

**THE MINUTES OF THE 755TH STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 11 JULY 2025, 9:00 A.M.  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET, WITH REMOTE OPTION ON ZOOM  
DAN MCCOUBREY, ACTING CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

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

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Zachary Frankel, Chair (Real Estate Developer)		X	
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)	X		
Kareema Abu Saab (Commerce Department)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Thomas Holloman (City Council)	X		
Kyle O'Connor (Department of Public Property)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)		X	
Franz Rabauer	X		
Robert Thomas, AIA (Architectural Historian)	X		
Matthew Treat (Department of Planning and Development)	X		

The meeting was held in person at 1515 Arch Street, with the option for applicants and the public to participate via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department  
Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the meeting in person:

Rustin Ohler, HDO Architecture  
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance  
Jeff Regan  
Tallulah Regan  
Amanda Mazie  
Jerzy Kolaczynski  
Khalfani Leslie, Pelican Point  
Erika Cronin  
Jeffrey McMahon

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

Abbey Lewis  
Andrey Zeygelshefer  
Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture and Design  
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNObdesign  
Carl Massara  
Daniel Trubman  
Dave Aquadro  
David Fecteau, PCPC Staff  
David Gest, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
Dennis Carlisle  
Eric Mazie  
Eric Quick  
Evan Litvin, LO DESIGN  
Eva Surmacz  
Francis Mangubat  
Gi Giannone  
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance  
Jay Farrell  
John Hunter  
Josh Fishbein  
Julia Hayman  
Kevin Brett  
Kimberly Haas  
Lea Litvin, LO DESIGN  
Livia Luan  
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association  
Rachael Pritzker, Esq., Pritzker Law Group  
Rich Leimbach  
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture  
Robin Komita  
Rustin Ohler, HDO Architecture  
Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC  
Sam Olshin, AOS Architects  
Sherman Aronson  
Stephanie Pennypacker  
Steve Black, HDO Architecture

Timothy Spell

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 754TH STATED MEETING, 13 JUNE 2025**

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

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. McCoubrey 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 754th Stated Meeting, held 13 June 2025. No comments were offered.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the minutes of the 754th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 June 2025. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 754<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the PHC</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adopt minutes</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

## **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.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:05:00

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Brett Feldman represented the property owner.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commented in support of the continuance request to allow additional time for the easement negotiations.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of 775 S. Christopher Columbus Blvd. to the September 2025 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Continuance</b> <b>MOTION: Approve continuance</b> <b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Thomas</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

## **REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2025**

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:10:05

#### **DISCUSSION:**

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

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 317 Lombard Street, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 125 and 127 N. Mole Street, 800 S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and 7321 Elbow Lane. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Consent Agenda</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adopt Architectural Committee recommendations for Consent Agenda items</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

## **AGENDA**

### **ADDRESS: 317 LOMBARD ST**

Proposal: Construct three-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Peter's School

Applicant: Sam Olshin, AOS Architects

History: 1873; Saint Peter's School; Lewis Esler; Addition, Mitchell/Guirgola, 1983

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct an addition to the St. Peter's School building at 317 Lombard Street. This Historical Commission approved three earlier versions of this application in 2019, 2021, and 2024, all of which proposed a stand-alone, multi-use building to the east of the school on a surface parking lot owned by St. Peter's Church. The earlier applications proposed a multi-use building that would have been used by both the school and the church. The church has decided not to pursue the project, so the school is now proposing an addition for exclusively school use to the western side of the extant school building on Lombard Street. The original school building was constructed in 1873 and added to in 1983. The school building is classified as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The proposed addition would attach to the west façade of the 1983 addition and would be clad in brick and brick-colored composite panels. It would approximate the massing and rhythm of the large three-story rowhouses that once stood on the site.

### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct 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 addition would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The addition would be differentiated from the historic building and would be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features with the property and its environment.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion that more brick is used on the north facade and that the brick wraps around onto the west facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 125, AND 127 N MOLE ST**

Proposal: Construct rear additions; restore front facades

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Hassan Edge Jr., WJH Construction

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO design

History: 108: 1840; 109: 1835; 110: 1840; 112: 1840; 114: 1840; 125: 1850; 127: 1850

Individual Designation: 9/26/1967

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application for in-concept review proposes to construct rear additions and restore the front facades of seven rowhouses on the 100 block of N. Mole Street, a block of brick rowhouses constructed between 1835 and 1850. Two different height options are proposed for the rear additions, with an applicant preference for the three-story height based on the relatively small square footage of the houses. Public visibility of the rears of the even-number addresses is from across a parking lot from N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street. There may be an oblique view of the rear of 109 N. Mole Street where a driveway cuts through from Cherry Street. There is no public visibility of the rears of the properties at 125 and 127 N. Mole Street. Front façade restoration work includes window, door, shutter, and stoop restoration or replacement and brick repointing. The Historical Commission's staff can typically review and approve this type of work administratively.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct rear additions.
- Restore front facades.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 11 JULY 2025**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

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 front façade work will result in restoration or replacement with historically accurate windows, doors, shutters, stoops, and window sills.
- *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 construction of the proposed rear additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and the additions will be compatible with the historic materials and features.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval in concept of the two-story rear addition option, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, provided the rear additions respond to the character of each building and do not extend above the parapet lines, the windows in the additions respond to the scale of each building, any rear roof decks do not extend above existing parapets, and any front facade elements proposed for replacement are called out as such in application materials submitted for final approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 800 S 5TH ST**

Proposal: Construct third-floor rear addition; alter rear wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Quinn Blackwell

Applicant: Carl Massara

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/2/1975

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to remove a non-historic rear addition, construct a third-floor rear addition, and alter the rear wall openings of this corner building in Queen Village. New basement windows will be installed into existing basement window openings, which are currently infilled with plywood.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove non-historic rear addition.
- Construct third-floor rear addition.
- Alter rear wall openings.
- Install basement windows.



**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 alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the rear elevation uses standard windows to match the size of the side windows, the Juliette balconies are omitted, and any brick cornice or special treatment of the existing brick on the rear addition is retained when the third story is constructed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 700 S 2ND ST**

Proposal: Demolish one-story buildings; construct four-story buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Emily Larviere

Applicant: Evan Litvin, LO Design

History: 1785

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes demolishing two one-story buildings and constructing two four-story buildings at 700 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The property runs west from S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to S. Philip Street along Bainbridge Street. The building at the southeast corner of S. 2<sup>nd</sup> and Bainbridge Streets was constructed about 1785 and individually designated in 1966. The other two buildings on the property are considered non-contributing to the historic resource. The middle one-story building was constructed in the 1940s. The one-story building at the southeast corner of S. Philip and Bainbridge Street, at the rear of the property, was historically designated and listed the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as 208 Bainbridge Street in 1958, but the designation was rescinded after the upper floors and roof were demolished in 1959.

The two proposed four-story buildings will be single-family residences with pilot houses and roof decks. They will be clad in red brick with entrances facing onto Bainbridge Street. The new buildings will be built directly adjacent to the historic building but there will be no internal connection.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Demolish two one-story buildings.

- Construct two four-story buildings.

**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 design of the proposed four-story buildings successfully differentiates itself from the historic building through its more contemporary design but maintains material compatibility through the use of red brick cladding. However, the massing, size, and scale of the proposed buildings are too large. They should be reduced in height. The cornice of the new buildings should match or be lower than the roofline of the historic building in order to meet Standard 9.
  - The scale and rhythm of the window openings of the proposed buildings are not compatible with the historic building. The design should be further studied and revised to 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.*
  - If a future owner wishes to return 700 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to its original appearance, the two new buildings could be removed and the historic rear openings restored; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial as proposed, but approval of a revised design with reduced height and window openings that are more compatible with the rhythm and scale of the historic building, 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:** 00:11:30

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Evan Litvin, attorney Rachael Pritzker, and developer Francis Mangubat represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Amanda Mazie, an immediate neighbor, commented in opposition to the application.
- Erika Cronin, an immediate neighbor, commented in opposition to the application.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the application.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application addressed concerns about the overall height and massing, and visibility of pilot houses. The revised design shows three stories composed of red brick and a fourth-level penthouse clad in gray slate. The penthouse level is set

back two feet from the historic building and one foot along the Bainbridge Street and S. Philip Street elevations, creating a clear visual separation from the historic building and highlighting the material from brick to slate. The material selection for the project is acceptable.

- The windows still appeared randomly placed and the arrangement contributes to the appearance of one large building rather than two separate ones. The applicant will consult with the staff to create a more compatible window configuration.
- The pilot houses have been removed and replaced with operable skylights for roof deck access.
- The applicant confirmed that the mechanical condensers will be located on the roof. They intend for the equipment to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way but will design screening as necessary.
- The preservation issues must be differentiated from the zoning concerns voiced by neighbors. Zoning matters are outside the Historical Commission's purview.
- The revised application did not provide an elevation drawing with information on materials for the south wall. The applicant confirmed at the meeting that the south wall, which is not visible from the public right-of-way, will be clad with Hardie board.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised design satisfies Standard 9. The first three levels are brick and topped with a cornice that stands lower than the historic building's roofline. The fourth floor has been revised as a slate-clad penthouse level that rises slightly above the historic building. A separation has been created between the historic building's back wall and the penthouse level to create a visual break between the old and the new. The window openings of the proposed buildings were minimally revised. The applicant agreed to work with the staff to revise the windows in a manner that satisfies Standard 9.
- The application satisfies Standard 10; the proposed buildings could be removed and the historic building restored.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details including the reconfiguration of the windows and color of the cladding, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Holloman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 700 S 2<sup>nd</sup> St</b> <b>MOTION: Approval</b> <b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Holloman</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 4567 FLEMING ST**

Proposal: Construct two additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Timothy Spell

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1868

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Victorian Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 5/13/2022

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes constructing a two-story addition to the historic building and a separate two-story building with a walk-out basement at 4567 Fleming Street. The three-story, two-bay historic building was constructed of stone in the late 1860s. Details of a brick rear ell with a wood porch appeared on historic maps beginning in 1923 but may have been constructed at an earlier date. The property is a contributing resource to the Victorian Roxborough Historic District. The legal parcel is located at the edge of the historic district and the majority of properties facing the property are not within the district boundary. The public visibility of some of the proposed changes may be limited, owing to existing landscaping and natural slope of the full parcel.

The proposed two-story garage addition is set back from the street and is connected by a new hyphen structure to the rear ell behind the main block of the historic building. A covered porch and sections of the wall of the rear ell would be removed to connect the addition to the house. The proposed design shows a shed roof and vertical composite wood siding with a dark finish. A separate two-story building with a walk-out basement is proposed for an open area to the north of the house. The design of the new building is like that of the proposed garage addition with a

shed roof and composite wood siding. A suspended metal walkway connects the new building to the addition's hyphen connector.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove sections of the south wall of rear ell.
  - Construct garage addition.
  - Construct a two-story building with a walk-out basement.

**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 two-story garage addition is successfully differentiated from the historic building through its massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The use of a hyphen structure to connect the historic building and new garage successfully limits the removal of historic materials and eases the transition between the old and new. Although the general massing is compatible, the architectural details such as the shed roof and dark vertical siding are not compatible with the historic building; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 9. As proposed, the degree of differentiation between historic and new construction is too great with the addition's design competing with historic building rather than complementing it.
  - Similar to the garage addition, the proposed design for the stand-alone building is not compatible with the historic building but the physical separation from the historic building makes its lack of compatibility less crucial; therefore, the proposed new stand-alone building could meet Standard 9.
  - There will be limited visibility of the proposed elevated walkway between the addition and new building, therefore it meets 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 removal of historic materials from the historic building is limited to a side porch and select areas of the rear ell's south wall. If a future owner wishes to return it to its original appearance, the hyphen structure and addition could be removed leaving the rear ell largely intact; therefore, the proposal meets Standard 10.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the cladding and roof shape of the garage addition and stand-alone building are revised to be more compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the massing, cladding, and roof shape of the garage addition and stand-alone building are revised to be more compatible with the historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:54:40

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Rustin Ohler, property owner Timothy Spell, and attorney Rachael Pritzker represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the application.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant submitted a revised application based on the Architectural Committee's comments. The revised design shows that the garage addition remained the same, but the design of the standalone building was revised with a lower height, flat roof, and solar panels obscured by a small parapet. The revised version also included alternate options for exterior siding colors.
- The applicant presented physical samples of the exterior siding material at the meeting and also showed the alternate colors that are available. The color originally specified in the application, "Anthracite," is acceptable and can be approved.
- The property can accommodate two new additions without negatively impacting the historic character.
- The revised height and mass of the standalone addition successfully responded to the Architectural Committee's concerns.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application satisfies Standard 9. The size of the overall lot can accommodate two additions without negatively impacting the historic character of the building and district. The overall design and material of the garage addition and standalone building are successfully differentiated from the historic building. The massing, form, and material of the garage addition are compatible with the historic building. The standalone building is physically separated from the historic building and will likely appear to be a separate property from historic building.
- There will be limited visibility of the proposed elevated walkway between the addition and new building. Therefore, that aspect of the design meets Standard 9.
- The application satisfies Standard 10; the removal of historic materials from the historic building is limited to a side porch and select areas of the rear ell's south wall. If a future owner wishes to return the historic building to its original appearance, the hyphen structure and addition could be removed, leaving the rear ell largely intact.

**ACTION:** Ms. Carney moved to approve the revised application with the anthracite color for the cladding, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Holloman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 4567 Fleming St</b> <b>MOTION: Approval</b> <b>MOVED BY: Carney</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Holloman</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 7321 ELBOW LN**

Proposal: Construct one-story addition; modify window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael and Christina Peterson

Applicant: Jeffrey Regan, Tallulah Regan, and Eva Zhou, Tallulah & Bird

History: 1925; Willing, Sims & Talbutt

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: French Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021

Staff Contact: Alex Till, [alexander.till@phila.gov](mailto:alexander.till@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a one-story addition on a two-story wing of a large Norman style residence in the French Village Historic District. The property is classified as contributing to the historic district. The addition will be clad in stone matching that of the house and will feature wide windows and French doors on all sides and a hipped standing seam copper roof. Sections of a first-floor wall of the wing will be removed where the addition will connect to it. Stone will be salvaged to be used in the construction of the addition. The application also proposes widening an existing window on the adjacent southwestern facade of the building near the new addition.

The house was constructed in 1925 in a French Norman style as part of a planned suburban residential neighborhood. The proposed addition faces and will be minimally visible from the adjacent Elbow Lane and not visible from the adjacent McCallum Street. Most of the addition will be hidden behind tall garden walls that delimit a courtyard between the house and the street. The addition will feature windows and doors that will replicate the design of those on the historic building and a hipped copper roof that reflects the roof design of the historic building, albeit in a different material. The construction of the addition will necessitate removing sections of a first-floor façade with windows and doors. The window on the southwestern façade

proposed for widening will not be visible from any surrounding public rights-of-way but is a historic feature of the building.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Remove sections of a first-floor wall, including windows and doors, on a wing of the house.
- Construct a one-story addition.
- Widen an existing window.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed addition satisfies Standard 9. It will necessitate the removal of sections of an original exterior wall along with windows and doors. Its massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with those of the historic building.

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the enlarged window is symmetrical, the sizes of the masonry piers and other elements are refined, and as much of the exterior wall is retained as possible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda.

**ADDRESS: 2024 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Construct garage; remove rear bay; install windows; stucco rear; construct deck on rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bella Projects LLC

Applicant: Jeffrey McMahon, JM DB

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes various work to the rear of the building at 2024 Delancey Place, which backs up onto a service alley block of Panama Street. The scope includes construction of a rear garage, removal of a rear bay and solarium, and installation of windows where the bay and solarium have been removed, replacement of the rear ell's sloped roof with a flat roof with deck, and installation of stucco to all exposed brick on the rear of the building. The existing rear bay is clad in siding but may be original as a wood bay appears on an 1895 atlas. The construction of a rear garage would reduce the public visibility of proposed changes to the rear ell.



**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct garage.
- Remove rear bay.
- Install new windows in rear wall of rear ell.
- Install roof deck on rear ell.
- Stucco rear masonry.

**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.*
  - Removing the two-story bay and installing non-historic windows as well as covering the rear masonry in stucco will alter character-defining features.
  - The roof deck addition on the rear ell is appropriate, provided the historic roof slope is maintained.
  - The removal of the non-historic solarium and construction of a rear garage satisfy Standard 9.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the removal of the rear bay and covering the masonry in stucco; approval of the roof deck, provided the pitched rear-ell roof is maintained; and, approval of the removal of the solarium and construction of the garage, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of removal of the rear bay, covering the masonry in stucco, and rear ell roof alterations; approval of the removal of the solarium and construction of a garage, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Jeffrey McMahon represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised proposal calls for the retention of the brick of the rear facade and ell.
- The revised proposal calls for the reconstruction of the second- and third-story bay windows.
- The revised proposal calls for the roof slope of the ell to be retained
- Single pane "picture" windows are inappropriate on the reconstructed rear bay.

- The brick-clad garage design will be similar to the adjacent garages.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised plans, with appropriate windows on the rear bay and ell roof slope, is compatible with the original design of the rear of 2404 Delancey Street, satisfying Standard 9.

**ACTION:** Ms. Carney moved to approve the revised application, provided the center bay windows are double-hung sash, with the staff to review details including the deck skirt, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Holloman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 2024 Delancey PI</b> <b>MOTION: Approval with conditions</b> <b>MOVED BY: Carney</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Holloman</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

**ADDRESS: 2022 GREEN ST**

Proposal: Add lightwells at front and side facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2022 Green St Condominium Association

Applicant: Benjamin Estepani, Pace Architecture and Design

History: 1864

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install five new emergency escape windows into the basement floor of 2022 Green Street, a semi-detached house in the Spring Garden Historic District. Two egress wells would be located at the front façade and three would be located in the side yard of the property. All proposed window locations would be within existing basement window openings. The existing decorative front facade basement security gates would be retained and reinstalled. The front egress well grates would be flush with the existing flagstone

sidewalk and painted to match.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct five lightwells at basement level.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction 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.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the three side egress wells, but denial of the two front egress wells, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the three side egress wells and denial of the two front egress wells, pursuant to Standard 9.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:33:09

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Benjamin Estepani represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The base of the building is likely painted limestone, not cast stone as was stated in the application.
- The color of the well should match the color of the surrounding flagstone, not the white color of the painted limestone.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application, installing only one egress well and retaining the decorative security grate, satisfies Standard 9.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application with one egress well at the front facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent with one abstention.

<b>ITEM: 2022 Green St</b> <b>MOTION: Approval</b> <b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)			X		
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	10		1		2

**ADDRESS: 614 PINE ST**

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Qian Jin Real Estate LLC

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes constructing an addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell of 614 Pine Street, with a roof deck over the entire rear ell serviced by two pilot houses. The addition would be clad in an unidentified panel material and fenestrated in a random manner. The proposed addition and roof deck would likely not be visible from Pine Street but would be visible from the side and rear from Waverly and Addison Streets. As proposed, one pilot house would require the demolition of a portion of the rear slope of the roof. Two skylights are also proposed for the rear slope of the gable roof.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct addition on two-story portion of rear ell.
- 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 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.*

- *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 roof deck and pilot house would require the demolition of a small portion of the roof of the main block.
  - While the adjacent stretch of Addison Street is largely a service alley, two houses on have their primary entrances on Waverly Street.
  - The third-story addition is very tall with a very large floor-to-ceiling height. The addition should be reduced in height by several feet.
  - No details are given for the cladding on the east elevation. Given the visibility from Waverly Street, it should be clad in a way that is compatible with the existing brick walls.
  - A black metal picket railing around the roof deck would be more appropriate than the panel-clad parapet wall shown in the plans.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the parapet wall is replaced with a black metal picket railing and the cladding is revised to be more compatible with the existing building, with the staff to review details, 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:** 01:42:30

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sam Xu represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association commented in opposition to the application as proposed but indicated an openness to supporting a rear addition on the building.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Documentation of the existing conditions of the building and its context within the historic district would be helpful in assessing this project.
- Concerns remain about how the front pilot house would intersect with the roof of the main block.
- The height of the proposed addition still seems too high, though it is difficult to assess any revisions to height in the current drawings.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The current proposal does not satisfy Standard 9 or the Roofs Guideline.

**ACTION:** Mr. Lech moved to remand the revised application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 614 Pine St</b> <b>MOTION: Remand to Architectural Committee</b> <b>MOVED BY: Lech</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Thomas</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **ADDRESS: 1730 WHARTON ST**

Proposal: Legalize windows with modifications

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pelican Point Investments LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson

History: 1888; Eighteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church/Friendship Baptist Church;

J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes legalizing aluminum windows installed throughout the building at 1730 Wharton Street. Located at the southeast corner of Wharton Street and S. 18th Street, the former 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church, constructed about 1888, historically featured wood windows with marbled blue glass. Between fall 2018 and summer 2019, many of the historic windows were removed without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The original frames and some of the original marbled blue glass windows remained.

At its 14 August 2020 meeting, the Historical Commission adopted the Architectural Committee's recommendation for an application proposing complete restoration of the building's exterior as part of a conversion to multi-unit residential use. The approval was conditioned on the windows being wood or aluminum-clad wood at the side elevations, including the installation

of stacked double-hung windows in the double-height openings, provided the muntin patterns matched those of the historic windows, and the mullion between the windows at the new floor level was as minimal as possible; the marbled blue glass windows were retained, restored, or replicated in the front façade openings and communal spaces; and the louvers at the corner towers were retained, with the understanding that glass or operable windows may be installed behind them. In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. It appears that Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased. Instead, aluminum windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes which do not fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the exterior work and a Stop Work Order at the request of the Historical Commission's staff, prompting this request for legalization from the property owner/developer.

In April 2025, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for legalization and recommended denial. The application was continued several months to allow the applicant to work on a revised proposal, which is being presented on the following pages marked as "Revised." This revised application requests permission to retain most of the aluminum windows but proposes modifications within some masonry openings to attempt to better fill the openings like the historic windows had. The revised application also proposes a new design within the monumental opening on Wharton Street that is intended to simulate the historic design.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Legalize window replacement – revised to show modifications to window openings while retaining most 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 new windows, even with proposed modifications, do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:55:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, owner/developer Cal Leslie, and architect Rich Villa represented the property owner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- In May 2021, the Historical Commission's staff approved window shop drawings by Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation that proposed all new wood windows sufficiently replicating the historic appearance and included the character-defining marbled blue glass where appropriate. Seaquay Architectural Millwork Corporation went out of business, and the windows shown in the approved shop drawings were never purchased.
- Aluminum windows with grilles between the glass and of sizes which do not fit the masonry openings were installed throughout the building in early 2025 without any approvals or permits.
- This revised application requests permission to retain most of the aluminum windows but proposes modifications within some masonry openings to attempt to better fill the openings like the historic windows had.
- The existing windows, which currently stand slightly proud of the masonry exterior walls, could be recessed into the walls to help them to read like historic windows.
- There are inconsistencies in the drawings related to size of windows, location of new interior floors, and code compliance which need to be addressed in a future application.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The new windows, even with proposed modifications, do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. More information is needed in order to fully evaluate the proposal.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to remand the revised application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.



<b>ITEM: 1730 Wharton St</b> <b>MOTION: Remand to Architectural Committee</b> <b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Lech</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

**ACTION:** At 11:52 a.m., Mr. Thomas moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Adjournment</b> <b>MOTION: Adjourn</b> <b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair					X
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

**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](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:

- 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;
- Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- 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;
- Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- 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.

DRAFT