Carter expressed concerns for the existing trees on the property.
- Claudia Becker commented in opposition to the application, citing Standard 9.
- David Traub agreed that the façade near the historic house should be brick and expressed ambivalence about the size of the proposed building.
- Allison Weiss commented in opposition to the proposal, echoing previous concerns about the materials and size of the building and the existing trees.
- Lori Salganicoff expressed opposition to the proposal, suggesting that a step back near the historic house would be more appropriate.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicants responded to the majority of the comments offered by the Architectural Committee and have taken steps to shift the building away from the historic house and neighboring properties on Gorgas Lane to better comply with Standard 9 and the Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction.
- A solid brick façade would make a better backdrop for the Joseph Gorgas House.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposal is consistent with the historic materials and architectural features of the neighboring historic structure, provided the entire side wall facing the Joseph Gorgas House and Gorgas is clad in brick, satisfying Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the brick along the Gorgas Lane facade is continuous, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by a vote of 6 to 3.

| ITEM: 6915 Germantown Ave | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Approval | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Mattioni | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | | X | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | | X | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | | | | | X |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | | X | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 6 | 3 | | | 2 |

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition and two freestanding houses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William H. Baltzell

Applicant: Jeffery Watson, BartonPartners

History: 1857; William L. Hirst/H. Louis Duhring House; additions 1893; 1927 by H. Louis Duhring

Individual Designation: 2/12/2021

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition and two freestanding residential buildings on the parcel at 208-10 Rex Avenue. The existing property features a large Italianate villa with an Arts and Crafts addition designed by H. Louis Duhring, who was also the owner of the property from 1919 to 1946. The historic building is surrounded by a large yard and has featured a semi-circular driveway since at least 1876.

The Historical Commission and Architectural Committee have reviewed several iterations of this project. Most recently, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application at its December 2023 meeting that addressed many of the Committee and Commission's earlier concerns and voted to recommend approval of the addition, provided the existing dormer on the rear of the Duhring addition is maintained and the masonry on the addition is lowered to first-floor sill height and below, and existing steel windows be maintained or replaced in kind; and conceptual approval of the freestanding houses. Following that meeting, the applicants revised components of the design to address the Committee's comments about the dormers and cladding of the new construction and additions, but also revised the site plan, shifting the new construction closer to the street and more into view from the public right-of-way. The revised application was presented at the Historical Commission's February 2024 meeting. At that time, the Historical Commission found that the freestanding buildings should be shifted back at least 10 feet on the site; that the color of the siding of the proposed freestanding buildings should be less creamy and more recessive; and that the stone base on the proposed freestanding buildings, particularly the elevation facing Rex Avenue, should be lowered and larger windows installed in the garage to create more traditional window proportions. The Commission remanded the application to the Architectural Committee, and the applicants have since revised the application further to address the concerns raised, including by shifting the freestanding buildings back on the site, adjusting the color of the cladding, lowering the street-facing windows, and replacing the concrete curbing along the driveway with pavers.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate historic building.
- Construct rear addition.
- Construct two free-standing buildings and new driveway

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *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 will 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 project involves limited removal of historic materials and retains the spatial relationship of the historic building to the curved driveway and large yard.

- The new construction will be differentiated from but compatible with the historic materials, features, and massing to protect the property and its environment.
- The application satisfies this Standard.
- *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.*
 - If the proposed rear addition and new construction buildings were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would remain, satisfying Standard 10.
- *Guidelines for New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings and Related New Construction, Recommended:*
 - *Designing new construction on a historic site or in a historic setting that it is compatible but differentiated from the historic building or buildings.*
 - *Constructing a new addition on a secondary or non-character-defining elevation and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.*
 - *Ensuring that the addition is subordinate and secondary to the historic building and is compatible in massing, scale, materials, relationships of solids to voids, and color.*
 - *Distinguishing the addition from the original building by setting it back from the wall plane of the historic building.*
 - *Locating new construction far enough away from the historic building, when possible, where it will be minimally visible and will not negatively affect the building's character, the site, or setting.*
 - The proposed rear addition is located on the least visible elevation, is subordinate to the historic building, and is set back from the wall plane of the historic building.
 - The new construction is located far enough away from the historic building to limit the impact on the building's character, site and setting.
 - The application satisfies this Guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guideline for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guideline for New Exterior Additions and Related New Construction.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2200-04 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: George J. Badey III

Applicant: Michael Drury, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1904; Henry Butcher House; Field & Medary, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house at 2200-04 Locust Street.

