

**THE MINUTES OF THE 668TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 APRIL 2018
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Terry Dillon, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
Mark Dodds, Division of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Martha Cross, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
H. Ahada Stanford, Commerce Department
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I
Leonard Reuter, Esq., City Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Pip Campbell, CCRA
Allen Rubin, SGCA
Vincent DiMaria, Callowhill Neighborhood Association
Paul Boni, Esq.
Kelly Somers, SCB
Kristen Suzda, WRT
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Dustin Downey, Southern Land
Chris McGinnis
Harry Pollack, NCL Realty
Kenny Pollack, NCL Realty
Bill Young
Bill Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild LLP
Fred Baumert, Keast & Hood
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Dustin Downey, Southern Land
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Rick Gross, BWRA
Wade Albert, CCRA
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Maria Sturm, German Society
Adam Montalbono, Moto Design
Andre Golsorkhi
Oscar Beisert
Gary Reuben
Dave Kyu, Asian Arts Initiative
Teresa Walker
J.M. Duffin
Venise Whitaker
Susan Reel-Panish, Pella Windows

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Hartner, McCoubrey, Royer, Stanford and Turner joined him. Martha Cross attended the meeting as the City Planning Commission designee, Terry Dillon attended as the Department of Licenses & Inspections designee, and Mark Dodds attended as the Housing & Community Development designee.

MINUTES OF THE 667TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes of the 667th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 March 2018. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MARCH 2018

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the Consent Agenda, which included applications for 1907-15 Walnut Street and 1904-40 Sansom Street, 514 Spruce Street, 2205 Bainbridge Street and 950-52 S. Front Street. Mr. Farnham informed the chair that he had received several requests to remove the application for 1907-15 Walnut Street and 1904-40 Sansom Street from the Consent Agenda. He explained that no one had explicitly objected to the design, but several had expressed an interest in commenting on it. Mr. Thomas removed the application for 1907-15 Walnut Street and 1904-40 Sansom Street from the consent agenda.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the Architectural Committee recommendations for the applications for 514 Spruce Street, 2205 Bainbridge Street and 950-52 S. Front Street. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1907-15 WALNUT ST AND 1904-40 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct mixed-use building, alter existing buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1911 Walnut Street, LLC

Applicant: David Gest, c/o Southern Land Company

History: 1907-15 Walnut Street, vacant

1904 Sansom Street, c. 1855, altered by Clarence Wunder, architect, 1923

1906-16 Sansom Street, Warwick Apartments, Chester H. Kirk, architect, 1902

1918-40 Sansom Street, vacant

Individual Designation: none

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, various, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review window, door, masonry, and deck details at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street, provided the deck at 1904 Sansom Street is not visible from Sansom Street and that the bridge over Moravian Street is restudied with the goal of reducing its width, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historic buildings at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street and the construction of a mixed-use 49-story and two-story complex at 1907-15 Walnut Street and 1918-40 Sansom Street.

The project site is located on the 1900 blocks of Walnut and Sansom Streets in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. Moravian Street, a narrow alley, runs east-west through the site. At the time of the establishment of the historic district in 1996, a non-historic, non-contributing theater building stood at 1907-11 Walnut Street. It was destroyed in a fire and demolished. The lot at 1907-11 Walnut Street is vacant today. The property at 1913-15 Walnut Street was at the time of the establishment of the historic district and is today a vacant lot. The building at 1904 Sansom Street, called the Coffeehouse, is a c. 1855 rowhouse that was remodeled in the Spanish Revival style in 1923; it is classified as significant in the district and is in poor condition. The building at 1906-16 Sansom Street, called the Warwick Apartments, was constructed in 1902, is classified as contributing to the district, and is in poor condition. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street under the financial hardship provision in 2017 and it was demolished soon thereafter. The lot is currently vacant. The surface parking at 1922-40 Sansom Street was undeveloped at the time of the establishment of the historic district in 1996.

The historic buildings at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street would be combined and converted for housing. The rear of the building at 1904 would be removed and reconstructed as an elevator and stair tower for the new complex. The building at 1906-16 currently has a single, very small elevator and a single stairway that runs across an exterior balcony at every floor. The new elevator and stair tower will provide the requisite access to and egress from every floor. The tower will be clad in brick. A roof deck will be added to 1904, but will be set back from the plane of the front façade to be inconspicuous. Windows will be replaced in the historic buildings to match the historic window appearances. The non-historic infill in the storefront opening at 1904 will be replaced with an entranceway system that echoes the historic windows. The masonry of the historic buildings will be cleaned and repaired.

A 49-story tower will be constructed on the 1907-15 Walnut Street lot. The four-story base of the tower will be articulated to replicate the rhythms of the historic buildings to the west. It will be clad in limestone and metal panels and a glass curtain wall system, and include a canopy over the entrance. The upper section of the tower will be clad in a glass and metal panel window wall system and will include balconies. The tower will cantilever five feet beyond the property line at the west.

A two-story section connected to the tower will be constructed along Sansom and 20th Streets. It will be clad in modular brick panels, metal panels, and a glass curtain wall system. It will include roof decks at the east and west ends. Parking will be located below grade with an entrance along 20th Street. A loading dock entrance will be located on Sansom Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Neil Sklaroff, developer Dustin Downey, and architects Kelly Somers and Kristen Suzda represented the application.

Ms. Somers presented the new-construction portion of the project to the Historical Commission. She identified the location of the site and showed a site plan. She pointed out the location of the tower on Walnut and the two-story retail space on Sansom. She noted the location of the parking and loading dock. She explained the links across Moravian Street. She presented architectural drawings of the new construction. She noted that the tower sits on a three-story podium that relates to the surrounding buildings. She displayed renderings of the tower and retail building. She showed elevations of the bridge over Moravian Street. She discussed the materials that will clad the buildings' exteriors. She displayed plans of the various floors in the tower and retail building.

Ms. Suzda presented the rehabilitation plans for the historic buildings. She explained that the buildings would be converted for veterans' housing. She stated that accessibility is a primary concern. The large, infilled, at-grade opening in the coffee shop building will be used as the accessible main entrance for the complex. The ramps will be in the interior. The buildings will be cleaned, repointing, and patching masonry. New windows to match the historic windows will be installed. Ms. Suzda explained that the coffee shop building is in very poor condition at the rear. She discussed the plans for the elevator and stair tower at the rear of the coffee shop, where the building is currently in poor condition. The cladding of the tower will correspond to the color of the brick on the Warwick. She pointed out the roof deck proposed for the coffee shop. She stated that the deck would not be visible from Sansom Street. Ms. Suzda explained that the Warwick lacks an adequate stairway. Currently, one must use the exterior fire balconies to move up and down in the building. She pointed out on the plans where west-facing windows and doors will be infilled to accommodate interior changes. She noted that the brick infill will be slightly recessed. Mr. Thomas asked about a steep ramp on the plans. Ms. Suzda explained that it is a trash ramp, not an accessibility ramp. She reported that there are no interior connections between the older buildings and the new construction. She walked the Commissioners through the interior plans.

Ms. Somers presented renderings of the new construction and historic buildings showing the street facades. She addressed the comments of the Architectural Committee regarding Moravian Street. She displayed renderings of the Moravian Street façades. She displayed architectural drawings of the revisions made to the Moravian Street bridge. She explained the reasons for maintaining the bridge at its initially proposed width. She described the third-floor amenity deck on the Sansom Street building. She noted that the developer will restore the entire

