THE MINUTES OF THE 770TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 9 OCTOBER 2026, 9:00 A.M.
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET, WITH REMOTE OPTION ON ZOOM
ZACHARY FRANKEL, CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Frankel, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Zachary Frankel, Chair (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Thomas Holloman (City Council)	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		Arrived 9:12
Mina Monavarian (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Ibriz Muhammad (Commerce Department)			
Kyle O'Connor (Department of Public Property)	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
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner II
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the meeting in person:
Albert Weiss, Esq.
Anne Harvey, Neighborhood Gardens Trust
Annelise Ream, Keith Haring Foundation

Arlene Herskoviz
Bruce Bohri, Department of Planning and Development
Earl Hopkins, Philadelphia Inquirer
Elizabeth Milroy
Elizabeth Young, Neighborhood Gardens Trust
Emily Foster
Emily King, Keith Haring Foundation
Emily Mello, Mural Arts
Frank Luzi
Isabella Segalovich
Jane Golden, Mural Arts
Jenny Greenberg, Neighborhood Gardens Trust
Jessica Clifford
Jim Kennedy
Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Margaret Doyle, Keith Haring Foundation
Nathan Osburn
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty
RJ Rushmore
Sean Whalen, Esq.
Simon Castets, Keith Haring Foundation
Tanya Covington

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

12153854451
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Abby Cornelia
Abby Freed
Abigail Freed
Aine R. Doley
Allie Marchesani
Amy Johnston
Ashley Lepera
Aviva Kapust
Ben Shackleton
Chamor Thomas, Neighborhood Gardens Trust
Christina DiMichele
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Davitra Y. Smith
Denis Dougherty, Philadelphia Brick & Stone Pointing
Dori Bova
Emaleigh Doley, Neighborhood Gardens Trust
Eric Schulz
Gail Rodgers McCormick
George Poulin
Gerlinde Harb
Jay Farrell
Jeenee Lee
Julia Hayman
Kate Eckert

DRAFT

Katherine Liss, Art Commission
Kelly Vresilovic
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City
Larissa Schroeder
Laura Baker Dickey
Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
Lily Winagle
Lori Arnold
Matt Goldberg
Melissa Donia
Megan Schmitt
Orson Gillick Morris
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Phil Katz
Rebekah Grimes, Department of Planning and Development
R.J. Rushmore
Samantha Chui, Department of Planning and Development
Sam Uray
Sarah Kolker
Sarah Kuchan, CP Johnson
Sasha Zeiger
Sophia Roach
Stephanie M. Pennypacker
Sydney Conaway, Art Commission
Tom Familetti

DRAFT

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 769TH STATED MEETING, 11 SEPTEMBER 2026

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:02:30

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Frankel 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 769th Stated Meeting, held 11 September 2026. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to adopt the minutes of the 769th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 September 2026. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 769th Stated Meeting of the PHC **MOTION: Adopt minutes** **MOVED BY: Washington** **SECONDED BY: Thomas**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)					X
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

DRAFT

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

ADDRESS: 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Remove marquee; install storefront
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 19R Chestnut Partners LP
Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Chestnut Square Associates LP
History: 1928; Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater; Hoffman & Henon, architects
Individual Designation: 8/9/2008
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The applicant for 1910 Chestnut Street has requested to continue the application from the October 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission to the December 2026 meeting.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:03:00

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of the application for 1910 Chestnut Street to the 11 December 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Request for continuance **MOTION: Approve continuance** **MOVED BY: Thomas** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)					X
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 SEPTEMBER 2026

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2102 GREEN ST
Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct rear addition with roof deck and pilot house
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: John C. and Margaret T. Caramanico
Applicant: Lauren Thomsen, Lauren Thomsen Design
History: 1854
Individual Designation: 5/1/1975
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000, Contributing
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes alterations to the 1854 Italianate rowhouse at 2102 Green Street. An insurance survey from the time of construction describes a three-story brick dwelling house with three-story brick back building and two-story frame kitchen. Historic maps confirm the three-story rear ell. Presently, the rear ell is two stories in height, and it is unclear whether a story was removed or if the ell was rebuilt at the reduced height in the past.

The rear of the property is on Wilcox Street, a service alley lined with garages, decks, and rear additions of various sizes.

In 1980, the Historical Commission approved the replacement of the front façade owing to its structural condition. At that time, the owner was asked to restore the façade using scored stucco to simulate brownstone, utilizing 2104 or 2106 Green Street as an example for projecting sills and lintels. In 1984, the Historical Commission approved the scored stucco sample. In 1993, the Historical Commission approved a deck over the rear parking area. That deck is now in disrepair and is proposed to be reconstructed as part of this application.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Demolish rear ell.
- Construct full-width three-story rear addition.
- Construct roof deck with pilot house.
- Reconstruct deck over rear parking area.
- Construct egress window well at front façade.
- Restore front façade features