The property is a significant historic resource to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish section of upper roof.
- Construct 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 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner such that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - Demolition is limited to a small, non-visible section of the upper roof. All proposed work is reversible and could be removed in the future; therefore, this element of the project meets Standard 10.
- *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 proposed roof addition could meet the Roofs Guideline if the pilot house was lowered in height by one to two feet. The roof mockup shows the flag visible 12 feet above the roof deck from viewpoints looking toward primary facades along Locust and S. 22nd Streets. The height of the pilot house is currently proposed to be 10 feet. If the pilot house is reduced in height by one to two feet, it will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street.
 - The proposed roof deck and railing could meet the Roofs Guideline if they are moved back five feet from Locust Street (east) and S. 22nd Street (north) elevations. With the additional setback, the railing will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street.
 - Elements of the roof deck structure and railing on the west elevation may be visible from the east further down Locust Street, but they will likely be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced and roof deck is set back further along Locust Street and S. 22nd Street, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the pilot house is reduced and the roof deck is set

back further along S. 22nd Street, pursuant to Standard 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 627 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 627 N 16TH LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on an Italianate twin at a contributing property in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building was constructed in 1875 and is three stories tall with a pitched roof and prominent cornice. The addition will be located at the rear of the building and span the full width of the lot. The application proposes to demolish the three-story rear wall of the property along with a one-story rear shed addition and construct an addition at the rear of the building that will expand the footprint and extend slightly higher than the current rear ell of the historic building. It will be clad in fiber cement panels and feature six windows on the rear elevation but none on the side, party walls. The rear of the building is visible both obliquely from the front on 16th Street looking down the side of the building and prominently from the side and rear along neighboring Wallace Street. The addition will be visible both from 16th and Wallace Streets and particularly will present a large blank wall to the Wallace Street side.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a three-story 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 shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large, wide, and is not compatible with the historic materials, massing, size, and scale of the historic building or district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends 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: 00:37:05

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Ian Toner and property owner Anthony Mascieri represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jill Wasserman, a neighbor on the same block, opposed the application.
- Lisa Ernst, a next-door neighbor, opposed the application.
- Andrew Biggin, a next-door neighbor, opposed the application.
- Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation and Spring Garden Civic Association opposed the application.
- Hannah Stark of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia opposed the application.
- Anthony Mascieri, a representative of the property's owners, commented in support of the application.
- Andy Wasserman, a neighbor on the same block, opposed the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised design is an improvement over the original design and features more appropriate brick cladding materials and more windows on its visible portions.
- The addition is large and will extend significantly in the rear yard of the lot, a character-defining feature of the houses on the block.
- The addition will be highly visible from the public right-of-way on Wallace Street.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9. It is too large, and is not compatible with the historic materials, massing, size, and scale of the historic building or district.

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

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 627 N 16th St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Denial | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | | | | | X |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 9 | | | | 2 |

ADDRESS: 336 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Enlarge existing roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lia Gentile

Applicant: Elizabeth Johnson, Brighton Architecture and Design LLC

History: 1840; alterations, c. 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge an existing roof deck at 336 South 17th Street, a contributing property in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The property is situated on the southwest corner of S. 17th and Panama Streets. This block of Panama is a narrow dead-end segment of the street, with both garages and residential properties fronting the street. The existing deck is 11' x 16', with a portion being roughly 7' x 13'. The proposed roof deck extension would enlarge the deck by 5' x 28'-8" and result in a zero-foot setback from Panama Street. There is currently, and will continue to be, a 15' setback from S. 17th Street.