block of Moravian. She stated that they will improve the streetscape and the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Suzda presented the sight-line study for the roof deck on the coffee shop, showing that it would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced Dustin Downey. He stated that the developer will be responsible for the maintenance of Moravian Street. He stated that the City would never “put another dime” into Moravian Street. He noted that the City Council passed an ordinance vacating Moravian above and below the street surface. Mr. McCoubrey asked if Moravian would continue to be a public street. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it would remain public. Mr. McCoubrey asked why the façades of the bridge have no windows. He stated that, now that he better understands the bridge, he does not object to the width of it, but he would like to see some fenestration or other articulation on its facades. Ms. Somers stated that the facades of the bridge currently shown as solid to satisfy the fire code; owing to their adjacency to the lot lines, the facades are proposed as solid. Mr. Downey and Ms. Somers stated that they are looking at ways to improve the design of the bridge. For example, they are considering redesigning the parapet to reduce size and scale of the bridge facades. Ms. Cooperman stated that the bridge as designed has a “menacing, looming, dark quality.” Mr. Thomas noted that the project will bring life and activity to Moravian Street. He suggested that anything that can be done to reduce the mass of the bridge would be appreciated. Mr. Downey noted that they will be meeting with the Fire Marshall and the Department of Licenses & Inspections and can discuss the requirements at that time. Mr. Dillon explained that there may be ways in which they could meet the fire code with sprinklers or other mechanisms. Mr. Downey pledged to work to improve the design of the bridge.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the rear of the coffee shop is being demolished. Mr. Downey responded that some of the rear of the building will be removed. He stated that the structure at the rear of the building is compromised and needs to be replaced. Ms. Cooperman asked if documentation of the structural failure at the rear had been submitted. She stated that the Commission needs to be diligent when reviewing demolition. Mr. Sklaroff responded that he would characterize the work at the rear as an alteration, not a demolition.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he objects to the curb cut on Sansom Street for the loading dock entry. Mr. Traub claimed that the garage and loading dock were not presented to the Historical Commission when it reviewed the application to demolish the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street. He asserted that the plans of the new development that were presented at that time of the demolition application did not show a garage entrance. He claimed that a retail space was shown on the ground floor of the new building, immediately adjacent to the Warwick. He stated that he wanted “to present these facts to the Commission for the record.” Mr. Sklaroff responded that the development team did not present any plans for the new construction when it proposed the demolition of the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street to the Historical Commission. He stated that the demolition application was strictly related to the feasibility of the reuse of the historic building and had nothing to do with the subsequent reuse of the site. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that Mr. Traub was mistaken when he claimed that plans were presented during the demolition review showing a retail space next to the Warwick. He noted that the curb cut was located in the proposed position at the insistence of Council President Clarke.

Richard Gross remarked that he lives at 1920 Chestnut Street and chaired the stakeholders’ group for the Boyd Theater project. He stated that the Boyd Theater project resulted in an excellent outcome for the neighborhood. He stated that he is also a member of the Center City

residents Association board, but that he is not speaking on behalf of the association. He stated that, after Southern Land proposed an inappropriate building for the site, he was asked to convene another stakeholders' group. He stated that such a group was formed and it included representatives of the surrounding neighbors. The group raised money and hired architects to help revise the proposed project. He concluded that the stakeholders are entirely in support of the resulting design. He asserted that the revised building is compatible with the Rittenhouse historic district. He observed that the preservation of the historic buildings on Sansom and their reuse for subsidized housing was important to the stakeholders and has been achieved. Mr. Gross reported that they were able to convince the developer to create a closed area for trash and loading, protecting the neighborhood from noise and congestion. He also noted the widening and improving of Moravian Street. He noted that the tower was relocated to protect Rittenhouse Plaza. He also noted that Sansom will be improved for pedestrian traffic. The Sansom Street loading entrance will only be used in the early morning. He stated that the stakeholders strongly support the project, which is compatible with the historic neighborhood.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia reported that his organization participated in the stakeholders group. He commended Richard Gross and Southern Land for their work to improve the project. He also commended the reuse of the Sansom Street historic buildings. He noted that a grand mansion once stood on the walnut Street portion of the site.

Attorney Paul Boni stated that he represents the Rittenhouse Plaza. He stated that his client generally is supportive of the building. He distributed copies of architectural drawings from the applicants' presentation. He objected to third floor portion of the building at the east along Walnut Street and suggested that it should be two stories in height only. He asserted that the proposed building should only be two stories at the east, the same height as the adjacent Rittenhouse Plaza annex. Anything taller than two stories would "unduly impact" residents in the Rittenhouse Plaza, Mr. Boni claimed. Anything taller would also create "another incongruous differential in building heights along Walnut." He contended that eliminating the third story would not be a hardship.

Wade Albert, the president of the Center City Residents Association, stated that that his organization supports the proposed project. He commended Southern Land for working with the stakeholders' group. He thanked Southern Land for reusing the two historic buildings and bringing vibrancy to Sansom Street.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission should be provided with information about the structural failure at the rear of 1904 Sansom Street. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission was provided with encyclopedic information about the histories and conditions of the historic buildings on the site. Mr. Farnham noted that the preservation ordinance defines a "demolition" as the razing or removal of a historic building entirely or in significant part. He explained that Mr. Sklaroff has characterized the removal of the rear of 1904 Sansom as an "alteration," not a "demolition," because the rear of the building is not a significant part of the building. Ms. Cooperman opined that the removal is a demolition, not an alteration. Mr. Mattioni disagreed, stating that the proposal provides a very sensitive approach to a very complex situation.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided refinements of the design of the exterior of the bridge over Moravian Street are considered, and to find that the removal of the rear section of 1904 Sansom Street is an alteration as defined in §14-203(76) in the Philadelphia Code, not a demolition as defined in §14-203(88), with the

staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1132 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct 2-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christopher McGinnis

Applicant: Christopher McGinnis

History: 1826

Individual Designation: 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as proposed, but approval of the replacement of the rear ell with an ell replicating the existing width, provided the sliding glass doors at the second floor are replaced with punched window openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing two-story rear ell and construct a two-story rear addition clad in cement board siding or stucco. The existing rear ell is in poor condition, and was not original to the building, but does appear on a 1917 map. The proposed addition spans the full width of the property, eliminating the existing three-foot side-yard setback and thereby building over the existing visible section of the rear wall of the main house. The rear of the building is visible from Wharton Street to the south (side) and Howard Street, a service alley at the rear.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Chris McGinnis Jr. and his father, Chris McGinnis Sr. represented the application.

Mr. McGinnis Jr. stated that he recently purchased 1132 S. Front Street and it is his first home. He contended that the three-foot side setback on the rear ell prohibits a functional kitchen and bedroom, given its narrow width. He stated that he is a structural engineer, and the current rear ell is deficient and in very poor condition. He proposed to pour a new footing and rebuild the new rear addition to the same length as the current rear ell, but as wide as the full width of the main house. He noted that two adjacent properties at 1130 and 1134 S. Front Street have full-width rear additions, and were individually designated at the same time as his property. He stated that he is willing to accept the punched openings recommended by the Committee, and that he would work with the staff on other details.

Mr. McGinnis Sr. stated that he owns 1130 S. Front Street, which he purchased 30 years ago when many of the buildings were abandoned. He reported that 1132 S. Front Street has been abandoned for five years. He reported that his property at 1130 S. Front Street has been restored per the Historical Commission's standards.

Mr. McGinnis Jr. distributed revised drawings of his project to show punched openings on the second-floor rear per the Architectural Committee's recommendation, but with a rear ell spanning the full width of the main house.

Mr. McGinnis Sr. commented that rebuilding in the original, narrow rear ell would not allow for a functional, legal bedroom with a closet. He continued that a kitchen on the first floor would not be practical.

Mr. Thomas asked about the rear lot behind the house. Mr. McGinnis Sr. stated that they intend to build a house on the lot. Mr. Thomas asked if the rear ell would be visible after the construction of the house is complete. Mr. McGinnis Sr. responded that the rear ell would not be visible, and that there are other construction projects being planned for other lots at the rear of these S. Front Street properties. Mr. Thomas asked if the height of the rebuilt ell will rise above the eave of the main roof. Mr. McGinnis Sr. responded that the new construction will remain the same height as the existing ell, which does not rise above the eave of the main roof.

Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee agreed with the staff recommendation, and determined that the rear ell, in its historic width, and the exposed section of the rear wall of the main house, are character-defining features of the building. He reiterated that the property is individually designated. He explained that the Committee agreed that it was acceptable to remove the existing rear addition, but that it should be rebuilt to match the historic width and height.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Dillon seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Mses. Stanford and Turner and Messrs. Dillon, Hartner, Mattioni, and Thomas voted in favor. Mses. Cooperman and Cross and Messrs. Dodds and McCoubrey dissented.

ADDRESS: 514 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition; replace garage door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James and Anna Whitesell

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1813; Peter Berry, house carpenter; rear façade rebuilt, 1946; front façade rebuilt, 1966

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the location of the mechanical equipment and design of the garage door, but approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition at this three-story building. The proposed rear addition will be clad in brick, with standing seam metal roofs, and will be substantially blocked from public view at the rear by the existing garage fronting Cypress Street. A non-historic one-story addition will be demolished, and the first and second stories of the rear masonry wall will be removed. Zoning records show that this rear wall was rebuilt in 1946, which accounts for the existing non-historic appearance. The rear chimney will become a working chimney and will be extended in height as necessitated by building code requirements. The rear roof slope will be extended slightly. An existing one-story garage at the rear of the property will be extended by six feet into the rear yard, and a new garage door will be installed. The staff suggests that the garage door should be redesigned with glazing along the top of the door and panels below, rather than the more modern style that is proposed in the application.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2205 BAINBRIDGE ST

Proposal: Restore front façade; install egress dormer window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Timothy Kerner

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are wood, not clad, and have the appearance of double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade of this single-family residence. All aspects of the restoration are able to be approved at the staff-level, except for the front dormer window, which the staff believes was historically two double-hung windows with arched tops. The applicant seeks to retain the existing rectangular opening and insert an egress-compliant casement window to fit the opening.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1919-21 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition; reconfigure facades; stucco rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andre O. Golsorkhi and Autum G. Oser

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1919; rebuilt after fire, c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a red brick compatible with the surrounding streetscape, not a gray brick, is used at the front façade; the first and second-floor rear façade is brick, not stucco; and a railing, not a parapet, encloses the rear deck; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify a non-contributing building that was once a carriage house but was significantly altered in the mid twentieth century. This application proposes to demolish and reconstruct the primary façade along Brandywine Street. The existing single-leaf door at the front entry will be removed. The entry will be moved to the center of the first-floor façade and double-leaf doors will be installed. The existing windows will be removed and new openings will be created to accommodate new double-hung, fixed, and casement metal windows. The applicant proposes to replace the red brick on the primary façade with a gray brick.