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 alterations will be in keeping with the varied massing, scale and materials on Wilcox Street, and the front façade alterations are in keeping with the design of the adjacent property at 2104 Green Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to

recommend approval in concept, provided the current width of the rear ell is maintained at an upper floor or floors, and as much of the existing main block rear wall is retained as possible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:04:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Lauren Thomsen represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENT:

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The scope was revised to reduce the size of the pilot house, set back the third floor of the rear ell, and adjust the fenestration at the rear to be more in keeping with the rest of the row.
- There remains uncertainty about the existing rear wall of the main block, its condition, and the extent of demolition proposed. Current photographs would assist the Historical Commission in subsequent reviews.
- The redesign of the rear ell addressed many comments from the Architectural Committee.
- A deck railing set back on the rear ell is set back rather than right out at the edge is preferred.
- A sloped roof on the pilot house is preferred.
- The rear ell of the adjacent property at 2104 Green Street was altered so that it only has one window facing the rear ell at 2102 Green Street. Therefore, constructing an addition close to the neighboring rear ell would not have an adverse impact.
- The proposed alterations will be in keeping with the varied massing, scale and materials on Wilcox Street, and the front façade alterations are in keeping with the design of the adjacent property at 2104 Green Street, satisfying Standard 9.
- More documentation of the existing rear wall and rear ell should be included in an application for final approval.

ADDRESS: 2201 PANAMA ST

Proposal: Construct fourth floor and roof deck
Review Requested: Review In Concept
Owner: Amy and Alexander Blumenthal
Applicant: Amy Blumenthal
History: 1963; Goldberg & Nauta, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse-Fitler residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, dan.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fourth-floor addition with a mansard roof and roof deck on a rowhouse at 2201 Panama Street, built in 1963 and classified as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The Historical Commission approved fourth-floor additions and roof decks at 2211-13 Panama Street in 2025, 2225

Panama Street in 2019, and 2227 Panama Street in 2021. This application is for a corner property. The other houses were mid-block.

The Roofs Guideline is the standard typically invoked when reviewing rooftop additions and decks; it requires that the addition is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way to ensure that the addition does not adversely impact the public's perception of the historic building. However, in this case, the building is non-contributing, so the Historical Commission is charged with protecting the historic district but not the building itself. In this case, the preservation question is whether the proposed addition and deck have an adverse impact on the district more broadly. Additions and roof decks can be visible on non-historic buildings and new construction without adversely affecting their surrounds.

The proposed addition and roof deck will visually impact the 2200 block of Panama Street and the 300 block of S. 22nd Street. Both blocks are composed of contributing buildings. The building at 2201 Panama Street is more squat than surrounding residential contributing properties. A rooftop addition at 2201 Panama Street will not add enough height to the building to impose upon the surrounding taller historic buildings. This project can be executed without negatively impacting the surrounding historic district buildings, provided the height and massing of the rooftop addition, and the placement of the roof deck are adjusted to limit the visual impact on adjacent and nearby contributing historic properties.

The Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of a proposal for an addition and roof deck for 2201 Panama Street at its August 2026 meeting. The proposal was withdrawn prior to the September 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission. At its August review of the application that was later withdrawn, the Architectural Committee supported the removal of the existing second-story mansard roof but recommended denial of the application owing to the dark color and height of the fourth-story standing-seam metal mansard roof, the placement of the fourth-story windowsills, and the visibility of the roof deck.

The application that was reviewed by the Architectural Committee and then withdrawn has been revised as follows for the current application:

- The third-story mansard roof has been eliminated.
- The façade will be painted a red brick color.
- The faux slate mansard roof color will be grey.
- The height of the fourth story has been increased from 10'-2" to 10'-6".
- The fourth-story sills have been relocated just above the cornice.
- The three adjoining windows on the front façade of the third story have been replaced with two separate windows.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a fourth-story addition and 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 will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The building is not historic, so no historic materials would be destroyed with the

construction of the addition and deck. Changes in the proposal have increased the compatibility with the historic context. The proposal calls for painting the façade red to blend with the nearby contributing red brick buildings. The low height of the existing house and choice of a faux slate grey shingles allows for the addition of the fourth-story mansard roof without adversely impacting the visual continuity of this area of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

- *Roofs Guideline I 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 Roofs Guideline does not apply to this application because the building in question is non-contributing; there are no character-defining features at the building. The roof deck railing is set back from the S. 22nd Street facade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 15:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Phil Katz and Zach Winters, architects, represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

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

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENT:

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The property at 2201 Panama Street is non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.
- The revisions to designs of the addition and roof deck responded to suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee.
- The design of the addition and roof deck would not adversely impact the historic character of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.
- The design of the cornice should be revised before applying for final approval.
- The proposed modifications to the building at 2201 Panama Street, if revised as suggested, would not adversely impact the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, satisfying Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 16 SEPTEMBER 2026