The property owner originally applied for a roof deck at this property in early 2020 and the matter was reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 25 February 2020. The original proposal called for a roof deck that was 11' x 37' with a 7'-3" setback from S. 17th Street and a 5' setback from Panama Street and a nine-foot-tall pilot house. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval provided the deck was set back from the front façade to align with the pilot house; the height of the pilot house roof was minimized; the structural beams were revised on the Panama Street side to reduce visibility; and the back of the deck was moved away from the rear wall, with the staff to review details. The architect revised the plans to incorporate that feedback and the matter was placed on the Consent Agenda of the March 2020 Historical Commission meeting. Owing to the pandemic, plans were put on hold and a building permit was finally issued in May 2023.

The property owner contends that the property has a small, concrete pad as a yard, with no real usable outdoor space, and the roof deck, as built, has not provided sufficient outdoor space for the owner's needs. The property owner has indicated that she is very willing to consider any and all design options, materials, etc. that might be agreeable to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Extend existing roof deck by 5' x 28'-8"

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed deck does not meet Standard 9 as the roof deck, which would be visible from both S. 17th Street and Panama Street, would interfere with the historic integrity of the property and its environment, especially the narrow and picturesque Panama Street.
- *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 proposed deck does not meet the Roofs Guideline, owing to the high visibility of the proposed deck from both South 17th Street and Panama Street.

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 1:05:58

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Elizabeth Johnson and property owner Lia Gentile represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub spoke in opposition to the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The proposed railing on this corner property would be highly visible from the public right-of-way.
- With a deck at this location, there would be no material choice or design option that could make the deck less conspicuous.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 9, as the proposed deck would diminish the historic integrity of the property and its environment, especially the narrow and picturesque Panama Street.
- The application fails to satisfy the Roofs Guideline, as the deck extension would not be inconspicuous or minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Michel seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 336 S 17th St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Denial, Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Michel | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | X | | | | |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 10 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 708 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct 35-story mixed-use tower

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: JR Sansom Partners LLC

Applicant: Meredith Ferleger, Dilworth Paxson LLP

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Jewelers' Row Historic District, Non-contributing, pending

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a 35-story mixed-use retail and residential tower at 708 Sansom Street. The property known as 708 Sansom Street is an assemblage of vacant lots formerly known as 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street. The property is in the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District. The district nomination is pending before the Historical Commission, which continued the review of the nomination in May 2020 until the Historical Commission resumes in-person meetings.

The proposed building would be 35 stories in height, with a 31-story tower on a four-story podium. The building would have frontages on Sansom Street and S. 7th Street. The entrance to the retail space would be located on Sansom Street. The entrance to the residential lobby,

parking, and loading dock would be located on 7th Street. The building would be clad in aluminum and glass. The top of the podium would align with the cornice height of the building to the west. Floors 5 to 20 would cantilever 7'-6" to the west, out over the building at 712-14 Sansom Street. Floors 21 to 35 would cantilever 4'-6" to the west.

The Historical Commission must determine the scope of its jurisdiction over this application, full jurisdiction or review-and-comment jurisdiction. Section 14-1005(4) of the preservation ordinance states that "the Historical Commission's scope of review of applications for building permits for construction, as defined herein, shall be limited to a 45-day period of comment." Section 14-203(76) of the ordinance defines "construction" as "the erection of a new building, structure, or object upon an undeveloped site." Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations defines an "undeveloped site" as:

a property within an historic district which is not individually designated, to which the inventory in the historic district nomination attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value, and upon which no building or structure stood at the time of the designation of the historic district.

The site at 708 Sansom Street is not individually designated; the inventory for the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District does not attribute any value to the vacant lot; and no structure stands on the site currently. The site at 708 Sansom Street is an "undeveloped site." However, some floors of the proposed building would cantilever 7'-6" over the property to the west, perhaps changing that determination. While the Historical Commission has reviewed and approved at least two applications involving towers with cantilevers over adjacent properties, neither involved an "undeveloped site." Therefore, those cases do not shed any light on this question.