On the rear façade, the windows and garage door will be removed. New fixed and metal casements are proposed to replace the existing windows. A new garage door with upper glazing is proposed as well. The building's rear wall is currently red brick.

As the building is non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, most of these changes have been approved by the Historical Commission staff. The outstanding approval is to rebuild the front façade in gray brick.

Since the 27 March 2018 Architectural Committee meeting, proposals for the rear addition, 42" parapet wall, and stucco on the rear façade have been removed from the application.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Andre Golsorkhi and architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano stated that he has worked with the staff on approval of most aspects of the project. He noted that the current application is limited to the front façade brick color. He and Mr. Golsorkhi both opined that the proposal for gray brick is in keeping with the variety of colors and textures found on the 1900 block of Brandywine Street. They asserted that the gray brick is in keeping with the historical character and material integrity of the historic block.

Mr. Thomas requested to see the three samples of proposed gray brick. Commissioners discussed the gray brick, the current brick, and other masonry materials on the 1900 block of Brandywine Street. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee had also reviewed the three samples of gray brick and had recommended red brick in lieu of gray brick.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Allen Rubin, the resident and owner of 1918-20 Brandywine Street, contended that red brick is the most appropriate for this location. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that red brick will maintain the character of the historic block.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided the façade is constructed in red brick, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 340 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Neil Gordon

Applicant: Jack E. Burns, Jr., Jack Burns Architecture, LLP

History: 1868; front façade rebuilt, 1971

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This revised application proposes to construct a roof deck with a 7'-3" setback from the front façade and a pilot house. There is no setback proposed at the rear of the roof. A smooth, board and batten cement siding is proposed for the pilot house, and a 3'-0" glass railing

with a black top rail is proposed to enclose the deck. The pilot house roof has been redesigned to slope backwards, and the overall height has been reduced. Because of the building's location close to a corner, the railing would be slightly visible from 17th Street. The rear of the property is visible from Panama Street, making the deck and railing as currently proposed highly visible.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Jack Burns and Chris Schrack represented the application.

Mr. Burns introduced himself to the members of the Historical Commission, and explained that he presented a significantly different design previously to the Architectural Committee, which was much more visible from the public right-of-way when compared to the revised design. He stated that his clients' home has no outdoor space, and they are looking to create some with the installation of a roof deck. Mr. Burns explained that the Committee recommended that the roof deck was too close to the front of the property, and was also too large and too tall, and that he revised the proposal to attempt to comply with the Committee's recommendations. He stated that visibility from 17th Street has been substantially reduced, making the visibility from Panama Street the primary concern. He explained that there is a view-shed through a driveway on Panama Street that makes the rear of his clients' house completely visible. He further explained that the street dead-ends just down the block, and there are only a few residences and relatively little vehicular traffic on it, in addition to dumpsters from the businesses. He opined that the view from Panama Street is not very significant and that it is a very limited view by anyone who does not live on the block. Mr. Burns directed the Commission's attention to a photograph of a recently-constructed roof deck that is as visible as his proposal, if not more, from the same vantage point on Panama Street. Ms. Schmitt directed the Commissioners to drawing HC-111 in their packets.

Mr. Burns explained that when they considered schemes that made the deck out of view from the driveway on Panama Street, they ended up essentially with a 10' box that sat on top of a deck, taken up mostly by the pilot house. He directed the Commissioners to drawing HC-105, to further demonstrate why the deck would have to be significantly reduced in size in order to put it out of view from the driveway. Mr. Thomas asked if the subject property backed up into a yard of a property on Panama Street. Mr. Burns responded that on drawing HC-105, Panama Street would be at the top of the page, and that the location of the north arrow on the sheet was the approximate location of where the photograph Mr. Thomas was looking at was taken from. Mr. Thomas asked if the photograph was taken from the rear, and Mr. Burns responded that it was taken from Panama Street looking across the rear yard. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the view was across two rear yards. Mr. Burns pointed out that, at the corner of 17th Street, there is a large, non-historic building that blocks the view of the deck almost entirely. Ms. Cooperman stated that the visibility of concern was from Panama Street. Mr. Thomas commented that he frequently walked down this street, and Mr. Burns reminded him that there was a large surface parking lot directly across the street from his clients' property. Mr. Thomas asked if there are any other questions or comments from the Commissioners, to which Mr. McCoubrey responded that he thought that the Committee wanted to see the deck reduced in size, and set back from the front façade to reduce visibility from the public right-of-way. He commented that he did not see a rendering of a view looking south down 17th Street, noting that the building to the north of the subject property was shorter, making this an important view to mock-up in order to determine the extent of visibility. He commented that the pilot house changes have minimized its visibility; however, the significant overhang intrudes into the view from Panama Street, looking more like a structure than a deck. He suggested that the 3-foot overhang be removed. He continued that the proposal, if amended, is acceptable if the deck is placed at the rear ell,

given the visibility is from such a limited location on Panama Street. He explained that the two issues are the visibility from 17th Street from the side not shown in the application, and the removal of the three-foot overhang from the pilot house. Mr. Burns responded that the neighboring house has a gabled roof, so the parapet would obscure the view looking south down 17th Street. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he does not see a view taken from this location in the packet, so he cannot comment. Mr. Burns directed the Commissioners to drawing HC-110 in their packets, and Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the image is from Google Streetview, and does not show the location of the proposed railing, so the level of visibility should be confirmed with the staff. Mr. Thomas added that a gable roof at the neighboring property will help. He asked the function of the overhang at the pilot house, to which Mr. Burns responded that his clients have a desire for some outdoor covered storage space, but that it can be removed. Mr. Thomas questioned if it had to do with solar protection, and Mr. Burns replied that it is a personal desire of his clients.

Mr. Burns stated that he desired to use glass panel for the railing system, but that the Committee was hesitant with the material choice. Mr. McCoubrey instructed Mr. Burns to work with the staff on the metal railing alternative shown in the application, and suggested that he minimize the dimensions of the elements as much as possible. Mr. Burns directed the Commissioners to the details of the railing alternatives on drawing HC-107 in their packets.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided that the overhang at the pilot house is removed, and a mock-up demonstrates that the deck is minimally visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, including the railing, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1833 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct roof deck; replace garden wall; alter entrance location at rear; reconfigure window openings at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tyler and Alejandra McNeil

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1858

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the roof deck, owing to its visibility, and approval of the changes to the garage door and the new garden wall, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the rear ell of this contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, and to enlarge an existing garage opening at the rear along Cypress Street, which is considered to be a service alley on this block. An existing fourth-floor door will be modified into a dormer to allow for deck access. An existing rear chimney is to be raised to 7'-0" above the finish deck per code. The garage entrance is to be enlarged and a new steel roll-down garage door will replace the existing garage door. The existing CMU garden wall and metal door will be replaced with a red brick wall and metal door. The application also proposes to remove two windows at the rear above the garage, raise the sills, and install a new lintel and two new windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Christina Carter represented the application.

Ms. Carter corrected Ms. Schmitt's description of the Architectural Committee's recommendation, clarifying that the denial was for the roof deck only, and that the Committee had recommended approval for the remainder of the proposed work. Ms. Schmitt confirmed that Ms. Carter was, in fact, correct. Ms. Carter then explained that she did not have any presentation, but that she was there to answer any questions about the application.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that, even though the Committee voted against approval of the deck, perhaps some of the suggestions made were not necessarily consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He noted that a suggestion was made to remove the hipped roof in order to be able to lower the deck to minimize its visibility. He remarked that, although he did not comment on it during the Committee meeting, he wished that he had, because removal of the roof would remove a significant element of the building, and the configuration of the deck as proposed was more consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards than removal of the roof and dropping of the deck. He continued, adding that he had two additional comments, the first being that the open area or void below the deck should receive some type of screening, such as an apron, so that the underside of the deck would not be exposed. He stated that his second comment is that the railing should not slide around in front of the chimney, but rather should be tucked back so as not to engage the chimney. He offered to explain these comments to the Committee at its next meeting.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Carter if she had any comments in terms of modifying the application, to which she responded that she could accommodate both requests, but that they also learned that they can lower the deck by approximately 28 inches. She asserted that visibility of the deck from 19th Street is already quite minimal as proposed in the drawings under review, but that lowering the deck will help with visibility looking west on Cypress Street. Mr. McCoubrey stated that as proposed, the deck was somewhat visible from the alley. However, this block of Cypress Street is a service alley rather than a residential street.