ADDRESS: 1800-04 and 1808-12 WILMOT ST

Name of Resource: Second Baptist Church of Frankford
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Second Baptist Church of Frankford
Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission
Staff Contact: Josh Schroeder, joshua.schroeder@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Second Baptist Church of Frankford at 1800-04 and 1808-12 Wilmot Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 14-1004(1) of the Philadelphia Code. The nomination contends that the Second Baptist Church of Frankford satisfies Criterion J by exemplifying the cultural, social, and historical heritage of the community. The historic church building was constructed in 1924-25, but the congregation was first established as a mission church in 1869 to serve Frankford's Black Baptist population. As the congregation grew, Second Baptist became a leading institution in Frankford's Black community and played a leading role in civil rights and social justice efforts in Frankford.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1800-04 and 1808-12 Wilmot Street, the Second Baptist Church of Frankford, satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1800-04 and 1808-12 Wilmot Street, the Second Baptist Church of Frankford, satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:34

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Schroeder presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- The Reverend Davitra Smith of the Second Baptist Church of Frankford represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Second Baptist Church of Frankford has been a leading institution for Frankford since its founding in 1869.
- The Second Baptist Church of Frankford reflects the importance of the church in Philadelphia's Black communities.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property satisfies Criterion J, as the Second Baptist Church of Frankford reflects the cultural, political, social, and historical heritage of Frankford.

ACTION: Ms. Washington moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at

1800-04 and 1808-12 Wilmot Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Holloman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1800-04 and 1808-12 Wilmot St **MOTION: Designate** **MOVED BY: Washington** **SECONDED BY: Holloman**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)					X
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 2147 AND 2149 ELLSWORTH ST
Name of Resource: *We the Youth* Keith Haring Mural
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 2147, 2147 Ellsworth LLC; 2149, Neighborhood Gardens Trust
Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission
Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination, authored by Alex Till of the Historical Commission's staff, proposes to designate a mural titled *We the Youth* as an object. Artist Keith Haring and teenagers from Philadelphia and New York painted the mural on the shared party wall at 2147 and 2149 Ellsworth Street in 1987. The mural spans the entire exposed party wall and extends onto the concrete garden wall behind it. The nomination contends that the *We the Youth* mural satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. It argues that the mural has significant value as part of the heritage and culture of Philadelphia and for its association with Keith Haring, an internationally renowned American artist, and therefore satisfies Criterion A. The nomination also argues that the mural is a work by Keith Haring, an artist who significantly influenced the cultural development of Philadelphia, the United States, and the world, and therefore satisfies Criterion E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that *We the Youth*, the Keith Haring mural on the properties at 2147 and 2149 Ellsworth Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic

Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that *We the Youth*, the Keith Haring mural on the properties at 2147 and 2149 Ellsworth Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, H, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:34:23

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. He explained that staff member Alex Till authored the nomination. Mr. Farnham added that he reviewed the nomination and confirmed that it was correct and complete, and verified that the references it cited in fact support the positions presented in it.
- Ori Feibush and attorney Sean Whalen represented the property owner of the property at 2147 Ellsworth Street. Jenny Greenberg, the executive director of the Neighborhood Gardens Trust, represented the owner of the property at 2149 Ellsworth Street.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Greenberg stated that her organization, the Neighborhood Gardens Trust, is the co-owner of the party wall on which the *We the Youth* mural is painted. She observed that the mural connects Philadelphia's neighborhood history with the legacy of Keith Haring, one of the most influential artists of the twentieth century. She explained that Neighborhood Gardens Trust is a Philadelphia-based nonprofit land trust dedicated to acquiring and preserving community gardens and shared green spaces to enhance quality of life in Philadelphia's neighborhoods. She thanked Alex Till for writing the nominating and to the Committee on Historic Designation for recommending that the mural satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, H, and J. She confirmed that her organization wholehearted supports and agrees that the mural meets all four Criteria. She reported that the Neighborhood Gardens Trust, then known as Neighborhood Gardens Association, acquired the property at 2149 Ellsworth Avenue, a formerly vacant lot that had been transformed into a sitting garden by community members through the Point Breeze Federation. Ms. Greenberg noted that the selection of this wall by project partners including the Brandywine Workshop, City Kids Foundation, and Keith Haring took into consideration its adjacency to the garden. She also noted that the mural, *We the Youth*, was created by Keith Haring in collaboration with Philadelphia and New York City Youth 39 years ago, in 1987, in recognition of the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. The mural's location reflects Haring's commitment to making art accessible to the public regardless of socioeconomic status, and to engaging young people as creative partners. Following the creation of the mural, the community garden was refurbished by neighbors with support from the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society. For more than 30 years, this garden, known as the Haring Mural Garden, has been deeply loved and cared for by community members. By preserving this space in perpetuity, Neighborhood Gardens Trust protects visual and physical access to the mural, preventing a house from ever being constructed in front of it. *We the Youth* is the only collaborative public mural by Haring that remains intact at its original site anywhere in the world. Ms. Greenberg observed that the mural is not only a significant work of art, but also a historic object whose cultural value is deeply connected to its setting in a typical residential block in the Point Breeze neighborhood. She noted that, after years of disinvestment, this neighborhood has undergone rapid redevelopment. She recounted that, in conversations with longtime residents, she frequently hears them lament the loss of neighborhood character and