In February 2020, the Historical Commission reviewed and commented on an application proposing to construct a 24-story mixed-use retail and residential tower at this site at 708 Sansom Street. At that time, the Historical Commission concluded that its jurisdiction was limited to review-and-comment because the site was "undeveloped." The 24-story tower project was eventually abandoned.

If the Historical Commission determines that it enjoys full, not review-and-comment, jurisdiction over this site because it is not "undeveloped," owing to the cantilever, then the application is subject to the 90-day clock in Section 14-1005(6)(f) of the preservation ordinance. For properties under consideration for designation like this one, the Department of Licenses & Inspections is prohibited from issuing a building permit unless the Historical Commission approves the application, or the Historical Commission does not take a final action on the nomination within 90 days of the submission of the application. In other words, if the Historical Commission does not designate the district within 90 days of the submission of the application, the Department of Licenses & Inspections may issue the permit regardless of the Commission's opinion of the proposal. The application was submitted on 12 March 2024. The 90-day review period will end on 10 June 2024, prior to the Historical Commission's meeting on 14 June 2024. Given that the Historical Commission has no plans to resume in-person meetings in the next few months and has committed to providing new 60-day notice to property owners in the proposed district before resuming the review of the nomination for the Jewelers' Row Historic District, it appears unlikely that the Historical Commission will complete the designation of the historic district within the allotted 90 days and the Department may issue the permit without the Commission's approval.

Since the Architectural Committee's review, the applicant revised the design of the podium with

the intent of making it more compatible with the proposed historic district. Also, the attorney for the developer submitted a legal memorandum that concludes that the Historical Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over the application, but not full jurisdiction.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 35-story tower.

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.*
 - Given that the property where the tower will be constructed is a vacant lot, the new construction will not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9. The four-story base or podium of the proposed building is not compatible with its environment in scale or architectural features, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9. It should be redesigned to be more compatible with the proposed historic district.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that, to satisfy Standard 9, the base of the proposed tower should be redesigned to be more compatible with the proposed historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial and suggested that the applicants focus on revisions to the podium of the building to make it more compatible with the proposed historic district and to better relate to the pedestrian experience.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:17:14

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Meredith Ferleger, architects David Schultz and Jay Rockafellow, and developers Reed Slogoff and James Pearlstein represented the application. Ms. Ferleger asserted that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction should be limited to comment only, not full jurisdiction. Messrs. Schultz and Rockafellow presented the design to the Historical Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON JURISDICTION:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society advocated for the Historical Commission to assert full jurisdiction over the application.
- Daniel Trubman contended that the Historical Commission does not have full jurisdiction over the application and should only comment on it.
- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Historical Commission should determine that it has full jurisdiction over the application.
- Hal Schirmer stated that the Historical Commission should determine that it has full jurisdiction over the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED BUILDING:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that the proposed building should be redesigned to be more compatible with the historic district. The canopy or trellis over the parking entry should be removed.
- David Traub of Save Our Sights stated that the application should show the front elevations of all of the buildings on the 700 block of Sansom Street. He stated that the podium should be clad in masonry. He stated that the tower is too large.
- Hal Schirmer stated that the Historical Commission should designate historic districts within 90 days.
- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the applicant has not provided adequate elevations and renderings of the facades of the building. He stated that the color of the podium façade should be lighter. He stated that the parking entrance should be redesigned.
- Allison Weiss of SoLo/Germantown Civic Association stated that the proposed building is oversized and out of character.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The lot at 708 Sansom Street is a vacant lot that meets the criteria to be considered an undeveloped site at Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.
- The proposed building at 708 Sansom Street would cantilever out over the adjacent building at 712-14 Sansom Street, above the roofline of the adjacent building, and would abut the adjacent building at the shared party wall, but the proposed building would not attach to or internally connect to the adjacent building.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections has informed the Historical Commission that it would not require a separate building permit for 712-14 Sansom Street to construct the building at 708 Sansom Street as documented in this application.
- The Law Department has advised the Historical Commission that it cannot state as a matter of law that the Historical Commission enjoys either comment or plenary jurisdiction over this application. The Historical Commission must interpret the City's historic preservation ordinance and its Rules & Regulations and make its own determination about the appropriate level of jurisdiction.
- Section 14-201(14) of the Zoning Code states that "Where the meaning of a restriction in this Zoning Code is ambiguous and the intent cannot be discerned through the usual rules of statutory construction, the restriction shall be construed in favor of the landowner, provided that the resulting construction does not lead to irrationality in the Zoning Code." To the extent that there is ambiguity in the in the code and regulations regarding determining whether a site is undeveloped, this section of the code requires that the Historical Commission find in favor of the landowner and conclude that the site is undeveloped.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application proposes "construction," as defined at Section 14-203(76) of the Philadelphia Code, because the site is "undeveloped," as defined in Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission Rules & Regulations, and therefore its jurisdiction over the application is comment only, not plenary.