Mr. Thomas suggested that a motion be made to allow the staff to review and approve the changes suggested by Mr. McCoubrey. Ms. Cooperman asked if the motion needed to address the garage door, to which Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Committee had recommended approval of all of the other proposed work.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided that an apron screens the view of the underside of the deck, and that the railing does not engage the chimney, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 950-52 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Remove frame addition; construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SAM9803 LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design

History: 1820

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as well as the restoration of the marble steps, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a two-story frame portion of the rear ell and to construct a three-story rear addition in its place. The new addition would connect to the existing brick rear ell and would be clad in HardiePlank lap siding. A deck would extend between the new addition and the third floor of the main block. Portions of the existing roofs of the main block and the rear ell would be modified to create greater consistency between spaces. The window of the rear dormer would be cut down to create a door onto the deck, which would be enclosed with a metal picket railing. The application also proposes to replace an existing CMU wall and wooden gate across the property's side yard with a brick and iron fence.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 114 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Legalize parapet wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Samschick

Applicant: Core Realty Inc.

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of five-foot-tall CMU block walls on top of the building's party walls. The walls, which begin approximately 28 feet back from the front façade, are visible from several public rights-of-way. The Department of Licenses & Inspections inspected the property and issued a violation for the work in November 2017. The applicant has not provided a reason for the extension.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commissioners reviewed the application and concluded that the inexplicable additions to the party walls were highly visible from the public right-of-way and did not comply with the preservation standards and guidelines.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Hartner excused himself from the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 401-29 N 10TH ST

Name of Resource: Esslinger's Brewery

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: NCL Realty LP

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted 5 to 1 to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 401-29 N. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J, but not Criterion A, while noting that the text of the nomination may not be accurate with respect to the remains on the exterior of the Dallett Chandlery building. Mr. Lavery dissented.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 401-29 N. 10th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J; an appendix argues that the property satisfies Criterion E. The nomination states that the former George Esslinger & Son's Brewery complex represents the development and heritage of Philadelphia as a brewing center between 1879 and 1967, and is an important representative firm within the larger context of breweries, representing the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community. Additionally, the nomination assigns greater significance to the altered building at the corner of N. 10th and Callowhill Streets, which is said to have been constructed circa 1826 for Elijah Dallett's Residence, Soap Manufactory, and Stable.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham stated that the attorney representing the property owner submitted a letter requesting that Ms. Cooperman recuse from this review. Mr. Farnham explained that he consulted with an attorney at the Board of Ethics and the Law Department attorney representing the Historical Commission about Ms. Cooperman's obligations regarding recusal. The attorneys advised that Ms. Cooperman would need to recuse if she is unable to review the nomination impartially. Ms. Cooperman acknowledged the letter from the property owner's attorney requesting her recusal in this matter and stated that she will not recuse because she is able to judge this nomination impartially. Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney William Martin, property owners Harry and Kenny Pollack, preservation consultant George Thomas, and engineer Fred Baumert appeared on behalf of the owners. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Martin described the consultants' qualifications, and stated that the property owner went through significant effort and expense to bring perspectives to what they feel is a deeply flawed nomination. He explained that Criterion I was recommended for inclusion by the Committee on Historic Designation; however, Section 5.5.a(10) of the Commission's Rules and Regulations provide that the nomination is to include "a narrative citing all Criteria for Designation that the

resource satisfies.” The nomination does not reference Criterion I, and contains no evidence as to satisfaction of Criterion I. In the 14 February 2018 minutes from the Committee meeting, Ms. Cooperman commented that “there is no evidence at this time regarding subsurface remains that may satisfy Criterion I.” Mr. Martin continued that the Regulations require that evidence is provided in the nomination, so the Historical Commission should not consider designation under Criterion I. The Committee understood it had the option of returning the nomination to the nominator, but decided not to do so. He opined that the appropriate step for the Committee would have been for it to return the nomination to the nominator, ask the nominator to complete the appropriate research, submit a revised nomination, and allow the property owner to have the opportunity to see what the evidence is and appropriately respond. This was not the approach followed, so there is significant question as to whether the Commission can designate under Criterion I. Regarding Criterion J, Mr. Martin referenced comments from five months prior from a discussion between Judge Anders of Common Pleas Court and Commission attorney Leonard Reuter regarding the Criteria for Designation. Judge Anders observed that the Criteria are worded with superlatives, indicating that the Commission is authorized to designate properties that are important and significant, but not those that merely have limited significance. He asked that the Commission keep this in mind, and noted that this is a workaday factory and is not an exemplary historic resource.

Harry Pollack provided background about his business, National Chemical Laboratories (NCL). He stated that he has worked there for 40 years. His father started the business in 1946 at 8th and Lombard Streets. He relocated to the brewery complex in 1966, which he purchased from a group of investors. It took his father approximately three years to repurpose it into a factory that would manufacture industrial and institutional cleaning products. Mr. Pollack’s father made many modifications when he purchased the factory, and the prior owners had also made many modifications. He suggested that there have been hundreds of modifications to the 15 buildings in the complex. He explained that NCL manufactures products and distributes them coast-to-coast through distributors, and also sells to 50 countries. NCL employs 87 full-time employees and 7 part-time employees. Over the past 20 years, NCL has paid over \$7 million to Philadelphia in City wage tax. He noted that it is very difficult to operate a factory in Philadelphia, let alone to have the buildings historically designated. He stated that they feel that it will be financially impossible to run the business if the buildings are historically designated. He introduced his brother Kenny Pollack, who will present photographs of the complex. Mr. Martin commented that this photographic tour would be provided because most of the Commissioners do not walk around N. 10th Street and Ridge Avenue often.

Kenny Pollack introduced his photographic walk-through as a way to offer the Commissioners the advantage of better understanding the site and its buildings. He explained that the photographs were taken from the public street, so they offer the best public view of all of the buildings. The buildings are referred to as Buildings 1 through 7, and then 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E, and 8F. He highlighted the changes made over the years to the different buildings in the complex, including infilled and replaced windows and doors, brick replacement, step replacement, wall replacement, loading dock infill/additions, new entrances and stairways, parapet alterations, addition of steel headers, addition of vents, stucco applied over brick, and repointing. He also pointed out many defects in the buildings. Mr. Martin thanked the Commission for its patience and attention, and noted that every building in the complex is proposed for designation, which is why this level of detail about each building is necessary.

George Thomas, preservation consultant, presented on significant issues in the nomination. Mr. Thomas referred to the nomination as “profoundly flawed” and suggested that it should have

been rejected for not fulfilling the requirements and for not understanding the Criteria. He opined that it represents a significant failing of the Committee on Historic Designation. He suggested that the nomination should have been rejected simply on the grounds of its failures. It is filled with errors and is sloppy, and is replete with materials that are not relevant to the nomination. He noted that the Committee agreed that the property did not satisfy Criterion A; but it nevertheless persisted in applying Criterion J. Without any proof or evidence, the Committee added Criterion I for archaeological potential. The appropriate act would have been to return the nomination to the nominator for major revisions. That was not done, and so the nomination before the Commission is the same deeply flawed nomination for a building complex that is not exemplary and for which no archaeological proof exists. The nomination originally argued for Criterion A and J, for significance as a brewery and for exemplifying the heritage of the community. The Committee rightly removed Criterion A from consideration. Mr. Thomas noted that his own research proved that the brewery was of no historical or architectural significance, and its architects were minor. At the same Committee meeting, it was decided without any documentation or physical evidence to add Criterion I. The nomination itself is unchanged so there is no discussion of how it satisfies this Criterion. The nomination omits a discussion of context. There is no attempt to discuss cultural heritage that it is said to exemplify. Instead, 16 pages of the nomination discuss the long-demolished Dallett Chandlery as the focus of satisfying Criterion J. The Committee recognized that the Dallett Chandlery was long gone, and that this portion of the nomination did not satisfy Criterion J, but nevertheless that Criterion is still under consideration. Since the nomination's focus was discarded, no information was supplied to justify Criterion J. The nomination should evaluate by any number of means how this complex exemplifies the community. There is nothing provided to guide the Commission to define or understand the community. This area was once a dense neighborhood. Since the 1950s, city plans have essentially called for a clearing of the neighborhood. Demolition of most of the community was achieved by the 1960s. Since 2002, another 8 buildings have been demolished. The City Planning Commission continues to certify nearby areas as blighted. The City Planning Commission's 2035 plan continues to encourage demolition in the area with a focus on higher density. Mr. Thomas asserted that, if the goal was to capture exemplary breweries, there are better preserved examples with more context, including Weisbrod & Hess, and Gretz Brewery.