heritage. The historic designation of this mural will help to ensure that Haring's iconic dancing figures and primary colors at S. 22nd and Ellsworth Streets live on, with shared green space in the foreground, continuing to foster community cohesion, resilience, and pride. Ms. Greenberg reported that her organization has been deeply moved by the outpouring of support for the mural's designation, and the words of community residents, elected officials, members of the LGBT community, artists, academics, and others who have spoken and written about what the mural means to them, and why it should be protected in its original location. She contended that the mural is extremely vulnerable to being lost to redevelopment, and historic designation is essential to securing its protection. She concluded that, as the guardians of *We the Youth*, the Neighborhood Gardens Trust, and its partners at Mural Arts Philadelphia and the Keith Haring Foundation, have the expertise and access to resources for stewarding the mural on-site in perpetuity, with attention to its unique relationship to the garden. She stated that her organization is committed to undertaking a balanced approach to conservation and restoration, working with a trusted and experienced conservator, and will work with the party wall's co-owner in a fair and collaborative way. She thanked the Historical Commission for its consideration and for recognizing the extraordinary significance of the *We the Youth* mural to preserving the legacy of Keith Haring in Philadelphia, in the Commonwealth, and for the broader history of public art in the United States and beyond.

- Mr. Whalen, an attorney representing 2147 Ellsworth LLC, stated that his client is seeking to preserve the mural, despite what might have been stated elsewhere. He asserted that designation will have no impact on whether this mural is preserved. If it is designated, preservation steps will be taken. If it is not designated, preservation steps will be taken. The property owner's goal has always been and is today in front of the Historical Commission to replace this mural in kind with modern materials, so it is here for 100 years without having to be adjusted or re-preserved or repainted every 10, 15, or 20 years going forward. Mr. Whalen stated that what has been proposed and what his client is currently proposing is to stabilize the mural, to remove it from the wall because of significant delamination and separation between the mural substrate, the stucco, from the brick wall behind so that it can then be preserved in a climate-controlled environment in a museum. This is not a question of whether or not the mural is going to be preserved. It will be preserved. Mr. Whalen stated that his client has consulted with experts and has expert opinions that the mural cannot be preserved in place. He stated that his experts assert that it should be removed and restored, and a replacement mural should be installed at this site. Mr. Whalen stated that his client is not refuting that the mural satisfies all of the Criteria for Designation identified by the Committee on Historic Designation. He stated that, instead, his client is noting that that the Historical Commission is never obligated to designate simply because a resource satisfies the Criteria. He stated that designation is discretionary. Mr. Whalen asserted that the wall on which the mural is painted has failed. He explained that the wall is a party wall and a house stood on the garden lot until the 1970s. Experts have observed that there is a one to three-inch gap between the wall and the stucco on which the mural is painted. He contended that the party wall is not in good and stable condition. He stated that the mural was painted on stucco placed on the interior plaster that had been applied to the inside of the house that stood at 2149 Ellsworth Street. The paint was applied to stucco placed on top of the interior plaster. The brick is fine, he acknowledged, but the plaster to stucco connection has failed. The stucco is basically now a free-standing wall leaning against the brick but no longer attached to it. He stated that they placed a small video camera between the stucco and the brick wall to document

the detachment. The video shows that the stucco with the mural has detached from the wall. He stated that the stucco cannot be reattached to the brick wall without damaging the mural, or without demolishing the house at 2147 Ellsworth Street. He asserted that neither is an acceptable outcome. Mr. Whalen again acknowledged "the importance, the wonder, and the beauty of this mural." He stated that it should be preserved and will be preserved. Mr. Whalen claimed that there are two other Haring murals that have been preserved "in place." They are both in New York. However, both were completely reconstructed and entirely repainted. There is no evidence of the hand of Keith Haring remaining in those murals. That is what preservation in place means for murals. Mr. Whalen noted that Philadelphia has the greatest collection of murals in any city in the United States, maybe the world. The Mural Arts website says there are at least 4,400 documented murals in the city. Mr. Whalen stated that he is not making a financial hardship case but will likely have to make one in the future. He observed that the question before the Historical Commission is whether it is good public policy to designate this mural. He asked how many other murals the Historical Commission has designated and then answered none. He noted that the Historical Commission considered and rejected a proposal to designate the Painted Bride mural. He claimed that the actual nominator remains anonymous. The nomination proposes designating an object, which is defined as a material thing of function, aesthetic, cultural, historic, or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable, yet related to a specific setting or environment. He referenced a statue. He remarked that the building at 2147 Ellsworth Street is an occupied, single-family house that is three stories in the front and two in the rear. He noted that no one is claiming that the house is historically significant. He claimed that the mural somehow rendered the party wall an object that is able to be designated. He observed that the wall is not a freestanding wall. It is not a separate object to itself. It is an integral structural component of the house, so nothing can be done to the house. Any designation of the mural with the party wall is actually a designation of the house as well. But the party wall is not an independent object. It cannot stand alone without the house. A wind would blow it over. He asserted that the wall cannot be an independent object. It is inseparable from the house to which it is attached. The mural itself, the actual physical paint, cannot be designated as a mural, as an object by itself, because it cannot be removed and it cannot be moved.