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The height, bulk, and massing of the tower are too large for the context.
- The design of the podium of the tower, including the materials, colors, rhythms, scale, and features, could be improved to be more compatible with the adjacent buildings, streetscape, and historic district. The design was, however, improved with the revisions made after the Architectural Committee meeting.
- The trellis or canopy over the parking entrance is too large.

ACTION: Mr. Lech moved to find that the application proposes “construction,” as defined at Section 14-203(76) of the Philadelphia Code, because the site is “undeveloped,” as defined in Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission Rules & Regulations, and therefore its jurisdiction over the application is comment only, not plenary. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by a vote of 9 to 1.

| ITEM: 708 Sansom St | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| MOTION: Jurisdiction limited to comment | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Lech | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Carney | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | | X | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | X | | | | |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 9 | 1 | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 1827-31 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Valerie Rushmere

Applicant: Maggie McDevitt, Renewal by Andersen

History: 1875; Carriage Houses; cornice removed, all openings altered

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing six Anderson Fibrex windows on the front façades of these former carriage houses, historically associated with Green Street properties. The Brandywine Street buildings have been altered over the years and previously functioned as a heating and plumbing shop beginning in 1914, a floor layer’s shop, and then a sheet metal shop beginning in the 1950s. According to zoning archive documents, it appears that many of the façade opening alterations date to the 1950s. No historic windows remain.

This application proposes replacement of two mansard windows and four second-floor windows with Andersen Renewal Series Fibrex double-hung inserts with no muntins. The application does not include drawings that show how the subframes of the Fibrex window would fit the existing frames. Based on a 1975 photograph showing two-over-two sash in the mansard windows, and the construction date of the buildings, the Historical Commission's staff concluded that two-over-two sash are appropriate throughout, and that an alternate material window could be appropriate for this particular property. However, the application does not provide sufficient information to understand if the Fibrex window can be installed in such a way that it does not build down the window opening.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing non-historic windows; install Fibrex windows.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in design or materials and therefore fail to satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:35:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Window sales representative Keith Scheurich represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant is now seeking approval for single casements without muntins for the second-floor windows, and double-hung inserts without muntins for the mansard windows.
- The application has been supplemented with window section drawings.
- A 1975 photograph shows two-over-two sash in the mansard windows.
- The second-floor window openings have been altered over the years, and no historic windows remain on the building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Replacement of the mansard windows with two-over-two double-hung sash will satisfy Standard 6. The second-floor windows can be replaced with single casements

because evidence of the original window configuration does not exist, and the window openings have been altered over the years with the change in use of the building.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the mansard windows are two-over-two double-hung sash, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 1827-31 Brandywine St | | | | | |
| MOTION: Approval with condition | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Carney | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | X | | | | |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 10 | | | | 1 |

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1503-05 WALNUT ST

Name of Resource: City National Bank Building
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: PR Walnut Associates LP
 Nominator: Center City Residents' Association
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1503-05 Walnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building, constructed between 1930 and 1931 for the City National Bank, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion C, the nomination claims that the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Art Deco style of architecture, during which several related modernist movements in Philadelphia became the dominant aesthetics for commercial buildings. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the stylized geometrical ornamentation, low-relief decorative panels, and other flourishes on the façade are distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style as applied to commercial buildings in Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1503-05 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1503-05 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:43:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Mr. Farnham noted that a representative of the owner had informed the Historical Commission's staff that the owner would not oppose the designation and would not be participating in the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- 1503-05 Walnut Street was constructed between 1930 and 1931 for the City National Bank.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Art Deco style of architecture, satisfying Criterion C.
- The stylized geometrical ornamentation, low-relief decorative panels, and other flourishes on the façade are distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style as applied to commercial buildings in Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1503-05 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 1503-05 Walnut St. | | | | | |
| MOTION: Designate; Criteria C and D | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Carney | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | X | | | | |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 10 | | | | 1 |

ADDRESS: 8835 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Julia Hebard Marsden Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: CHH Community Health

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Julia Hebard Marsden residence 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 with stable is representative example 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.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination at its November 2022 meeting. The review has been continued since that time to allow the property owner and community representatives to meet and discuss plans for the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the site at 8835 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. The staff also recommends that the Historical Commission seek a compromise designation that would allow the not-for-profit health care provider, which provides essential services to the community, to reuse the site effectively while protecting and preserving the most important historic resources at the site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Julia Hebard Marsden House at 8835 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the boundary amended to exclude the large non-historic parking garage structure.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:48:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Michael McIlhinney and Lori Salganicoff the Chestnut Hill Conservancy represented the nomination.
- Attorney Eileen Quigley and architects Joyce Lenhardt and Lawrence McEwen represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nominator and the property owner have been negotiating for many months to seek a compromise designation that would allow the not-for-profit health care provider, which provides essential services to the community, to reuse the site effectively while protecting and preserving the most important historic resources at the site.
- While the nominator and the property owner may have agreed on a compromise designation, the terms of that compromise are not documented sufficiently to allow the Historical Commission to fully consider the merits of the compromise nomination.
- The proposed boundary for the compromise site as well as the structures or parts of structures that would be considered contributing to the site should be fully documented with text and images before the Historical Commission considers the matter.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The review of the nomination should be continued for one month to allow the compromise nomination to be fully documented.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination to the May 2024 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: 8835 Germantown Ave. | | | | | |
| MOTION: Continue | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Cooperman | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: Mattioni | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | X | | | | |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 10 | | | | 1 |

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 201 LEVERINGTON AVE

Name of Resource: Keystone Mill

Review: National Register Comment

Property Owner: 201 Leverington Avenue BSP LP

Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.

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

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 201 Leverington Avenue located in the Manayunk neighborhood of Northwest Philadelphia and historically known as the Keystone Mill. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission’s meetings.

The Keystone Mill, built in 1887, is a three-story industrial building with exterior walls of Wissahickon schist that are currently covered by stucco. The Keystone Mill is significant at the local level under Criterion A in the area of industry as one of the largest and best-equipped shoddy mills in Philadelphia operating between 1887 and 1906. During this economically tumultuous period, the use of shoddy, a form of recycled wool that was far less expensive than new or virgin wool, helped the city’s textile industry to remain profitable and continue to grow despite restrictive tariffs on foreign wool and a general economic depression. The Keystone Mill

is also significant under Criterion C at the local level in the area of architecture as a highly characteristic example of the work of S. S. Keely, the well-known manufacturer and builder who designed and constructed at least 15 mills in Manayunk from the 1840s through the 1890s. In his mill buildings, Keely developed an industrial architecture unique in its appearance in Philadelphia. The period of significance of the Keystone Mill begins with its construction in 1887, and ends in 1906, when the mill's ownership declared bankruptcy following the decline of the shoddy industry.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:32:49

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehler presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Preservation consultant Kevin McMahon represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hal Schirmer inquired about the boundary proposed in the National Register nomination and recommended that it match its local designation.
 - The Historical Commission's staff confirmed that the property is not listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, so there is no local designated boundary to match.
 - Mr. McMahon stated that the boundary shown in the nomination document reflects both the current legal and historic parcel for the mill building.
- Steven Peitzman asked about the nomination's assertion that S. S. Keely's designed mill buildings in Manayunk that were distinctive in their appearance. Mr. Peitzman asked Mr. McMahon to explain more about this.
 - Mr. McMahon said that the uniqueness was not related to their structural design or the overall building form. He pointed out that 201 Leverington Avenue is fairly similar to Keely's mills in Kensington but what set his Manayunk mills apart was his use of contrasting materials such as Wissahickon schist walls and red brick details. Mr. McMahon said this created a visual look that was unusual in Manayunk and surrounding neighborhoods, as well as Kensington where most mills were located.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman complimented Mr. McMahon on the nomination and commented that it was thorough and well done. She said she is pleased to see an individual National Register nomination for the property.
- Ms. Carney said she agreed with Ms. Copperman's comments. She added that she always appreciates it when industrial buildings such as 201 Leverington Avenue are nominated. Ms. Carney noted that the building's interior appears to have a high degree of historic integrity.
- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 201 Leverington Avenue on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADDRESS: 775 S CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS BLVD

Name of Resource: Southwark Municipal Piers

Review: National Register Comment

Property Owner: Tower Investments, Inc.

Nominator: Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.

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

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 775 S. Christopher Columbus Blvd located on the Delaware River waterfront in South Philadelphia and historically known as Southwark Municipal Piers, also known as Piers 38 and 40. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

The Southwark Municipal Piers, also known as Piers 38 and 40, are a pair of two-story, Beaux Arts-style, commercial piers on the Delaware River waterfront in South Philadelphia. The piers were designed by the City of Philadelphia's Department of Wharves, Docks and Ferries and built in 1914 and 1915. In 1957, the piers were connected when a concrete deck on pilings was built between them. They possess statewide significance under Criterion A in the areas of commerce and transportation as one of the defining achievements of the City's early twentieth century port modernization program. Built by the Snare & Triest Company of New York City, the piers helped Philadelphia to remain competitive in both international trade and passenger travel after 1915. In an era when steamships were becoming ever larger, Piers 38 and 40 were designed to receive and efficiently process cargo and passengers from many of the world's newest and biggest vessels, ensuring that the country's third largest city and second largest port continued to be a major center of commerce and industry. The Southwark Municipal Piers are also significant under Criterion C in the area of architecture as major examples of the Beaux Arts-style port terminals built along the U.S. waterfronts between 1900 and 1930. The period of significance begins in 1915, when the piers entered service, and ends in 1962, when Philadelphia completed a much larger, more modern port terminal in South Philadelphia. The Historical Commission is currently reviewing a nomination of the piers to the Philadelphia Register.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:42:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Preservation consultant Kevin McMahon represented the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hal Schirmer said it is a great location and site. He stated that the Library of Congress has a 1777 map of the area where the piers stand today that was drawn

by the British occupying forces. Mr. Schirmer said it is interesting to see what was there and what we have built since then.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Mattioni recalled coming to the piers by cargo ship during the late 1950s and early 1960s. He noted that it is a testament to their construction that they are still standing.
- Ms. Carney said she is pleased that the property is nominated for the National Register.
- The Commissioners supported the nomination for listing 775 S Christopher Columbus Boulevard on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:46:20

ACTION: At 12:58 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| ITEM: Adjournment | | | | | |
| MOTION: Adjourn | | | | | |
| MOVED BY: Mattioni | | | | | |
| SECONDED BY: McCoubrey | | | | | |
| VOTE | | | | | |
| Commissioner | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Thomas, Chair | | | | | X |
| Washington, Vice Chair | X | | | | |
| Carney (PCPC) | X | | | | |
| Cooperman | X | | | | |
| Kindt (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Lepori (Commerce) | X | | | | |
| Lech (L&I) | X | | | | |
| Mattioni | X | | | | |
| McCoubrey | X | | | | |
| Michel | X | | | | |
| Treat (DPD) | X | | | | |
| Total | 10 | | | | 1 |

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory committees 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.

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.