Mr. Thomas stated that the nomination should be rejected owing to errors. It incorrectly identifies building materials, such as referring to cast stone as copper, and everything in the description is suspect. The nomination claims that the corner office building is somehow the 1820s Dallett Chandlery. Mr. Thomas showed building plans from the 1950s that show that this is not the case. He stated that the nomination has an incorrect understanding of building phases and construction dates. Major defining features that would tell someone that this was a brewery are gone, including the cupola. The nomination itself told the Commission that all of the buildings except for two are of so little consequence that it did not matter what was done to them. He clarified that this was the section of the nomination that called for less stringent reviews of work to these buildings, such as being able to put windows wherever one would want to. He noted that this shows a lack of understanding on the nominator's part for the complexities of these building types.

Mr. Thomas explained that certain types of industrial processes create enormous stresses on buildings. This is particularly true with food preparation and brewery buildings, because they were built without moisture barriers and the interior holds vast amounts of humidity, which soaks into the walls from the inside and causes brick to spall and fail. He explained that all of the parapets are failing or have been replaced, and metal brackets have been used to hold them in

place, which is not a standard preservation technique. Some parapets have been replaced with cinderblock. The interior structure is connected by brackets to the steel frame embedded in the wall. This is a steel structure, basically two stories in height, with no interior flooring, floating on the inside of this building, because the brewery wanted cooling from the top of the building to dump down along the sides of the building. It is a brewery-specific design, the job of which was to cool the beer and keep it at a stable temperature, but it was not to provide any rational, modern structural system that would work for any other use. He stated that all of the buildings in the complex are in horrific condition, and are not designed for modern adaptive reuse. He commented that the reasons to designate something as historic are because the resource conveys significance of quality or character, which these buildings do not do; or because it conveys a particular sense of the heritage of a place, which has been entirely demolished in this case. He stated that it should bring a future value to the City, which this complex cannot do, as the only potential reuse might be self-storage. He stated that the buildings are certainly not able to be used in their current forms and conditions for any modern human use.

Mr. Thomas summarized his findings. He concluded that the complex is no longer exemplary of the neighborhood, and therefore does not satisfy Criterion J. Its designation does not meet the test of policy and purpose, because its preservation would not contribute to the health, prosperity, and welfare of the people of Philadelphia; its preservation is not important to the education, culture, traditions, and economic values; its preservation does not strengthen the economy of the City; it meets neither the tests of “significance” nor “exemplary;” and no evidence was presented to demonstrate the presence of important archaeological information. He concluded that the nomination should be rejected.

Fred Baumert, Chair of Keast & Hood Engineering, presented on the condition of the buildings. He described extensive efflorescence, rebuilt parapets, and numerous wall cracks. He explained that the defects go through the entire thickness of the wall, which indicates pronounced deterioration. The brewing process created enormous internal humidity, which, due to the lack of windows and vents, resulted in the saturation of the exterior masonry. The present tenant does not create as much humidity, but still injects more moisture into the air than will be found outside the buildings. This means that moisture is almost always seeking to migrate through the masonry, from the inside to the outside, where it creates the damage. Industrial facilities are hardly ever well-maintained. They are often modified in a utilitarian fashion to suit the needs of the moment. A brewery has no need or desire for windows. The ones that are there today were installed to suit later purposes for current tenants. Kenny Pollack had mentioned that they applied caulk to try to keep water out. That is not effective in these buildings, because the moisture is on the inside of the buildings, trying to get out. Steel is being corroded from the interior towards the exterior. Caulk then acts as a barrier and further traps moisture in the wall. Brackets are being used to keep parapets from falling. Some parapets were replaced with cinderblock. A brewery is designed solely to enable a specific set of processes. The tower has only four levels, but they are very tall levels. The floors do not attach to the walls, meaning that the walls are standing relatively unbraced. Star bolts have been installed where some of those brackets have failed. Because the wall is so minimally attached to the structure, if one were to try to renovate the building for some other purpose which would have windows, the cutting in of those windows will basically break the walls. Efflorescence is due to interior humidity. Mr. Baumert showed large zones where faces have popped off the brick. He marveled that he has never before seen a westward facing wall that is fully exposed to sun for more than half of the day covered with green moss. He explained that this speaks to the tremendous amount of humidity in the masonry. Mr. Baumert summarized that the very tall narrow spaces are suited to process tanks, but not offices or apartments. The minimal

construction of some portions of the complex make the insertion of windows into blank walls very difficult. He reminded the Commission that the proposed designation is not just for the one attractive façade, but for all 15 buildings.

Mr. Martin summarized that the nomination lacks any information regarding Criterion I, so that Criterion should be dismissed from consideration. The consultants have demonstrated that the Criteria are not met, that designation would not satisfy the policy rules of the City, and that designation would inappropriately burden this business. He theorized of the type of burden on the business if it had to come before the Commission every time it wanted to make a change to one of its 15 buildings. He considered the balance between the burden placed on the property owner, versus the benefit of preserving the workaday factory, a horrifying thought for a business operator.

Mr. Beisert defended the nomination. He stated that the property was nominated under Criteria A and J, and he does still believe that the complex represents the larger development patterns of the City, despite the Committee not agreeing. The brewery expanded to take over much of the block, which shows how industrial complexes grew. He described it as an intact complex that represents how the city developed in industrial areas. The brewery argument in the nomination was for Criteria A and J, and was not limited to the Dallett Chandlery. He proclaimed this complex to be one of the most, if not the most, intact brewery complex in Philadelphia. There used to be over 100 breweries in Philadelphia, but most closed after the 18th Amendment. A small number reopened, and Esslinger's was one of those to reopen. Much of the extant building campaign represents the period after prohibition. Mr. Beisert noted that Mr. Thomas contends that this complex is bland, but he countered that the facades on Callowhill Street and Ridge Avenue do represent the style of the time. The buildings represent the Modernist styles of the time. The nomination does not contend that Esslinger's was one of the most important breweries. Rather, one of most important aspects of the complex is how it expanded after prohibition. Mr. Beisert displayed a list and maps of early breweries that have been partially or completely demolished. He opined that Modernist industrial buildings are just as worthy of preservation as high-style flamboyant industrial buildings. He noted that the Gretz Brewery is also missing its cupola, yet Mr. Thomas suggested it as worthy of designation. In response to claims that the entire neighborhood has been demolished, Mr. Beisert showed the immediate area and opined that it is still dense, despite some demolitions. He noted that this is being nominated as an individual property, and as such, context is irrelevant. There are many designated resources in the City that have completely lost context. But if context is a consideration, this building is in Callowhill, in the area of the Callowhill Neighbors. He displayed a map that highlighted commercial or industrial buildings 50 years of age or greater in the immediate vicinity. He concluded that to say that it is not eligible under Criterion J, owing to context, is incorrect. He referenced the Highline in New York City, and stated that when they started planning for the Highline, the Landmarks Preservation Commission designated an historic district of all of the industrial properties around the Highline. Now it is one of the most amazing neighborhoods in the country. He agreed that it is now expensive and it did not create affordable housing, but it did create an amazing public space. He countered that to Philadelphia, where these kinds of buildings get demolished in favor of bland townhouses and unaffordable gated communities. He referred to this complex as an integral feature of the Reading Viaduct, as it is immediately adjacent to the elevated line. He displayed examples of Modernist breweries that have been reused in other countries. He commented that he regrets writing the section of the nomination that assigns greater significance to several buildings and asks that the remaining buildings are not reviewed as strictly. He explained that the goal of the nomination is not to restrict the current owner from continuing to operate, but rather the goal is to see that if the

property is sold in the future, it is reused. It is a site where liquid products have been manufactured for 200 years. Part of being a World Heritage City is preserving industrial history. He suggested that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards do not need to be followed in every case. He rhetorically asked if every building on the complex can be saved, and responded "maybe not." He continued that, if the property is eventually sold, it should at least be reviewed to be reused in some way. He concluded that there are several people from the neighborhood in attendance who would like to speak.

Venise Whitaker, not an adjacent neighbor, but a Citizen Planner and preservation activist, asked that the property be added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. She referred to the buildings as part of the streetscape, and noted that breweries are reusing buildings throughout the City.