- Mr. Frankel interrupted Mr. Whalen and asked him to get to his point.
- Mr. Whalen stated he thinks that this is the first attempted designation of a mural in the country. He then stated that only two exterior murals in the country have been designated historic. One is the *Great Wall* in Los Angeles. It has been completely repainted multiple times. The second is *Chicano Park* in San Diego. It has also been completely scraped and repainted several times. The mural in question will have to be repainted. Mr. Whalen spoke about *Crack Is Whack* and Carmine Street Pool murals, both by Keith Haring in New York City. Both are owned and maintained by the New York City Parks and Recreation Department. They are not historically designated. They have been repeatedly wholly repainted as many as four times. He asserted that it is inappropriate to designate the mural in this case because the historic preservation ordinance mandates a maintenance requirement. The artist has passed away. There is no ability to maintain this mural in place in any manner that would fall under the categories or the guidelines that the Historical Commission currently uses for historic preservation and maintenance. He stated that the Historical Commission has indicated that it would not move against the property owner to force the good repair standard, or some kind of

preservation. But that is not a legal standard. If the mural is designated, the property owner can be forced by the City and the Department of Licenses and Inspections to wholly repair and preserve the mural. The Neighborhood Gardens Trust will not have the money to repair the mural, so the cost is going to be placed solely on the private property owner.

- Mr. Feibush displayed and narrated a video recording that he claimed shows that the stucco has completely delaminated from the party wall. He explained that he inserted a video scope camera into holes that already existed in the mural. He stated that the scope was 10 feet long. He reported that there is absolutely no portion of the mural that is attached to the plaster and to the brick wall for the length of the scope. The mural is 100% freestanding. At some portions, the delamination is as little as one inch, but most of it is three to four inches. He stated that he has spoken to a half a dozen experts and they have concluded that there is no means or method to reattach the mural, the plaster, and the stucco back to the wall. He stated that the video recording shows 100% delamination of the mural, and the void between the mural and the party wall extends all the way to the cornice. He reported that the only portion of the mural that has no damage is the section on the five-foot high wall on the northern side of the property. He claimed that it is physically impossible to reattach the mural to the party wall. He asserted that the mural can be stabilized for one or two years but there is simply no long-term solution that he can support.
- Mr. Whalen concluded, stating that the engineering reports support Mr. Feibush's claims.
- Mr. Farnham noted for the record that Mr. Whalen and Mr. Feibush have not submitted the engineering reports that Mr. Whalen just referenced to the Historical Commission. He also noted that the video had not been submitted to the Historical Commission or reviewed by the staff.

- Mr. Thomas opined that, in his opinion as an architect, stucco can be repaired. He added that he thinks that it is very important to designate and recognize this mural. Once the mural is designated, the Historical Commission can ensure that it is appropriately repaired. He noted that the wall could be insulated when it was repaired.
- Ms. Washington pointed out that the owner of the property at 2147 Ellsworth Avenue was not disputing the cultural or historical significance of the mural.
- Ms. Cooperman pointed out that, while the Rehabilitation Standards of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties may not be applicable in this case, some of the other sets of standards in that document are applicable. Mr. Whalen claimed that the Historical Commission does not have a set of review standards to apply to an application to preserve a mural, but that claim is untrue.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Simon Castets introduced himself as the executive director of the Keith Haring Foundation. He explained that the Keith Haring Foundation was established by Keith Haring in 1989, just before his death from AIDS-related complications at the age of 31, to carry forward his artistic legacy and philanthropic commitments. He stated that, on behalf of the Foundation, he wished to express its strong support for the designation of the mural under Criteria for Designation A, E, H, and J. He stated that the Keith Haring Foundation's policy opposes the reproduction of Haring murals in