Kelly Edwards spoke on behalf of the Callowhill Neighborhood Association. She explained that she also works for Arts & Crafts Holdings, which is one of the primary developers in the neighborhood. She used Mr. Beisert's map to show all of the buildings that Arts & Crafts Holdings owns. She commented that many are historic buildings, several of which house breweries. She referred to the area as having high traffic, and noted that the opening of the Reading Viaduct park will only increase traffic. She commented that it is important to keep these buildings as part of the industrial character of the neighborhood, and there is an opportunity to think of the site creatively for reuse. She commented that the earlier portrayal of a dystopian view of the neighborhood is incorrect. She explained that all of their buildings were purchased at complete or 50% vacancy, and are now at 70% to 90% occupancy.

Gary Reuben, architect, real estate developer, and property owner, commented that he jointly owns the Wolf Building at 12th and Callowhill Streets, which has over 170,000 square feet of commercial and apartment space. He purchased it in 1997. The building currently has zero square feet of available space. He commented that he was Director of Design for Historic Landmarks for Living early on in his career, and worked on many tax credit projects. He stated that, in every case, the work that was required to meet the Standards translated positively to the bottom line, and to the neighborhoods in which he worked. He referred to Esslinger's as somewhat "pedestrian" in appearance, but opined that, if the city continues to lose buildings that speak to its industrial roots, neighborhoods such as Callowhill will become anonymous. He commented that many industrial buildings do not stand out architecturally, but that does not mean that they do not contribute to the historic character of the place. He opined that, if he were the owner of this property, he would have hired Mr. Thomas to help to get the buildings on the Register, and Mr. Thomas would have done a great job. He commented that the stories heard earlier about the structure of the building make him question how it can continue to be occupied.

Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, thanked the Pollacks for keeping their manufacturing business in Philadelphia. He asked what would change in their day-to-day operations if the complex is historically designated. He answered his own question with "nothing." But then he explained that the thing that will change is that if they go to the Department of Licenses & Inspections to pull a building permit, the Department will send them to the Historical Commission to obtain an approval stamp. He noted that approximately 90% of building permit applications are approved at the administrative staff level. He guessed that over the last one-and-a-half hours of this review, the staff has likely approved a dozen building permit applications that have come in during that time. He reiterated that very little will change in how the Pollacks do business, if the property is historically designated. What it will mean, however, is

that when the time comes for the property to be sold, the historic designation will afford the buildings a chance to be adapted for reuse.

Dave Kyu, of the Asian Arts Initiative, commented that he is involved in a planning group in the Callowhill neighborhood. He stated that he takes offense to the idea that the entire neighborhood has been recommended for demolition. He stated that one of the suggestions from the planning group is a desire of the neighbors to preserve the cultural legacy of the neighborhood and resist new cookie-cutter architecture, and this designation would help to achieve that goal. He cautioned that it does not mean that they support every designation, but Esslinger's was a building that came up often in discussions, as a building that people would like to see preserved. He concluded that he regrets that their outreach did not include the business owners and employees at the site, and he welcomes the opportunities to meet with them.

David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, agreed with everything said previously in support of the designation. He suggested that the context to the buildings is the entire city, and that the buildings provide the context around which new good architecture can be built. He suggested to the Pollacks that instead of spending money on attorneys and consultants, they come back to the Commission with a preservation plan prepared by architects and preservationists, showing what could be preserved in the large complex, and what needs to be demolished. He suggested that it would be something positive in terms of saving the site, and finding the specific buildings that need to be designated.

James Duffin reminded the Commissioners that the period of significance for the property extends to 1964, and a large number of buildings on the site date from after 1930. That is a period of Esslinger's history that needs to be considered when looking at the significance of the buildings and the complex to Philadelphia. He provided history on other breweries to provide context. He concluded that Esslinger's is a rare surviving example of an almost intact brewery site.

Leah Stringer, Callowhill resident and realtor, commented that Esslinger's is a fine example of the character that so many people are attracted to in the area. It is a gateway to the neighborhood and a prominent intersection. She commented that it is important to maintain its presence, and that she would love to see the factory remain in use. When the time comes for the property to be sold, it would be preserved and would continue to contribute to the industrial fabric of the neighborhood. She concluded that she loves that the neighborhood is defined by industrial architecture rather than by rowhouses.

Christina Voight spoke on behalf of the employees at NCL. She explained that she has worked at NCL for 13 years, and is currently the Director of Compliance and Quality Assurance. She commented that she was surprised to hear that the factory was nominated, and is nervous how it will affect her job and NCL's ability to operate. She commented that she is surprised that a factory that has been operational for five decades could be designated while in operation, because the consequences would be dire to the company and its employees. She introduced five employees of NCL, who share similar concerns. The employees introduced themselves. Michael Reardon stated that he has worked at NCL for 31 years in purchasing and logistics. James Socha stated that he has worked at NCL for 26 years in marketing. Antoine Glover stated that he has worked at NCL for 11 years. Jose Ortiz stated that he has worked at NCL for 26 years in the printing production department. He commented that NCL is a great place to work, and the company has helped the community. He stated that NCL has made a lot of effort

to keep the buildings standing, and he does not see how they can be historic. Mr. Reardon commented that historic designation would be a great burden on the company and the 87 employees' jobs may be in jeopardy. He stated that it would cost millions and millions of dollars to get the building back to 1865 standards. Ms. Voight continued that there are very few factory jobs left in Philadelphia. Over the last 50 years, the Pollacks have been thrifty and economical in making modifications to the buildings. It is a highly competitive industry, and they need to be allowed to make changes quickly and efficiently. They cannot be handicapped by having the buildings historically designated. If they are designated, they will not be able to make necessary changes in a quick and cost-effective way. Designation will make it too restrictive and cost-prohibitive to operate in Philadelphia. She asked that, on behalf of the 87 full-time employees, the Commission deny the historic designation.

Mr. Martin noted that the nominator asked earlier if every building on the site should be saved, and had responded "no." He noted that another preservationist asked that they figure out which building or buildings needs to be preserved. He reminded the Commission that this is a proposal to designate all 15 buildings on the site. He noted that a member of the community commented that "people love that Esslinger's building" but she did not say that people love all 15 of the Esslinger's buildings, and is likely speaking only about the corner building with the old sign. He noted that Mr. Steinke had stated that the staff approves approximately 90 percent of building permit applications, and opined that the staff does not review many applications that are seeking to put cinderblock in a wall to stop a leak, or remove part of a wall and install grilles, or install rolling gates at the rear. He explained that those are the day-to-day things that happen at a site such as this, and he is not sure that those applications will be rubber-stamped by the staff. He emphasized that it is not the responsibility of this property owner to maintain an amenity for the community near a future rail park. He reiterated that Mr. Baumert stated that these buildings cannot be adaptively reused. The references to other building reuses in the neighborhood are all for loft buildings with windows. These buildings do not have windows. If one were to put windows in, the buildings would collapse. The buildings cannot be used for anything other than how they are currently being used, and that is the problem.

Harry Pollack commented that all of the support for this designation is coming from the Callowhill Association, which is made up of people who paid \$400,000 or \$500,000 for their condominiums. These are people who like the hipster environment, and that is what they are trying to do with this designation. They are trying to take this private property, and then everyone employed at NCL will lose their jobs, because it is financially impossible to maintain these buildings to historical standards. He reiterated that NCL has been an anchor in the neighborhood for 50 years. Now, people want to have a neighborhood with a hipster environment and they want this factory complex as an emblem of that environment. He concluded that it is not fair to him and his brother as property and business owners, and it is not fair to the employees. The company does not exist to provide a scenic backdrop for hipsters.

Mr. Duffin started to speak again. Commissioner Thomas asked if he could offer new information. Mr. Duffin offered a bit of advice. He suggested that the Commission designate only one or two of the buildings, rather than the entire complex. He noted that the Commission has the freedom to do so, and has taken this approach with other designations. He offered the corner building with the sign as the most emblematic of the buildings. Mr. Traub countered this suggestion by stating that there is the need for preservation and an urban design plan that reconfigures the complex and provides the Commission with the information it needs to make an intelligent decision. He referred to it as a "failure of imagination" and suggested that the complex could be a magnet anchoring the neighborhood. Others adamantly rejected Mr.

Traub's assertion that the owners represent a "failure of imagination," asserting that the factory houses a profitable business that puts food on the tables on 94 families. The factory does not need a preservation plan; it has a successful business plan. Commissioner Thomas stated that he has heard a great deal of moving information. Mr. Reuben interjected that the steam plant near this property is similar to one in Maryland that is now a thriving complex. Commissioner Thomas requested that people withhold their comments until called upon by the chair.

Harry Pollack offered to not oppose the designation of the office building on the corner with the Esslinger's sign, the building called 8A in the nomination, provided the other buildings are exempted from the designation. He explained that it is solely office space, rather than working factory space, and therefore its designation would not impede the business. He further explained that the remainder of the buildings are all integral to NCL's manufacturing. He commented that the corner building has been altered, but he would agree to its historic designation, and would not fight the matter further. He concluded that NCL cannot operate if the entire complex is designated.

Commissioner Thomas observed that the Commission has been presented with a difficult situation. He stated that he personally is not prepared to make a decision one way or the other. He noted that there have been suggestions about how to look at the different buildings. He stated that the Commission has to be careful in how it approaches this. He opined that the property is valuable, but that the jobs are valuable too. He stated that there is a compromise that needs to be worked out. He explained that historic designation would not require the property owners to do any work to the buildings, until such time as they choose to do so. He opined that the future of the neighborhood and buildings are important, but that the future of jobs and families are also important. He reiterated that he does not feel comfortable voting either way. He stated that it is a conflict that requires further study, and that often times there is a situation where a property owner opposes designation, but a compromise is reached.

Harry Pollack asked if there is a functioning factory in Philadelphia that is historically designated. Commissioner Thomas did not answer the question, but responded that all of his grandparents emigrated here, and they still have a business in Kensington related to glass. He also stated that Philadelphia does not have the historic districts that it should have, and has not done the planning that it should have. He stated that it comes to a head right here, and that both votes would have negative consequences. He opined that there is a "win" that needs to be worked out.

Mr. Beisert suggested that the matter could be tabled, to allow time for him to speak with the Callowhill Neighbors Association, to see if there could be an agreement about the designation of the corner buildings or an agreement regarding demolition for the rest of the site. It was noted that no one is proposing to demolish anything. The complex is a functioning factory.

Ms. Cooperman noted that several Committee members had felt that the nomination could have been revised, but it was not sent back for revision, because the jurisdiction of the Commission would then lapse. She explained that it was discussed at the Committee meeting and is in the minutes. She reminded the Commission that the nomination has gone through the Committee process, and it is therefore not solely in Mr. Beisert's hands at this point. Rather, it is the Commission's decision to make. She explained that the Committee did not address the question of significance of each building because the question was not posed to the Committee. Some of the discussion revolved around the question of whether or not all of the buildings are contributing, but the inferred recommendation of the Committee is that there was not enough

information presented to make those decisions about what buildings might be contributing versus non-contributing. She opined that the most productive way forward would be to determine a process whereby the Commission could come to a judgment of what it believes is contributing and non-contributing portions of the complex. If the Commission accepts the premise that the property is significant as a brewery complex, but then chooses to designate one small piece of it, then that does not recognize the significance of the complex as a whole. The Committee was not tasked with determining which portions are contributing versus non-contributing, and therefore it did not supply a recommendation regarding that question. She stated that the Commission needs to determine a process of coming to that evaluation.

Commissioner Thomas commented that the issue of a nominator directing the course of the process came up recently on another matter, and that once a nomination is submitted and it is going through the review process, a citizen cannot ask the Commission to stop working on it. He commented that the Commission is charged with resolving these issues, and to that extent, the staff should meet with the owners and their representatives. Others may be involved but maybe not. It is an issue between the property owner and Historical Commission. There is an action that the Commission must take, and it is appropriate for the Commission to talk to the property owner in that regard. The property owners can then come back to the Commission and resume this deliberation.

Mr. Mattioni commented that the Commission may be able to grant a continuance, if one were to be requested, to allow both parties an opportunity to see if they can come to a resolution that they could present to the Commission. The suggestion by Harry Pollack to designate only one building puts the Commission in a difficult position, because it has not been presented that way. It needs to be presented to the Commission by the nominator or another representative. Harry Pollack asked if the nomination could be withdrawn. Mr. Mattioni responded that it cannot be withdrawn. He stated that the property owners can help the Commission by finding a way to come up with enough information and documentation to allow the Commission to make a decision. He opined that he could vote either way at this point, and asked the owners and nominator for some help.

Ms. Stanford commented that the economics of this is very important. From the employees up to the owners, there was a consideration of the economic impact if the property is historically designated. She suggested that perhaps it is something that the Task Force needs to look into, but the Commission has enough information to help businesses think about the repercussions of it. She stated that it is an unknown, and it may be pennies, and it may be millions. She stated that the Commission needs to think about that, even if it cannot do the analysis in an economic way, it needs to think differently when dealing with the lives of 87 families and assets in the community.

Mr. Steinke suggested that there is a misunderstanding regarding the impact of historic designation on the business, and that time is needed on both sides to better understand each other. He admitted that the preservationists do not understand the Pollack's business, and the Pollacks do not understand preservation the way some preservationists believe that they do. He commented that there is a lack of complete understanding, despite the Committee's efforts, of the historical merits of all 15 buildings, both individually and relative to each other. He asked that the Commission table or continue the nomination to allow for a greater understanding on both sides. He acknowledged Harry Pollack's extraordinary gesture to agree to designation for the most prominent building on the site. He noted that it was an offer of compromise never heard at this table from a property owner who is opposing designation.

Commissioner Thomas observed that the Historical Commission does not have sufficient information regarding the activities that take place in each of the buildings. He noted that the Historical Commission cannot wait for the Task Force to complete its work before it decides this case. Commissioner Thomas suggested that the Historical Commission could continue the matter. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission should not continue without a plan in place. She asked what the Commission hoped to accomplish during the tabling period. Commissioner Thomas agreed that the Commission should not continue the matter except to provide time to accomplish specific tasks. He asked about other industrial buildings that are historically certified. He stated that the property owners want to know how a designation would affect them. He added that designation might provide some benefits. He noted that most National Register Historic Districts were created by property owners seeking tax credits. He remarked that George Thomas has nominated districts to make properties eligible for tax credits. Commissioner Thomas explained that, if the Commission continued the matter, it would provide time for the various parties to undertake investigations; he added that the property would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during that time. Mr. Mattioni moved to find that Building 8A at 401-29 N. 10th Street, but not the remainder of the complex, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, but not I, and designate it, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. No one seconded his motion. Ms. Turner pointed out that the nominator did not include Criterion I in the nomination, but the Committee on Historic Designation had added it. She questioned why the Committee had added it when it was not included in the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked about the number of tax parcels at the site. Several responded that the entire complex is included in one tax parcel. Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission does not have enough information to act on the nomination. She stated that the nomination does not provide enough information to understand "the real significance or lack thereof to this group of buildings." Mr. Mattioni stated that the property owners have provided very detailed descriptions of the buildings and the problems that they would face with designations of any buildings other than 8A. He noted that Building 8A is the most prominent building on the site and the one that the public identifies with the former brewery, owing to the large Esslinger's sign on it. He stated that the building is a single, separate building. It has the most important, character-defining feature at the site and could be designated on its own. Mr. McCoubrey observed that he understands Mr. Mattioni's position, owing to the graphic strength of the signage on the corner building, but he suggested that Building 8C might also be worthy of designation. He stated that Building 8C also engages with the street and the public in a way that the other buildings on the site do not. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the nomination needs more study and discussion.

Commissioner Thomas confirmed that no one had seconded Mr. Mattioni's motion, so it was no longer on the table.

Commissioner Thomas suggested that the boundary proposed in the nomination should be considered. He stated that the Commission does "need to look carefully at where the boundary would actually be. That would require some study. And the boundary just wouldn't be from a preservation point of view. It would also be from [an] operations point of view. There really needs to be a discussion." He concluded that the Commissioners should be apprised of the activities in every building so that they can ensure that any designation would not adversely impact the business. Mr. Mattioni suggested that the owners request a continuance to allow them time to review the matter and make a more refined decision about what they can and

cannot accept with regard to designation. Ms. Stanford stated that the Commission should scrutinize the complex and determine what Criteria are or are not satisfied by each building. Commissioner Thomas stated that the last few statements are the beginning of the discussion that needs to take place. Ms. Cooperman and Turner asserted that the matter should be continued. Mr. Martin suggested that the Commission, which operates under Robert's Rules, should use the term "table" rather than "continue." Mr. Martin explained that, if the Commission tables the matter, perhaps for one month, the property owners would engage with the Commission's staff and, perhaps, the nominator and the Preservation Alliance. He stated that he would seek a resolution and present it for the Commission's consideration. If a resolution cannot be reached, at least the Commission would have the information it needs. He stated that he would not object to tabling the matter. Mr. Reuter asked Mr. Martin to acknowledge that the Commission's jurisdiction would continue through the tabling period. Mr. Martin stated that he understood that the jurisdiction would continue while the matter was tabled. He stated that his clients have no plans to demolish the complex. Mr. Mattioni stated that the onus is on the property owners to meet with the staff. The Commissioners discussed the appropriate length of time for tabling. Mr. Martin noted that his clients are out of the country in June. Mr. Reuter suggested that the Commission table the matter until the property owners are prepared to return, by attorney request, as is often done in zoning cases.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to table the review of the nomination until such time as the property owner requests that the Commission restart the review, with the understanding that the property remains under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the tabling period. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 909-31 NOBLE ST