other places. He reported that Keith Haring created more than 70 murals across North and South America, Europe, Asia, and Australia, making his work accessible to audiences far beyond museums and galleries. Only four of the 70 murals were created in collaboration with young people. Among these, *We the Youth* holds a singular place. It is the only one that survives in its original location within the very community that participated in its creation and where Keith Haring intended it to remain. Across the world, Haring's murals have been recognized and protected through national and municipal frameworks. Five have received direct official recognition in Pisa, Amsterdam, Melbourne, Barcelona, and New York, all cities acknowledging the civic value of these artworks. Given Keith Haring's roots in Pennsylvania, where he was born and raised, it would be especially meaningful for Philadelphia to join these cities in recognizing his legacy. Many people and organizations have stepped forward to express support for the designation of the mural. The Foundation is particularly grateful for this broad mobilization in favor of designation, an approach for which the Foundation has consistently advocated for close to four decades as a means of safeguarding Keith Haring's artistic heritage internationally. As you know, here in Philadelphia, support has come from the City Council, including its president, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Monument Lab, the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, MANA, the essential HIV AIDS charity, which is also a Keith Haring grantee, and the board of the Point Breeze Business Association. Across Pennsylvania, the Office of Governor Shapiro and the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office have also expressed their support. At the national level, we have been joined by the Public Art Fund and by all of Keith Haring's sisters, one of whom serves on the Foundation's board. The Foundation's board has unanimously endorsed designation. Our board includes Catherine Fleming, the CEO and President of the Getty Trust, as well as Maria Rosario Jackson, the former chair of the National Endowment for the Arts. Perhaps most importantly, dozens of Point Breeze residents have now added their voices to this extraordinary expression of support. The Foundation is deeply moved by their engagement, which reminds us that Keith Haring's legacy is not confined to the history of art. It continues to live through the communities, the civic relationships, and the cultural life that his work helped shape.
    - Mr. Frankel asked Mr. Castets about the preference of the Keith Haring Foundation regarding restoring this mural in place versus moving it elsewhere and replacing it in kind at the site.
    - Mr. Castets stated that the Keith Haring Foundation has been consistent about its long-held policy of restoring murals in place, not moving or replicating them.
- Emily Mello, the new executive director of Mural Arts Philadelphia, affirmed Mural Arts Philadelphia's deep commitment to *We the Youth* and to finding a path forward that ensures its preservation in Point Breeze. She stated that Keith Haring is one of the most recognized artists in the world. His work is in museums and collections, but also on T-shirts, mugs, and in children's books. She observed that she has seen firsthand how Haring's legacy has supported programs that bring together art and social justice. She reported that she brought young people to his preserved studio in New York, where the foundation shared his writing and other materials from his archive which have given voice to Haring's fears, hopes, and dreams for future generations, even as he knew his own time would be far too brief. Mural Arts values art's accessibility and art's ability to tell and seed many stories in public space. Haring's work continues to have meaning for people of all ages and walks of life. She noted that what she has heard about *We the Youth* is extraordinary. She observed that people in Point Breeze have brought their children to the mural and now bring

DRAFT

their grandchildren there, three generations, who have tended the garden and held and celebrated marriages there, welcomed out-of-town visitors, and have understood this mural as a source of pride, and many different kinds of pride. That is what public art can become, part of the lived memory of a place that makes it historically significant. As a new executive director of Mural Arts, I was thrilled to learn that this work is part of the collection we steward. And with more than 40 years of collective experience doing that work across Philadelphia, Mural Arts is committed to working with the community and its partners to find a responsible path forward for *We the Youth* in Point Breeze.

- Jane Golden, the former executive director of Mural Arts Philadelphia, stated that she supports the designation of the Keith Haring mural as a historic object. She stated that the mural was created in 1987 during Philadelphia's commemoration of the Bicentennial. The project was driven by the very iconic and wonderful Brandywine Workshop and Archives under the direction of Alan Edmonds, who is extraordinary. It was created in Point Breeze in collaboration with young people. Keith Haring did not want the mural in Center City. He wanted it to be in a neighborhood where it could live and breathe alongside the life of a community. It represents a moment in Philadelphia when public art, young people, and a neighborhood, and civic history all came together. It is incredible that nearly 40 years later the mural remains at its original site, where it should stay. This continuity is historically significant. In the ongoing threat of development and gentrification in this city, it is rare to find a mural at the same site, nearly 40 years after it was created. It also carries another important part of Philadelphia's cultural history. Keith Haring was an openly gay artist whose work became deeply associated with queer visibility, AIDS activism, dignity, and acceptance. The mural continues to be a beacon to this day. The mural inevitably contributes to Philadelphia's LGBTQ+ cultural history, as well as Haring's identity, his artistic legacy, and the meaning that his work has acquired over time. Keith Haring and this mural are part of our unique urban fabric in Philadelphia. Haring is unquestionably one of the most influential artists of the twentieth century. His visual language became internationally recognized, but his importance goes beyond popularity. He fundamentally challenged the boundaries between contemporary art, public space, popular culture, activism, and community engagement. Keith Haring was able to blur all the hierarchy that was set up in the public art world. That is an inspiration for all of us who carry that torch in public art making. Ms. Golden reported that she was able to meet Keith Haring while he was painting the mural. She stated that she climbed the scaffolding and talked with him about the mural. She noted that she took him on a tour of the city's murals the next day. She observed that his work demonstrated that art could be accessible without sacrificing seriousness, and that an artist could engage directly with social and political issues while working outside traditional museum settings. And at the same time, the work could be visually rich and interesting and magical and enchanting. This mural is especially important because it represents this philosophy around access and equity and fairness in motion for 40 years. It is a site-specific work. Its history includes not only the actual hand of Keith Haring, but the hands of many young people who participated in the creation of this mural. Murals are related to the place where they were created, and this gives them incredible meaning and resonance to the community. The murals in this city are like the autobiography of the City of Philadelphia. The mural is connected viscerally, emotionally, civically, psychologically, to the citizens who live here, and that is fantastic. Moving it would not simply mean moving a painting from one location to another, but it would be severing the physical connection between the artwork and the history that gives it