Name of Resource: Armour & Company Stock Depot

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: NCL Realty LP

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 909-31 Noble Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, I and J, but not Criteria A and C.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property 909-31 Noble Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former meatpacking plant of Armour & Company, constructed in 1906, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that Armour & Company, based in Chicago, was one of the most significant meatpacking firms in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, and that the building represents the history of the meatpacking and cold storage industries. The nomination contends that the building was constructed as part of a larger national movement to develop purpose-built stock depots in cities across the country. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the building embodies distinctive characteristics of the Italian Renaissance Revival style. Under Criterion C, the nomination asserts that the building is a local representative of a distinctive type and style used by Armour & Company in their stock depots across the United States.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman acknowledged the letter from the property owner's attorney requesting her recusal in this matter and stated that she will not recuse because she is able to judge this nomination impartially. Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney William Martin, property owners Harry and Kenny Pollack, preservation consultant George Thomas, and engineer Fred Baumert appeared on behalf of the owners. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Martin stated that the Pollacks purchased this property approximately 18 years ago. For those 18 years, it has only been used for minor storage. There are portions of the building that have never been accessed by the current owner. He stated that Mr. Baumert will present his conclusions regarding the building, and his grave concerns regarding the current condition of the structure. He stated that they have advised the Department of Licenses & Inspections regarding Mr. Baumert's conclusions. The Department of Licenses & Inspections has indicated that the property is subject to Historical Commission jurisdiction because of the pending nomination. He explained that Mr. Thomas can speak to the details regarding meat packing and that industry, and also the architecture and the fact that it was not designed by a real architect, but rather by a contractor. But they would like to first focus on the condition of the building. Mr. Martin stated that the building is on the verge of collapse and needs to be demolished. Once it is removed from the jurisdiction of this Historical Commission, the owners will move expeditiously to take those steps. It cannot be adaptively reused.

Mr. Baumert presented on the condition of the building. He stated that he had an opportunity to inspect the building, and he is alarmed. He stated that, the closer he looked, the worse the condition was. He advised the property owners not to enter the building, owing to its condition. Mr. Baumert stated that effective engineering relies on physics and experience. The ethics of the profession and the license under which he practices require that he focus foremost on quantifying and minimizing the risks and documents for every structure he designs and reviews. An engineer's judgment cannot be swayed by sentimental feelings. Therefore, he stated, he submits for the Commission's consideration that the building is unstable.

Mr. Baumert explained the reasons why the building is unstable. He stated that the designer of the building had no understanding of and paid no heed to the processes that are performed in a meat processing facility. A meat processing plant is subject to frequent wash-downs, moisture and humidity from condensation when carcasses are thawed, oiling, smoke curing, and other processes. It is a messy business. Despite all of this moisture, the building was framed with wood joists with wood floor boards and unprotected steel beams. He displayed a photograph of freezer pipes against wood joists. He noted that the wood joists are completely decayed, and there is no integrity left to the floor joists. He explained that condensation would have formed on the faces of these girders. He showed a photograph of a double beam that supports the masonry wall above. The condensation and water migration from above led to advanced corrosion of the steel beams. The beam webs are buckled due to corrosion, which means that the third floor is effectively collapsing. He displayed more photographic examples of collapsing floors in the building. He continued that the floors are collapsing due to a combination of decay of wood framing and the corrosion of steel beams. He showed a wood column that supports the roof and has been reinforced with four angles wrapped around the outside of it, and the base of which was cut off and replaced with a plinth because of the amount of decay. He noted that these retrofits predate the current owners. He continued that the movement in the floors has led to bowing and fracturing of the walls. He displayed a photograph of a third floor wall with a large horizontal crack and the wall bowing outwards by two inches. He explained that this is one of the rooms where the carcasses were thawed and cut apart. He displayed another photograph of

a different fractured wall where the floor that supports it has dropped. He commented that it again speaks to the complete lack of sophistication of the original designer. Instead of having floor joists pocketed into a bearing wall, the designer has walls landing on the floor joists, and then those in turn landing on a steel beam. The result is that heavy elements are being carried by wood framing that is decayed and falling apart. He remarked that the walls have a fair amount of moisture present, and a good amount of brick spalling and other damage. The internal humidity caused the original wood lintels to rot; they were replaced with steel, which subsequently has also significantly corroded to the point where those lintels are no longer able to support the masonry. The current owners infilled the openings with concrete masonry units (CMU) to keep the part of the wall from collapsing. He noted that most of the mortar has eroded on the inside of building due to freeze-thaw changes, which is rare for the inside of a building. He explained that the entire north (rear) wall was in such poor condition that the owners had to stabilize it when they first purchased the property. They hired a mason who faced the building with CMU, which Mr. Baumert referred to as an odd retrofit. The mason started the CMU at the belt course and went up from there. That means that all of the weight is bearing on a shelf in the brick that was never intended to carry this tremendous amount of weight. As such, the belt course is starting to fail. Embedded steel that supports this wall is suffering from advanced corrosion. He stated that he does not consider this wall to be stable, and he has expressed these concerns to the Department of Licenses & Inspections for this and other parts of the building. He displayed several photographs of the south (front) wall on Noble Street. He pointed out stair-step cracks in the center of the wall, which indicates that the wall itself is moving vertically internally. He remarked that this is not the type of thing one wants to see. He noted that the steel lintels above the windows have so corroded that they are fracturing the pilaster that supports it. He showed a photograph of trees growing out of the front wall, and explained that it means that there is too much moisture on the interior masonry. He concluded that the damage to the structure is advanced and pervasive, and he has advised the property owners that the building is entirely unsafe to use. The extent of decay and corrosion has made it essentially impossible to safely shore or rehabilitate. Therefore, he concluded, he has made the assessment that the building must be demolished for the safety of the owners and the public.

Mr. Martin commented that they are prepared to offer testimony on the history of the building and the fact that it is not significant, and that there is nothing in the nomination regarding Criterion I, should the Commission ask them to present on those subjects.

Commissioner Thomas asked if the Department of Licenses & Inspections was contacted regarding the assessment of this building's condition. Mr. Martin confirmed that it was contacted. Commissioner Thomas asked Mr. Dillon, a representative of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, if he was aware of it. Mr. Dillon responded that he is not, but he will check on the status. Commissioner Thomas explained that he is not trying to dispute the conclusions of Mr. Baumert of Keast & Hood, but that it behooves the Commission to not simply accept testimony on its own, but rather to check with the Department of Licenses & Inspections to learn if it concurs with Mr. Baumert's assessment. If the Department of Licenses & Inspections concurs, it gives the Commission what it needs to show it has responsibly reviewed the building. He opined that, while anything can be designated, in general when there is this type of situation where a building must be demolished regardless, it does not make good sense to designate the resource. He referenced the Kimmel Center construction and that it was agreed that the buildings on that block would be demolished, so there was no need to go through the designation process. He asked Mr. Dillon if he would be able to obtain a response from the Department of Licenses & Inspections immediately. Mr. Dillon responded that he is trying to obtain an answer right away. Mr. Mattioni suggested that the matter could be tabled, and if it

turns out that the Department of Licenses & Inspections declares the building imminently dangerous, then there is no need for this debate. Commissioner Thomas responded that there is no harm in tabling the matter for one month, to allow for an opportunity to obtain the necessary information from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. If the building is not imminently dangerous, then the Commission can resume its discussion. Mr. Dillon stepped out of the room to make a few phone calls to his colleagues at the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The discussion paused to allow Mr. Dillon to make his calls. Mr. Beisert asked if the building has been posted as imminently dangerous. Ms. Cooperman responded that that is what the Commission is trying to find out. Mr. Beisert responded that no matter what is determined, he wants the building to be reevaluated. Commissioner Thomas reiterated that Mr. Dillon is attempting to obtain the necessary information.

Mr. Dillon returned. Commissioner Thomas stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections is aware of the building and the concerns surrounding it. He explained that there is a question as to whether it has been posted as unsafe or imminently dangerous, and from the Commission's point of view, there is no answer to that at this moment. He explained that the Commission wishes to table the matter for one month, to allow the Department of Licenses & Inspections to speak with the Commission once it has looked into the matter. When the Commission takes up the matter in one month, it will have information from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. It may learn that the building is imminently dangerous and perhaps has already been demolished as a result. He stated that, if a building is imminently dangerous, it precludes any delay by the Commission, owing to cooperation with public safety.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to table the review of the nomination for one month to the Historical Commission's meeting on 11 May 2018. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 2:25 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(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.