meaning. And this is precisely why designating the mural as a historic object matters. The mural cannot withstand being moved. It can be restored. Mural Arts will continue to be a steward of the mural and will continue with the support of Neighborhood Gardens Trust and the Haring Foundation. Ms. Golden asked the Historical Commission to designate the mural, an actual physical object that embodies an important piece of Philadelphia's history. This is really very serious. This mural represents the history of our city, history of Point Breeze, history of Philadelphia's public art movement. The mural has survived through immense social and political change in our city and our nation. And it still stands. It stands as a beacon, a landmark, and an ever-present source of inspiration and pride. There are few opportunities to preserve history while it is still physically present and still connected to our city and community. Ms. Golden urged the Historical Commission to find that the Keith Haring mural meets the Criteria for Designation as a historic object, and to ensure that this remarkable piece of Philadelphia history remains here for future generations.

- Tanya Covington introduced herself as a resident of the Point Breeze neighborhood who lives across the street from the mural and as the block captain. She observed that she takes care of the garden at 2149 Ellsworth Street. She stated that she knows people who helped Keith Haring paint the mural. She stated that the mural means community. The mural draws people from around the world including art lovers, Keith Haring fans, families, tourists, and visitors. The mural draws people together. People move to the neighborhood just to be close to the mural. It creates a sense of community. People get married in front of it. People hold baby showers there. She noted that she threw a graduation party for her brother, a birthday party for her mother, and her grandson's first birthday party at the mural. She stated that the mural deserves designation because it means so much to so many people.
- Kate Jacobi, a Senior Project Manager at Mural Arts, stated that the mural and the garden together create an important piece of urban fabric. She stated that she oversaw the restoration of the mural in 2012 and 2013. She stated that the mural and wall to which it is attached were in far worse condition at that time than they are today. She stated that the mural can be restored again. She stated that she is committed to the long-term maintenance of the mural and the garden. She acknowledged that the mural needs repair, but she asserted that it can be repaired. She noted that people come from all over the world to see the mural. The mural should not be moved. It is site specific. The mural would not belong or make sense in a museum or a gallery. It belongs out in the open, where anybody from any means and any background can come to see it.
- Nate Osborne, a Point Breeze resident, stated that the mural satisfies many Criteria for Designation. He asserted that Keith Haring is the most recognized visual artist at the intersection of the LGBTQ and AIDS movements in the world. He reported that he raised $2,000 for restoration efforts in partnership with Mural Arts in a grassroots effort in two days. He reported that there is capacity in the community to help with restoration efforts. Preservation does not mean making a facsimile or copying of the mural.
- Melissa Donia, a Point Breeze resident who was born and raised in South Philadelphia, stated that the mural is very important to her and she would like it to stay where it is. She stated that it is an integral part of the community, and Keith Haring collaborated with youth from the neighborhood to paint the mural because he wanted it to be accessible; moving it would make it inaccessible.
- Ashley Lepera reported that she and her husband bought their house on S. 22nd

Street last year. She stated that she was unaware of this matter until recently. She stated that she is very upset that a private property owner could have so much influence over the art and history of the area. She objected to the fact that he was represented by an attorney. She stated that the mural is an integral part of the community.

- Lori Arnold introduced herself and claimed that she is a conservator with 30 years' experience and a Ph.D. in material science. She stated that it would be "a no-brainer" to preserve this mural. She stated that the mural is in poor condition. It is a very fragile mural. It is detached three inches in some places. It cannot simply be pushed back onto the wall. Restoring it will take help from the best mural conservators in the nation to stick it on the wall.
- Paul Steinke, the executive director of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, noted his letter to the Historical Commission, dated 14 September 2026, which indicates that the Preservation Alliance supports this nomination. He remarked that designating the mural will not preclude consideration of any of the restoration options. If the mural is designated, the mural owners will have access to the expertise of the Historical Commission, and the public will have a say in how this international treasure is managed and cared for in the future. The Preservation Alliance supports this nomination and recommends that the Keith Haring mural be added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as a historic object.
- Sarah Kolker introduced herself as an artist and educator in Philadelphia. She reported that she worked on the restoration of the mural in 2013. She explained that the restoration team was able to put the mural back together. She noted that she has worked in private and public schools all over Philadelphia and reported that the site-specific mural has been used as a teaching tool from kindergarten through 12th grade, and not only for learning about color and form, but also about the LGBTQ movement and AIDS. The students take great pride in the mural in their community.
- Sam Uray, a resident of the 2100 block of Ellsworth Street, across the street from the mural, identified as a queer artist and noted that Philadelphia has provided a safe haven to live authentically and create art. Haring is a major influence and Point Breeze recognizes and truly values the historical and cultural significance of this mural and the property it sits on. Haring was born in Pennsylvania, and his work has value to the queer community, and the Point Breeze residents who helped create it or witness its creation. The work is significant to both national and Philadelphia history and the mural meets the qualifications for historic designation. The mural is very special and worth protecting to a lot of people in Philadelphia and throughout the world. People come from all over the world to see this historic piece of art, which brings a cultural vibrancy to Point Breeze that the community is desperately holding onto as rapid gentrification dulls and sterilizes the neighborhood. All parties should have an open dialogue to determine the options for the mural's future privileging the community's preference for preserving it in its original spot. Art is an essential part of history, and work made by a queer Pennsylvanian even more so now, during a political climate that seeks to erase queer history. The mural matters so much to the neighborhood, the community, and the arts as a whole.
- Laura Baker Dickey stated that the Keith Haring mural is right outside her window at 2148 Ellsworth Street. She stated that she looks at the mural every day, and countless people come to visit the mural. They get joy from the mural and joy from the garden. She advocated for designation, which will enable the community to have a say in what comes next for the mural.
- David Traub stated that Save Our Sites heartily supports the designation of the

mural.
- Lily Winagle, a resident of Point Breeze, spoke in support of historically designating the mural.
- Kate Jacobi spoke a second time. She stated that the mural was in worse condition in 2012 and 2013, when it was restored, than it is now. She stated that the mural was able to be repaired and it did not cost millions of dollars.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:
- Mr. Thomas noted that the question before the Historical Commission today is whether the mural qualifies for and should be designated. Questions about the restoration can be confronted later if it is designated.
- Ms. Washington stated that hearing that there is a possible path to restoring the mural is significant because there is no disagreement about the importance of the artist or the mural.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that, if the Historical Commission does not designate the mural, it will have no role in in how the mural is treated in the future. Given the paramount and eminent historical significance of the mural, for which ample evidence has been provided in both the nomination and in the testimony today, the Commission would not fulfill its role of acting in the public interest if it did not designate this mural today.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- Internationally prominent artist Keith Haring and teenagers from Philadelphia and New York painted the mural on the shared party wall at 2147 and 2149 Ellsworth Street in 1987.
- The nomination as well as the testimony before the Historical Commission provided "ample evidence" of the "paramount and eminent historical significance" of the mural.

The Historical Commission concluded that:
- The mural satisfies Criterion for Designation A because it has significant value as part of the heritage and culture of Philadelphia and for its association with Keith Haring, an internationally renowned American artist.
- The mural satisfies Criterion for Designation E because it is a work by Keith Haring, an artist who significantly influenced the cultural development of Philadelphia, the United States, and the world.
- The mural satisfies Criterion for Designation H because it represents an established and familiar visual feature of the Point Breeze neighborhood, owing to its unique location at a street corner in front of a public garden and to the recognizable artistic style of Keith Haring.
- The mural satisfies Criterion for Designation J because it exemplifies the cultural heritage of the Point Breeze community.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that *We the Youth*, the Keith Haring mural on the properties at 2147 and 2149 Ellsworth Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, H, and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 2147 and 2149 Ellsworth St MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, E, H, J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)					X
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 5538-50 BALTIMORE AVE

Name of Resource: Ambassador Theater
Proposed Action: Designate
Property Owner: James J. Kennedy Jr.
Nominator: University City Historical Society
Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate 5538-50 Baltimore Avenue, the former Ambassador Theatre and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as satisfying Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion A because it is representative of the history of Philadelphia's neighborhood cinemas and tied to important regional theatre operators, including the Felt Amusement Company and Frederick G. Nixon-Nirdlinger. As a second-run neighborhood movie palace, it reflects the entertainment habits of working-class Philadelphians and the growth of cinema as a dominant cultural force. Under Criterion C, the nomination asserts that the Ambassador is a well-preserved example of Classical Revival as expressed in the architectural vocabulary of 1920s cinema design. Under Criterion J, the nomination illustrates the social role of neighborhood theatres like the Ambassador, reflecting the cultural heritage of the West Philadelphia community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Ambassador Theatre at 5538-50 Baltimore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

DRAFT

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5538-50 Baltimore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:03:41

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- George Poulin of the University City Historical Society represented the nomination.
- Property owner James Kennedy and his attorney Albert Weiss attended the meeting and spoke in opposition to the designation of the property. They argued that designating the property as historic would cause financial hardship, limit redevelopment options, and create burdens owing to the building's poor condition.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in favor of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Ambassador Theatre possesses strong historical, architectural, and cultural significance.
- Designation does not prevent redevelopment and may instead create new opportunities such as tax credits, adaptive reuse strategies, and broader buyer interest.
- The building's condition does not preclude its historic significance.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Ambassador Theatre represents the history of Philadelphia's neighborhood cinemas and their connection to influential regional theater operators, satisfying Criterion for Designation A.
- The building is a well-preserved example of Classical Revival architecture characteristic of 1920s cinema design, satisfying Criterion for Designation C.
- The Ambassador Theatre reflects the cultural and social heritage of West Philadelphia through its role as a neighborhood entertainment venue, satisfying Criterion for Designation J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5538-50 Baltimore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 5538-50 Baltimore Ave MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, and J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)					X
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:16:32

ACTION: At 11:37 a.m., Mr. Thomas moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

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

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT