THE MINUTES OF THE 726TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2023, 9:00 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

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

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

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:
Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Leonard Reuter, Law Department
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner I
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I
Maggie White, Law Department

The following persons attended the online meeting:
Mother Antoinette
George Poulin
Guy Laren

Tracey Pachman
David Landskroner
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade
Andrea Ehrlich
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Frank Dalicandro
Leah Silverstein
Kim Williams
David Traub
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
William O'Brien
Nancy Pontone
Rustin Ohler
Bonnie Tatcher
Loney Engineering
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting Group
Dr. Althea Hankins
Carol Graeber
Scott Woodruff
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Jeffrey Pond
Michael Phillips
Dan Clearfield, Eckert Seamans
John Betts
Alex Balloon
Brian Zoubek
Douglas Kingsbury
Mary McGettigan
Libbie Hawes
Suzanne Ponsen
Oscar Beisert
Leigh Ann
Jake Blumgart
Mary Tracy
Mark Travis
Paul Lorenz
Keith Lamont
Peter Bloomfield
Chwen-ping Wang
Adrienne Carpenter
Ori Feibush
Kevin McMahon
Aparna Palantino, Philadelphia Parks and Recreation
Robert Allen
Gwendolyn Daniels
Linda Bell
Wale Mabogunje, Parkway Corporation
Celia Jailer, Hidden City
Rich Leimbach
Herb Schultz
Cynthia Dutwin

DRAFT

Tom Ferraro
Loretta Micola
Sam Lewis
Rebecca Nuver
Bob Careless, Esq.
Gabriel Deck
Harrison Haas
Paul Boni
Kristene Whitmore
Brian Berson, Parkway
Ryan Solimeo
Thaddeus Squire
Steven Peitzman
Dennis Carlisle
Michael LaFlash
Jay Farrell
Sherman Aronson
Lorna Katz
Rebecca Shaffer
Wadell Ridley, St. Joseph's University
Amanda Kaiserman
Emmanuel Duncan, Duncan Partners

DRAFT

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 725TH STATED MEETING, 13 JANUARY 2023

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:20

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 725th Stated Meeting, held 13 January 2023. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 725th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 January 2023. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 725th Stated Meeting of the PHC **MOTION: Adoption of minutes** **MOVED BY: Thomas** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

CONTINUANCE REQUEST

ADDRESS: 3101 W PASSYUNK AVE
Name of Resource: Point Breeze Gas Works
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Gas Works
Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the designation of the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue. The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination on 3 March 2021. The matter has been continued since that time, awaiting the outcome of litigation in a related matter regarding the authority of local land use agencies to regulate utilities.

The nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, although some Criteria are not applied to all resources listed in the nomination. The site is inaccessible to the general public and subject to significant safety and security restrictions; therefore, aerial imagery was utilized to identify and catalog the resources. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works, which expanded as the city's population grew, was one of the city's largest employers in the mid-to-late nineteenth century and is one of the oldest surviving gasworks. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that many of the structures embody characteristics of the Gothic Revival style. It also notes that later structures were designed in the Jacobean Revival style. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the earliest buildings of the Point Breeze Gas Works were built under the leadership of John Chapman Cresson, an influential figure.

The site is very large and most of the land is vacant. Most of the buildings associated with the historic gasworks have been demolished. The site is currently used by the Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW) for the storage and distribution of liquefied natural gas. Access to the site is strictly controlled and visitors are not permitted. Persons with business at the site must be accompanied by PGW staff and wear protective gear including flame-retardant suits. The nominated buildings are primarily unused or used for storage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff initially offered a compromise recommendation that sought to protect the most important buildings from demolition while limiting the impact on PGW, but, in light of the Mayor's letter, the staff must recognize the significant safety and security concerns associated with the site and recommend against any designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and to limit the designation to buildings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 8, and 9a, with a period of significance of 1855-1929. Ms. Barucco seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission.
- Attorneys Chris Strom and Dan Clearfield represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination of 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue to the May 2023 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Sanchez seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 3101 W Passyunk Ave MOTION: Continue to May 2023 PHC meeting MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Sanchez					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2023

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 700-02 AND 704 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish building; reconstruct façade; construct addition
Review Requested: Final for demolition; In Concept for addition
Owner: 700 Chestnut Street Associates
Applicant: Michael Phillips, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg LLP
History: 700-02: 1922; Washington Square Building; Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris, architects.
704: 1853; new façade and other modifications, 1896; G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects.
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Chestnut Street East Historic District, Contributing, 11/12/2021
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the construction of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, which would extend onto the parcel at 704 Chestnut Street. The application has requested final approval for the demolition and reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street and in-concept approval of the addition. The historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street would be reconstructed based on photographs as part of the addition. Currently, only the lower three stories of the original five-story façade at 704 Chestnut Street survives. The application claims that the demolition is necessary in the public interest, that the public has an interest in the improvement of this section of Chestnut Street and in the reconstruction of the historic façade, and that demolition and reconstruction is the only feasible way to restore the historic facade.

Both buildings, 700-02 and 704 Chestnut Street, are classified as contributing to the Chestnut Street East Historic District. The applicant had requested that the Historical Commission reclassify the building at 704 Chestnut Street as non-contributing, but the Commission denied

that request at its August 2022 meeting. At the same meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for an earlier version of the demolition and addition and commented that the proposed demolition did not comply with the preservation ordinance and the proposed addition was too tall for its context. At the October 2022 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed a revised in-concept application for the demolition and new construction and offered positive comments but took no formal action.

The application contends that the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street and the reconstruction of its historic façade to its c. 1896 appearance as part of the larger construction project is necessary in the public interest. The application claims that the public has an interest in both the "continued and further growth and development of properties located within the City's most dense and permissive CMX-5 zoning district" and in "the restoration and recreation of the original five-story façade from c. 1896." The application includes an engineer's report as well as a construction cost estimate that support the contention that the only feasible way to restore the historic façade of the building at 704 Chestnut Street is to demolish and reconstruct the façade.

The application also includes a revised design for the addition to the existing building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, which would incorporate the reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the three-story building at 704 Chestnut Street.
- Construct an addition on and adjacent to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street with a reconstruction of the historic facade at 704 Chestnut Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street will destroy historic materials and features, even if the façade is reconstructed, and therefore will not satisfy Standard 9. It cannot be approved without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest.
  - The addition will not be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street or the historic district as a whole and therefore will not protect the integrity of the property and its environment, and will not satisfy Standard 9.
- *Section 14-1005(6)(d): Restrictions on Demolition No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building … or of a building … located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building … cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.*
  - The demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street cannot be approved in satisfaction of Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building … cannot

be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The application asserts that the issuance of the demolition permit is necessary in the public interest and provides supporting documentation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends final approval of the demolition and faithful reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street, as necessary in the public interest, conditioned on the Historical Commission's approval of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street that is compatible with the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code; but denial of the in-concept application for the addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval of the demolition and faithful reconstruction of the historic façade at 704 Chestnut Street, as necessary in the public interest, conditioned on the Historical Commission's approval of an addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street that is compatible with the historic district, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code; but denial of the in-concept application for the addition to the building at 700-02 Chestnut Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:09:48

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Washington recused because her organization has retained the applicant's attorney in an unrelated matter.

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Phillips explained why it is financially and structurally infeasible to retain the remnant façade of 704 Chestnut Street in place and build around it. He offered an engineering analysis and a construction cost estimate to support his case and concluded that no reasonable developer would choose to build at 704 Chestnut Street with the remnant façade in place. He stated that, if his client could demolish the remnant façade, he would salvage all reusable material from the façade and would faithfully reconstruct the façade with salvaged and new material to replicate the appearance of the c. 1896 building. He stated that it would be a true reconstruction. He added that a plaque or marker would be installed at the site explaining that the façade had been reconstructed. He concluded that they would not demolish the building at 704 Chestnut Street without proceeding with the larger project to reconstruct the historic façade as part of the overbuild.
- Mr. Schultz summarized the most recent changes to the design based on the comments of the Architectural Committee.
    - Mr. McCoubrey summarized the Architectural Committee's comments regarding the design of the overbuild. He offered a few suggestions for improving the revised design but concluded that the design is generally successful. He stated that he preferred the lighter color for the overbuild on 700-02 Chestnut Street. With regard to the demolition of the building at 704 Chestnut Street, Mr.

McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee concluded that the demolition is necessary in the public interest because the surviving façade is much altered and only a remnant, the analysis demonstrates that the façade cannot be feasibly retained in place with the new construction, and the reconstructed façade will replicate the appearance of the historic façade. He noted that the structural engineer on the Architectural Committee agreed that the remnant façade cannot be feasibly held in place and restored. The restored five-story façade will enhance the historic district.

- Ms. Cooperman disagreed that this demolition is necessary in the public interest. She stated that the applicant has not proved that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it might be adapted. She stated that the public will not understand that the façade at 704 Chestnut Street is a reconstruction. She concluded that she finds this application and her colleagues' response to it "troubling."
- Mr. Mattioni stated that he supports the application because two-fifths of an historic facade will be sacrificed for a replica of the entire historic façade. He stated that restoring the streetscape in this part of the historic district is in the public interest.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that, given the nature of the historic district, which is really the front facades along the block, the reconstruction of this entire front façade to its historic appearance is in the public interest. He supported the proposal and noted that the use of salvaged materials will improve the quality of the recreation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the application, provided that the reconstruction is faithful. He offered suggestions for the design of the new construction. He stated that he wished that the Benjamin Franklin Hotel had been depicted across 7th Street in the renderings.
  - Mr. Farnham noted that the Benjamin Franklin Hotel is two blocks from this site at 9th and Chestnut Streets. The building in question is the Public Ledger Building.
- Steven Peitzman commented that the demolition permit should be conditioned on the issuance of the new construction building permit. He offered suggestions on the design of the new construction and concluded that he is not "pleased" with the application.
  - Mr. Thomas noted that the Historical Commission has already indicated that the demolition permit should be conditioned on the issuance of the new construction building permit.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The façade of 704 Chestnut Street is a remnant of the historic façade, with only two of the five original stories surviving, and cannot be feasibly retained and restored in place.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The demolition and faithful reconstruction of the façade at 704 Chestnut Street is necessary in the public interest, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).
- The revised design of the reconstruction of the front façade at 704 Chestnut Street and the overbuilding satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to grant final approval of the demolition and faithful reconstruction of the front façade of 704 Chestnut Street, provided no demolition occurs until the building permit and financing are in place for the new construction, and in-concept approval of the revised application for the new construction, provided the 10th-floor recess on 7th Street is eliminated and the overall grey color is selected for the overbuild, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code and Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed a vote of 9 to 1.

ITEM: 700-02 and 704 Chestnut St **MOTION: Final approval of demolition and reconstruction; in-concept approval of new construction** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Mattioni**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman		X			
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington				X	
Total	9	1		1	1

ADDRESS: 27 DRUIM MOIR LN
Proposal: Construct dormer to expand third-floor room
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Ori Feibush
Applicant: Scott Woodruff, Designblendz Architecture
History: 1887; Brinkwood at Druim Moir; G.W and W.D. Hewitt, architects
Individual Designation: 6/5/1980
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a large dormer to extend the main stair up to the third floor. Currently, the third floor is only accessed by a single, narrow stair. The applicant seeks to add a second, larger stair to the third floor. The new dormer would replace a smaller extant dormer. The design of the dormer's two windows is based on the extant windows below. The façade where the alterations would take place is a secondary façade facing the driveway. The primary façade with the large porch is on the opposite side of the building and faces the gardens. The property and building are only visible obliquely from Druim Moir Lane, a private road.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish small dormer and portion of roof;
- Construct larger dormer to create a usable room out of an existing passageway.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval provided the dormer is reduced in size and pulled back slightly from the cornice to maintain the cornice line, and the dormer windows are subtly differentiated from the historic windows, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:45:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Scott Woodruff represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- One large dormer would be more appropriate than two dormers.
- Shifting the dormer back six to nine inches would allow for a typical sill height and make the new dormer less imposing.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised proposal addresses the Architectural Committee's concerns and meets Standard 9, provided the small dormer is eliminated and the larger dormer is centered over the bays below and held back from the cornice six to nine inches.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the small dormer is eliminated and the larger dormer is centered over the bays below and held back from the cornice six to nine inches, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 27 Druim Moir Ln MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 647 N 16TH ST
Proposal: Construct four-story addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Mike Rodgers
Applicant: Devon Loney, Loney Engineering and Consulting, LLC
History: 1875
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for a four-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot house at 647 N. 16th St. The building was constructed circa 1875 as a three-story row home with rear ell. The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate the building and add the addition for future use as a four-family residential property. As part of the scope of work, the rear ell's roof and select areas of the back wall will be demolished. Elements of the proposed scope such as the cleaning and repointing of masonry can be approved administratively by staff.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct four-story addition with roof deck and pilot house.

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

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

    - The massing and scale of the addition is not compatible with the original main block of the building. The new fourth floor rises six feet above the main block to accommodate the new floor of the rear section of the building. Therefore, the proposed new addition does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
    - The proposed addition permanently removes the original ell's roof and does not appropriately detail the transition between the historic roofline and the additional new wall; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 10.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
    - The pilot house is partially located on the front block of the building and is approximately 12 feet is height. If the applicant moves the pilot house back to the rear ell area of the building and lowers the pilot house height, it can meet the Roof Guidelines. If the pilot house is set back further and lowered in height, the deck and pilot house will not be visible from N. 16th Street and will be minimally visible from North Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and Roof Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and Roof Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:56:50

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Devon Loney represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- The proposed pilot house was relocated to the rear ell and addition.
- The rear addition's solid parapet wall was revised to a vertical picket railing.
- The exterior cladding of the addition was revised to cementitious panels.
- The rear addition will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.
- The revised application addresses a majority of the Architectural Committee's concerns.

The Historical Commission concluded that:
- Although the rear fourth floor rises above the main block, the revised application lowers the floor slightly and has updated the solid parapet wall at the top of the addition to a picket-style railing. Both changes reduce the visual height of the addition. It has been confirmed by the applicant and staff that the addition will not be

visible from N. 16th Street and will be minimally visible from North Street. Therefore, the new addition meets Standard 9.

- The proposed changes are limited to the rear ell. With the exception of its shed roof, the rear ell will remain in place and could be restored by a future owner, meeting Standard 10.
- The pilot house is located on the rear ell and addition. Both the pilot house and deck will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

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

ITEM: 647 N 16th St **MOTION: Approval as revised** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Carney**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9	1		1	1

ADDRESS: 1914 WILCOX ST
Proposal: Replace historic carriage house doors
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Waybar 534 LLC
Applicant: Paul J. Lorenz, CANNO design
History: 1880
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval to replace the original carriage house doors at 1914 Wilcox Street. The building was originally constructed as a carriage house in 1880 to serve nearby residences. An application was approved by the Historical Commission in July 2022 to construct a roof addition, roof deck, and rehabilitate exterior. As part of the scope of work, these doors were to be refurbished and altered to an automated door.

The building is under construction and the contractor has determined that the existing doors cannot be altered to roll up into the ceiling space above the garage area. The applicant is proposing a replacement door that is compatible with the historic building and the general appearance of the original door but can be operated as a roll up door.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace original carriage house doors with a new garage door.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
  - The original doors are a distinctive feature of this carriage house building and an example of the craftmanship of the period it was constructed. Few original carriage house doors survive in the Spring Garden Historic District. Replacement of the doors would not meet Standard 5.
- 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 features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
  - The existing doors are in fair condition. Small sections of the door have been altered over time, but the majority of the original materials and configuration remain in place. The doors are not deteriorated to the point where they require replacement. The doors are not proposed for replacement owing to their condition but rather for a change in operability, therefore the application does not meet Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:07:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Paul Lorenz represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised design for the new door more accurately reflects the appearance of the historic doors.
- The historic muntins in the doors' upper windows are thinner than shown in the proposed new door drawing.
- The angle of wood slats in the lower wood panels does not match the historic doors.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The proposed design for the window muntins and lower wood panels should be revised to better replicate the historic doors.
- The original doors are a distinctive feature of this carriage house building and an example of the craftmanship of the period of construction. The applicant has found the original doors cannot be altered to be raised up into the ceiling owing to the interior renovations and has revised the design to emulate the appearance of the original door, therefore meeting Standard 5.
- The revised design will match the historic door in design, color, texture, and exterior materials, meeting Standard 6.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the muntins, moldings, and angle of wood slats in the panels matches the existing doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1914 Wilcox St **MOTION: Approval of revised design with conditions** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Carney**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 130 N 3RD ST
Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct five-story building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 130 N. 3RD LLC
Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects, LLC
History: 1950
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic, non-contributing, one-story, two-bay, vernacular building and construct a new five-story plus cellar mixed use structure. This proposed building would contain four family dwellings plus vacant commercial space, a roof deck, walk-out rear decks starting at the second floor, and interior recessed balconies from the

second to fourth floor. Some proposed materials include dark gray cast stone with matching mortar, dark iron-spot velour brick veneer, aluminum storefront with black frames, frameless glass guardrails for the interior balconies, black picket guardrails for exterior balconies, and black solid paneled garage doors. Currently, the existing small structure only partially occupies the long lot, with parking spaces at the rear on the Cherry Street side. The applicant has provided a packet containing historical maps, site photographs, sections, elevations, and detailed renderings of the proposed new construction.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish one story non-contributing building and construct new five-story mixed use building to occupy entire lot.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The proposed demolition of the extant building satisfies Standard 9 because the property is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The proposed new building does not satisfy Standard 9; the inset balconies and other features would not be compatible with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:15:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Gabriel Deck represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the revised application.
- Alex Balloon, a neighbor of the property, commented in support of the revised application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Neither the front recessed balconies nor the glass guardrails are in keeping with the Old City Historic District.
- If muntins were added to the Cherry Street side windows, the building may appear more sympathetic with the Old City Historic District.
- Black metal guardrails would be more appropriate than glass.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application satisfies Standard 9, provided the recessed balconies are eliminated.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the recessed balconies are eliminated, and with the suggestions of juliet-style balconies with doors in lieu of open balconies and horizontal muntins on windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 130 N 3rd St **MOTION: Approval with condition** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Lech**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 3408 RACE ST
Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct three-story addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Constellar Corp.
Applicant: Chwen-Ping Wang, Ping Design LLC
History: 1872; John Shedwick, builder
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022
Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the majority of the two-story rear ell along with a one story non-historic shed addition at a Contributing property in the Powelton Village Historic District. It further proposes to construct a three-story addition in place of the rear ell. The building was constructed in 1872 and is three stories tall with a mansard roof. The mansard roof and dormers are visible at the front and rear facades. The two-story ell to be demolished dates to the time of construction. The application proposes to demolish all of it except a one-story portion of the west exterior wall. The new addition will cut into and block the rear portion of the mansard roof and be clad in vinyl siding. The new addition will be visible from the public right-of-way on N. Shedwick Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish two-story rear ell and one-story shed addition of building;
- Construct new three-story addition in place of rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
  - The proposed demolition of the rear ell does not meet Standard 2. The rear ell is an original part of the building.
  - The proposed three-story addition does not meet Standard 2. It will cut into and obscure the mansard roof and dormers.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed demolition of the rear ell does not meet Standard 9. It is itself part of the historic fabric of the building.
  - The proposed three-story addition does not meet Standard 9. It would destroy portions of the existing mansard roof. Furthermore, it will be clad in vinyl siding.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
  - The proposed three-story addition does not meet Standard 10. It necessitates the demolition of the historic form of the building and would not be removable in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:45:26

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Chwen-Ping Wang and developer Guy Laren represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- George Poulin, representing Powelton Village Civic Association, commented in overall support of the revised application, but noted that the existing building is also in somewhat poor condition, and he would like to see its condition improved. He also expressed some concerns about the proportions of the proposed new addition.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application satisfies the Architectural Committee's recommendation to redesign the addition so that its proportions better interact with the main block of the house and limit any obstruction of the main block's mansard and dormers.
- The dimensions of the windows on the proposed new mansard are out of proportion and should be adjusted.
- An additional mansard window should be added on the rear wall above the bay to better fit in with the design of the overall building.
- This block of N. Shedwick Street is a private right-of-way.
- A door should be added at the rear of the addition to provide access to a portion of the parcel cut off from the rest by the new addition.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application satisfies Standards 2, 9, and 10, with suggestions that the dormer proportions are adjusted, a new dormer is added to the rear elevation, and a door is added at the rear to provide access to a divided portion of the parcel.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with suggestions to study the proportion of the dormers, and to add a dormer at the south end of the addition and a door to provide access to the triangular lawn, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3408 Race St **MOTION: Approval** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Mattioni**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 425-29 PINE ST
Proposal: Construct three-story addition; cut window openings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Morgan Cat LLC
Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture
History: 1850; St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church; extensively altered for church, 1946; rectory added, 1952
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This revised application proposes to convert the former St. Andrew's Byzantine Ukrainian Catholic Church and rectory to multi-unit residential complex, with a three-story addition to be constructed at the rear. The church building is the result of extensive alterations starting in 1946 to a mid-nineteenth-century structure used as the Willing Day Nursery. The rectory was built as an addition to the church in 1952.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar scope in December 2022 and January 2023, and the Historical Commission reviewed it in January 2023. Each time the application has been revised based on comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. This current revised application responds to comments from both the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. The rear addition has been redesigned and the new windows in the sides of the existing building have been adjusted in shape and size. The Commission acknowledged the difficulty in adaptively reusing the church building. The stained-glass windows on the front façade will be retained. The rear of the property is visible to the public from Lawrence Court.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Convert former church and rectory buildings to residential use.
- Construct three-story rear addition.
- Cut new window openings into sides of church.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building have been revised to be more in keeping with the architectural features of the building.
    - The three-story rear addition has been revised in terms of materials and proportions to respond to the surrounding context at both front and rear. While the addition is large, it has been redesigned to not overwhelm the historic building as was initially proposed.

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Rustin Ohler and property owner Mark Travis represented the revised application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Peter Bloomfield commented in opposition to the application.
- Paul Boni, Chair of the Zoning and Preservation Committee on the Society Hill Civic Association, commented in opposition to the application.
- Mary Tracy, a Society Hill resident, commented that the side windows are visible from the street and opposed the application.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that the view of the rear is important.
- Amanda Kaiserman, a near neighbor, commented in opposition to the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The current application is the fourth revision to the design, based on December 2022 and January 2023 comments from the Architectural Committee and January 2023 comments from the Historical Commission. Each time the application has been revised based on comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.
- The historic rear ell is red brick, but is currently painted, and therefore red brick is appropriate for the new rear addition.
- The stained-glass windows on the front façade will be retained.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised design satisfies Standard 9. The three-story rear addition has been revised in terms of materials and proportions to respond to the surrounding context at both front and rear. While the addition is large, it has been redesigned to not overwhelm the historic building as it did when initially proposed. The new windows as proposed for the side facades of the church building have been revised to be more in keeping with the architectural features of the building.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the design of the third-floor rear addition is reconsidered and it has three front windows as shown in an earlier scheme, with the staff to review details including a brick color that is more red than brown, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Kindt dissented.

DRAFT

ITEM: 425-29 Pine St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)		X			
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9	1			2

ADDRESS: 117 S BEECHWOOD ST
Proposal: Legalize windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Duncan and Partners REI
Applicant: Emmanuel Duncan
History: 1922; Sansom Gardens; William Koelle, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows at the first and third floor front and entire rear of this Significant building in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The historic window and French door remain on the second-floor front of the building. In 2014 and again in 2020, Historical Commission staff approved shop drawings for new wood windows for the front and rear of this building. These approved shop drawings showed six-over-six double-hung wood windows for the first and third floor front and a three-pane basement window, and a mix of six-over-six double-hung wood windows and double casements for the rear. It is unclear if these windows were ever purchased and installed. The property was sold in 2021. Later that year, Historical Commission staff received a complaint from a neighbor about the installation of vinyl windows with grilles-between-glass and aluminum panning. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the vinyl windows at the request of the Historical Commission's staff, prompting this request for legalization of the vinyl windows from the property owner.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Legalize vinyl windows.

DRAFT

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:40:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:

- The property is classified as Significant in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.
- In 2021, vinyl windows with grilles-between-glass and aluminum panning were installed at the property without Historical Commission review and approval.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The vinyl windows and aluminum panning do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Sanchez seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 117 S Beechwood St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Sanchez					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 18 JANUARY 2023

ADDRESS: 1131 S BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Boot N Saddle Bar Sign
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Frank Del Borrello
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate an object, the Boot N Saddle Bar neon sign, attached to the property at 1131 S. Broad Street, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. An eight-foot wide and twenty-foot-tall stainless steel and porcelain sign with neon lighting elements is attached to the front of the three-story masonry commercial building that stands on the property.

The nomination contends that the Boot N Saddle Bar sign satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J as a historic object. It argues that the sign embodies many of the distinguishing characteristics of the Neon Spectacular design style as seen on neon signs in the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion D.

The nomination also argues that the sign, owing to its rare and complex design and position situated along the commercial corridor of South Broad Street, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.

The nomination further argues that the sign, through its connection to midcentury mom and pop commerce, neon sign design, and the area's Italian American community history, exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the object on the property at 1131 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Boot N Saddle Bar Sign on the property at 1131 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed as an object on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:44:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.
- Justin Del Borrello represented the property owner and expressed support for the designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property owner is in support of the designation.
- The sign is an important example of neon sign design along the S. Broad Street corridor.
- The sign exemplifies and highlights the community history of the neighborhood and is an established visual feature along S. Broad Street.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The sign embodies many of the distinguishing characteristics of the Neon Spectacular design style as seen on neon signs in the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion D.
- The sign, owing to its rare and complex design and position situated along the commercial corridor of S. Broad Street, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.
- The sign, through its connection to mid-century mom and pop commerce, neon sign design, and the area's Italian American community history, exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Boot N Saddle Bar Sign on the property at 1131 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, H, and J and to designate it as historic, listing it as an object on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 1131 S Broad St MOTION: Designate, Criteria D, H, J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				2

ADDRESS: 5401-03 VINE ST
Name of Resource: Crystal Bird Fauset House
Review: Designate
Property Owner: UCM Enterprises LLC
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5401-03 Vine Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A three-story brick townhouse, the home of Crystal Bird Fauset from 1933 to 1944, stands on the property. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J for its association with Fauset, a renowned Philadelphia politician and early civil rights advocate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 5401-03 Vine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5401-03 Vine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:49:50

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- Property owner Sam Lewis participated in the review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Renowned Philadelphia politician and early civil rights advocate Crystal Bird Fauset lived in the house at 5401-03 Vine Street from 1933 to 1944.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property at 5401-03 Vine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J for its association with Crystal Bird Fauset.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5401-03 Vine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 5401-03 Vine St **MOTION: Designate, Criteria A and J** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: McCoubrey**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 905-07 S 20TH ST

Name of Resource: Calanthe Hall
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Jerome Whack
Nominator: Nika Faulkner, Historical Commission Intern
Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, Heather.Hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 905-07 S. 20th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the two former brick rowhouses which have been combined into one property satisfy Criterion for Designation J. The nomination argues that Calanthe Hall's connection to the history of Philadelphia's Black fraternal organizations, especially Black female fraternal organizations, make it eligible for

designation under Criterion J, as exemplifying the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community. The period of significance spans from 1941, when the property was sold to the Black female fraternal auxiliary of the Knights of Pythias called the Grand Court of Calanthe, to 2004 when the property was purchased by the current owner to ensure continued support of the fraternal organization and its community members in the Southwest Center City/Graduate Hospital neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 905-07 S. 20th Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 905-07 S. 20th Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:56:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property was sold in 1941 to the Black female fraternal auxiliary of the Knights of Pythias called the Grand Court of Calanthe.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property at 905-07 S. 20th Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, as exemplifying the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 905-07 S. 20th Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 905-07 S 20th St MOTION: Designate, Criterion J MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 5801-03 GERMANTOWN AVE
Name of Resource: Parker Hall
Review: Designate
Property Owner: Dr. Althea Hankins
Nominator: Nika Faulkner, Historical Commission intern
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5801-03 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A three-story brick building, known as Parker Hall, stands on the property. The nomination contends that Parker Hall satisfies Criterion for Designation J. The nomination argues that the property exemplifies the cultural, economic, and social heritage of the community in its history as a commercial storefront and social hall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 5801-03 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5801-03 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criterion J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Committee on Historic Designation recommended revising the Period of Significance to 1900-1949.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:00:48

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the nomination.

- Dr. Althea Hankins represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- Suzanne Ponson, the president of West Central Germantown Neighbors, supported the nomination.
- David Traub supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 5801-03 Germantown Avenue served for decades as a social hall for the black community, including during World War II when it welcomed black veterans.
- During the last 20 years, the owner and founders of the ACES Veterans Museum have worked to preserve the building and document the legacy of its important use as a gathering space and social hall.
- The Period of Significance should be from 1900 to 1949. The end date of 1949 reflects when the Parker family sold the building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property at 5801-03 Germantown Avenue exemplifies the cultural, economic, and social heritage of the community in its history as a commercial storefront and social hall, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5801-03 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criterion J with a Period of Significance of 1900 to 1949 and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Sánchez seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 5801-03 Germantown Ave **MOTION: Designate, Criterion J** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Sánchez**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 1172-74 S BROAD ST
Name of Resource: Davis Auto Sales headquarters
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Filippone-Newman LLC
Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1172-74 S. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Davis Auto Sales headquarters satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the former auto sales and service shop, which opened in 1938, reflects the environment in an era when Art Deco design was embraced by architects and developers for small-scale but visually distinctive commercial buildings in neighborhoods across the city. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that in both its form and details, the building embodies character-defining features of the Art Deco style as applied to low-rise commercial construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1172-74 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1172-74 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:11:00

PRESENTERS:
- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission and represented the nominator.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:
The Historical Commission found that:
- The building, the Davis Auto Sales headquarters, was designed by architect Isadore W. Levin and constructed in 1937-38.

The Historical Commission concluded that:
- The former auto sales and service shop at 1172-74 S. Broad Street reflects the environment in an era when Art Deco design was embraced by architects and developers for small-scale but visually distinctive commercial buildings in neighborhoods across the city, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building at 1172-74 S. Broad Street embodies character-defining features of the Art Deco style as applied to low-rise commercial construction, satisfying Criterion D.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1172-74 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1172-74 S Broad St **MOTION: Designate, Criteria C and D** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 7200-04 CRESHEIM RD
Name of Resource: Cresheim Valley Apartments
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Cresheim Valley Realty Co.
Nominator: West Mount Airy Neighbors
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 7200-04 Cresheim Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the apartment building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, G, and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the 1914 Cresheim Valley Apartments reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Tudor Revival style as applied to low-rise apartment buildings. Under Criterion G, the nomination claims that the building's location next to the Richard Allen train station provides open park space on the train station parcel which should be preserved. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the building exemplifies the railroad-led economic and historic transformation of Northwest Philadelphia in the early decades of the twentieth century as the area became a bustling residential suburb within the city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7200-04 Cresheim Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, but not Criterion G. The argument for the satisfaction of Criterion G proffered in the nomination is based on open space at 200 W. Allens Lane, an adjacent parcel owned by SEPTA, not the subject property.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7200-04 Cresheim Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:14:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Cynthia Dutwin represented the nomination.
- Samantha Pulley represented the property owner and opposed the designation, claiming that the designation would cause a default on the mortgage and a doubling of tenant rents. She requested a one-month continuance of the review.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The owner has not provided information supporting the claim of mortgage default as a result of designation, and the Historical Commission is unaware of such provisions.
- The Historical Commission's attorney, who is an expert in land use law, has reviewed the property's mortgage documents, which are a matter of public record, and did not find any indication that a designation would cause a mortgage default.
- The owner may decline to participate in the Historical Commission's deliberations, but owner consent is not required for the Historical Commission to designate a property as historic.
- If the property is designated, the owner may appeal the designation.
- The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to the exterior envelope of the building, the site and any site appurtenances, and would not require rehabilitation work to the property, which appears to be well-maintained.
- Designation is not intended to be an undue burden.
- The owner has requested a one-month continuance, during which time the property remains under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- A one-month continuance will allow the property owner to better understand the implications of designation and will not put the property at risk as it remains under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission during the continuance period.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to grant a one-month continuance to the 10 March 2023 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

DRAFT

ITEM: 7200-04 Cresheim Rd MOTION: Continue to the March 2023 PHC meeting MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	11				1

ADDRESS: 5848 CITY AVE
Name of Resource: The Chestnuts
Proposed Action: Amend Designation
Property Owner: Sisters of the Visitation of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend the designation of the property at 5848 City Avenue. The property was developed as a country estate in the nineteenth century and converted for use as a convent in the twentieth century. The 11.6-acre property includes a mansion or main house and several other buildings and a large amount of open space.

The Historical Commission designated the property on 13 November 2020, at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. The owner of the property, a cloistered group of nuns who have little contact with the outside world, did not participate in the review of the nomination except to note a general objection to the designation by email. The Historical Commission found that the property satisfied Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J. While the property was nominated for its significance as a nineteenth-century country estate, the Historical Commission extended the period of significance to 1965 to include the property's history as a convent within its significance. With the expansion of the significance, the Historical Commission added the chapel, dormitory, and an ancillary building to the list of historically significant buildings that already included the mansion house, gardener's cottage, carriage house, and other outbuildings. The nomination adopted by the Historical Commission also called out numerous landscape features as historically significant.

The current application requests that the Historical Commission amend the designation to include the main house, gardener's cottage, carriage house and stable, and the land around the buildings and between the house and City Avenue. A letter with the application includes a marked-up aerial photograph that proposes a new boundary for the designation. It also calls for amending the Period of Significance to 1865 to 1940, the period originally proposed in the

nomination. The application points out numerous flaws in the nomination and offers numerous reasons for limiting the area of designation.

Following the Committee on Historic Designation's review in January 2023, the staff visited the site and evaluated the buildings and landscape. Following the site visit, the staff conducted additional research and authored a report. That report documents significant mistakes in the nomination related to the histories of the so-called Cherry Cottage, Cottage 1921, and Garden Building B. It reports that no features survive from the so-called rear garden, contradicting the nomination. It calls into question claims about several landscape features made in the nomination. It points out that a wall with fence cited as a resource in the nomination is actually located at a neighboring property. The recent site visit and additional research indicates that the staff should not have deemed the nomination correct and complete in 2020.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff continues to recommend that the Historical Commission amend the designation, redrawing the boundary as proposed to include the main house, gardener's cottage, carriage house and stable, and a portion of the best-preserved landscape between City Avenue and the main house, and redefine the Period of Significance to 1865-1940, as originally proposed in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission reject the application to amend the designation of 5848 City Avenue.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:34:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the amendment proposal to the Historical Commission.
- Attorneys Nathan Farris and Matt McClure, Sister Antoinette Marie Walker, and consultant Nick Kraus represented the property owner and amendment.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure stated that he represents the Sisters of the Visitation, the legal owner of the property, and St. Joseph's University, the equitable owner. Mr. McClure noted that the Historical Commission's staff had visited the site and prepared a 23-page report on its observations and subsequent research. He asserted that the report corroborates and expands on the findings of his preservation consultant. He contended that the nomination that led to the designation of this property fabricated history, whether intentional or not. Mr. McClure stated that the Historical Commission's decision to allow for third parties to submit nominations was predicated on three premises; nominations would be presented by thoughtful advocates focused on protecting important properties, and not simply as some sort of tool of frustrating future development; nominations would be thoroughly vetted by the Historical Commission's staff to ensure that the facts alleged were actually complete and correct; and that the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission would not give blind deference to the nominator, and then obligate the property owner to prove the negative. To do otherwise would not only be a fundamental violation of due process and the Commission's obligations under the ordinance, he asserted, but it would also be wrong. He added that it would also be an unconstitutional delegation of authority to a non-governmental actor, which he contended occurred in this instance.

- Mr. McClure spoke about the property itself. He explained that the property is a large monastery and has been used by the Sisters for decades for cloistered prayer and charitable work. At its height, about 30 sisters lived on the property; today it is only three. It is essentially an assisted-living facility for the three sisters. A few years ago, it became clear that the monastery would be closed, owing to dwindling numbers and financial concerns. The Sisters decided to sell the property to create a trust to care for the three remaining sisters and to continue their charitable works. The University is the obvious purchaser, since it owns the property next door, and as such has entered into an agreement of sale. He noted that the agreement is conditioned on modifications to this existing designation, which would be quite problematic for anyone buying this property. This property was nominated by parties who admitted to learning about the planned disposition of the property. The nomination was filed about one month into the COVID-19 crisis in April 2020. The nomination makes several contradictory statements about whether or not the property was accessed to prepare the nomination. The nominator may have flown a drone over the property. The nominator never contacted the Sisters and the Sisters never permitted access to the property. The nomination makes several factual claims about the condition of the property that would be simply impossible to make without visiting the property. There is no public access to this property. It is closed off, and was certainly inaccessible during the height of the pandemic. Mr. McClure acknowledged that there was confusion during the early months of the pandemic, when this nomination was evaluated by the staff, but he asserted that this nomination could not have been verified to be correct and complete without a site visit, which would have been impossible at that time. Mr. McClure asserted that, given the findings of the recent staff report, the nomination should not have been deemed correct and complete, owing to the many factual inaccuracies contained throughout the nomination, and should not have been processed. Mr. McClure objected to the nomination's classification of the resource as a "site" and claimed that that classification was chosen to frustrate future development. He enumerated the flaws in the nomination. First, the gardens no longer exist. Second, the historic site identified in the nomination does not even correspond to the property's current boundaries. Third, the so called pleasure gardens have been radically changed. Fourth, the nomination offers a complete misrepresentation of the buildings on the property. Fifth, the so-called Cherry Cottage ostensibly by architect William Price is not at the property, as claimed, but is actually in Devon, Pennsylvania.
- Mr. McClure reminded the Historical Commission that, under the Commission's ordinance, the Commission has the power to rescind or amend designations in the same manner that it adopts designations, and that may involve the exercise of discretion. He reminded the Commissioners that they have discretion when reviewing amendment applications. He stated that an amendment request should be granted when it is determined that factual or legals errors were made. He again stated that the property is not a "site" in the eyes of the ordinance and asserted that the application's request should be granted. Failing to grant the request would constitute a legal error. He stated that, as a compromise, the Sisters would accept a modified designation that includes the original portion of the main house, the gardener's cottage, and the carriage house as well as the land between those buildings.
- Mother Antoinette addressed the Historical Commission. She stated that she has lived at the monastery for 40 years. She stated that three sisters live at the monastery, and they are 63, 64, and 79 years old. She explained that the sisters are cloistered and must always remain within the walls of the enclosure, except to leave

for doctors' visits and other necessary events. Mother Antoinette stated that she is the superior administrator of the monastery. She reported that the church has ordered the monastery closed and the property sold. The proceeds of the sale would be used to create a trust fund, the earnings of which would fund other monasteries. Also, the proceeds would fund payments to the monasteries to which the three sisters at the site will move to support their activities. Mother Antoinette stated that no one is allowed on the property without permission, and no one was given permission to venture onto the property to prepare the nomination. She stated that she was initially unaware that someone flew a drone over the property to collect information but has since learned of the drone flight. No one was given permission to fly a drone over the property.

- Mr. Kraus stated that he prepared a report on the property, which was provided to the Historical Commission. Mr. Kraus stated that he works for Heritage Consulting Group and has an undergraduate degree in history and a master's degree in historic preservation from the University of Pennsylvania. He added that he is qualified to work as a preservation consultant under the National Park Service requirements. Mr. Kraus stated that he is the Vice President of Heritage Consulting Group, a historic preservation consulting firm where he has worked since 2007. He noted that, prior to that, he worked at the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office. He stated that he has worked on numerous nominations and reviewed enormous numbers of nominations for both the local, state, and federal registers.
- Mr. Kraus remarked that the nomination for 5848 City Avenue was submitted in April 2020, just after the Historical Commission closed its offices owing to the pandemic. He stated that the Commission's staff was not able to visit the site while it was determining whether the nomination was correct and complete. Due diligence was not possible at that time. He then noted that he submitted a report on the property to the Historical Commission in December 2022. The report was compiled after he visited the site and examined the buildings and landscape. He stated that the conclusions of his report coincide with the conclusions of the staff's report. He stated that the existing conditions described in the nomination do not accurately portray the site conditions and could not without access to the site. Most of the site is not publicly visible. He reported that there are limited site features left from the Baumann Plan, that the historic buildings have been significantly altered, and that non-historic buildings have been added to the site. He listed all of the features called out in the Baumann Plan and pointed out those that have been altered or no longer exist. He should a photograph taken from City Avenue indicating that the main entrance has been lost. He showed a photograph indicating that the main viewshed from the historic house has been lost, owing to the construction of non-historic buildings. He showed photographs of the area indicated as the rear gardens in the nomination and noted that no such gardens exist. He showed a photograph of the driveway along the house and noted the corrugated metal fence and other significant changes. He showed a photograph of the side façade of the main house, which indicated that the house has been significantly altered and the porch has been replace. He showed the Baumann Plan next to the current site plan and pointed out the many changes. He displayed photographs of the modern chapel and dormitory. He displayed a photograph of Garden Building B and stated that it is incorrectly identified and described in the nomination, likely because it is within the inaccessible enclosure. He showed photographs of an ancillary building and a former garage. Mr. Kraus summarized the oddities and misinformation in the nomination. He also pointed out the errors in the nomination identified by the staff report. He noted that the nomination fails to account for the facts that the Baumann Plan is for an area much

smaller than the current property and that 59th Street and Overbrook Avenue did not exist at the time of the Baumann Plan, even though the nomination claims that features of the Baumann Plan relate to those two streets. He also noted that the building that the nomination labels Cherry Cottage is in fact in Devon, Pennsylvania, not at this site. Also, the rear portion of the driveway did not exist at the time of the Baumann Plan because Overbrook Avenue did not exist. The nomination incorrectly claims that "tracery" of the rear gardens survives, but it does not. Mr. Kraus observed that the staff scaled the Baumann Plan and proved that landscape features cited in the nomination could not exist today, as claimed, because the chapel stands on the very spot where the nomination locates the trees.

- Mr. McClure asked Mr. Kraus if there anything in the original nomination that in any way suggests that a landscape architecture, landscape historian, or some else with similar qualifications ever inspected the property and assisted with the nomination.
    - Mr. Kraus stated that there is nothing in the nomination indicating that an expert in landscape history or architecture ever evaluated the landscape for the nomination.
- Mr. Kraus stated that the nomination includes a reference to the ledger of Addison Hutton, the architect of the main house, but then reproduces a page from the ledger for a building on Germantown Avenue that has nothing to do with this property. Mr. Kraus stated that there is nothing in the nomination that attempts to ascribe any significance to the later chapel or dormitory that would provide a basis for the Committee on Historic Designation's upgrading of those buildings from non-contributing to contributing. He also noted that the land where the 1921 cottage stands was not included within the Baumann Plan.
- Mr. McClure asserted that, as a practical matter, given the facts established in the extensive staff report and the evidence presented this afternoon, the Historical Commission really has only two legal choices: grant amendment application, which is a compromise that will preserve the original house and two other buildings designed by Addison Hutton as well as the lawn between the main house in City Avenue, or rescind the designation completely. Mr. McClure continued that the Commission's legal ability to process and adopt a third-party nomination is expressly premised on a staff conclusion that the nomination is complete and correct. The staff report is clear. The nomination was never complete and correct. He contended that the Commission really is without jurisdiction but urged the Historical Commission to adopt the compromise plan, which does the right thing for both the Sisters and the property. The University will acquire the property. The Sisters will be able to move to the new residences and the property will be subject to a SPINS regulation, which requires an ordinance of Council and work with the community.
- Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, to offer his advice.
    - Mr. Reuter advised the Historical Commission that it has the authority to amend or rescind the designation or deny the amendment request. He stated that it is up to the Historical Commission to determine whether Mr. Kraus and the staff are correct regarding the flaws in the nomination and the state of the property. He stated that he would not comment on Mr. McClure's assertions that the Historical Commission is legally mandated to take a particular action, but he did advise that the Historical Commission should amend the nomination if it learns that the original designation was based on factually incorrect information. He warned the Historical Commission that it would lose an appeal of its decision if it knew that the decision was based on factually incorrect information. He stated that there is

no public policy reason to support designating something without historical significance. Mr. Reuter concluded that he was not going to direct the Historical Commission but he noted that the facts do seem clear in this case.

- Mr. Thomas suggested that the staff should look closely at the site and nomination and report back to the Committee on Historic Designation.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that the staff has visited the site and prepared a report of its findings, which was provided to the Commissioners and public. He noted that, owing to his schedule, he was unable to visit the site prior to the Committee on Historic Designation's meeting in January. He stated that the staff supports the applicant's proposed boundary revision, which includes the oldest buildings and the landscape associated with them. He stated that he does not see the value is remanding this matter to the Committee on Historic Designation, which has already rejected the applicant's proposed boundary revision. He stated that the open questions regarding this matter are questions of fact and law and the Historical Commission has all of the information it needs to answer those questions.
  - Mr. Thomas acknowledged that he had not had a chance to read the staff's report.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee on Historic Designation did not have the benefit of the staff's report. She stated that a challenge with this case is that the City's ordinance does not provide for the designation of landscapes per se. A building permit is not required to remove a tree. The City does not regulate landscapes. She also noted that a suburban estate is not simply a building by itself but is an entire property. In this case, we know that the property was landscaped. She noted that the grounds were probably not planted exactly how Baumann planned and have certainly changed since Baumann, but the grounds are still a true landscape. Ms. Cooperman stated that she is an experienced landscape historian. She stated that the important question is: What is the appropriate setting for the buildings. She indicated that the topography and circulation should be considered. She said that the Historical Commission is in a quandary because it does not regulate trees.
- Mr. McClure stated that a third-party nomination is only ever reviewed by the Historical Commission after the staff determines that it is correct and complete. The staff is now saying that the nomination is not correct and complete. Therefore, the notice should not have been sent and the jurisdiction should not have attached. The staff issued a 23-page report that says that the nomination is not correct and complete. Legally, there is no jurisdiction. Mr. McClure then suggested that the Historical Commission should accept his compromise so that the Sisters can sell the property to the University. Otherwise, the Sisters will have to seek another buyer. Mr. McClure asserted that the Committee on Historic Designation attempted to shift the burden of proof onto the Sisters, asking why they did not retain a horticulturist or a landscape architect. The Committee tried to compel the property owner to prove a negative. Mr. McClure pointed out that the nominator was not advised by a horticulturist or a landscape architect. He declared that "We live in a democracy here. We have rules." He again suggested that the Historical Commission accept his compromise.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that the boundary in the proposed compromise plan runs very close to the main house at points.

    - Mr. McClure acknowledged that it does but pointed out that there are non-historic buildings adjacent to the historic house and the boundary was drawn between them.
    - Mr. McCoubrey replied that the historic house needs more breathing room.
    - Mr. McClure offered to work further to define the boundary.
- Mr. Thomas stated that he needed more information before deciding because he has never visited this property.
- Mr. Mattioni opined that the Historical Commission "had been had by the nominator." He stated that the Historical Commission would not have designated the property if it had the information that it now has. He stated that he has not agreed with everything Mr. McClure has claimed, but he sees a fundamental problem with the designation. He suggested that perhaps Mr. Thomas could visit the site. Mr. Mattioni concluded that he would like to see the situation rectified because it is not acceptable in its current form.
- Ms. Cooperman suggested that she and Mr. Thomas could visit the property and decide how to proceed.
- Mr. Thomas stated that he thinks that the Historical Commission could offer an in-concept approval of the boundary reduction. He stated that the Commissioners now need to decide where the boundary should be.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the mid twentieth-century buildings should be considered historically significant.
    - Ms. Cooperman reported that one member of the Committee on Historic Designation thought that the mid twentieth-century buildings should be considered historically significant.
    - Mr. McClure objected to the inclusion of the later buildings.
- Mr. Thomas asked Mr. McClure if he would object to tabling the matter for one month to allow for a more precise boundary to be defined.
    - Mr. McClure stated that he was amenable to working to refine the boundary but not to having more people to the site.
- Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Farnham if he had enough information to discuss the boundary.
    - Mr. Farnham stated that he believes that the Historical Commission has enough information to decide about the boundary but cautioned the Commissioners about deliberating outside a public meeting.
    - Mr. Reuter objected to any Commissioners visiting the site. He said that they could not possibly visit the site without discussing the matter, which would be inappropriate. He strongly objected to a site visit because they would inherently deliberate outside a public meeting, and there was no way to invite all parties to participate.

ACTION: Without objection, Mr. Thomas continued the amendment application for one month to the March 2023 meeting of the Historical Commission.

DRAFT

ITEM: 5848 City Ave MOTION: Continue for one month MOVED BY: Thomas					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				3

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 7701 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Construct rear addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Ridge Avenue LLC
Applicant: Charles Whitlock, US Best Construction LLC
History: 1790
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application seeks final approval for a two-story addition at 7701 Ridge Avenue. Constructed in 1790, the building is a contributing resource to the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District. The applicant is proposing to restore the front and south façades and construct a new rear addition. Vinyl siding is proposed for cladding on the addition. Window materials are not specified.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Restore front façade and south elevation.
- Rehabilitate interior for residential space.
- Construct two-story addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*
  - The applicant plans to preserve and restore the features of the historic front façade and south elevation, meeting Standard 5. The staff will work with the applicant to

approve new windows, doors, woodwork, and masonry repairs. The staff recommends that the applicant consider a stucco finish for south elevation.

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The massing, size, and scale of the proposed addition meets Standard 9. If the applicant agrees to revise the exterior cladding to wood or cement clapboard, window details to include framing and sill, and rear railing to be wood or composite material, the application can meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
  - All demolition of historic fabric is limited to the rear roof and rear openings. In the future, if the addition was removed, the essential form and integrity of the property would remain; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the applicant revises the material as suggested, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:44:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney William O' Brien and architect John Betts represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Steven Peitzman objected to the size of the proposed addition and contended that it does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- David Traub said he thought the south façade should be stone owing to its visibility from the public right-of-way.
- Oscar Beisert supported the application. He stated that the restoration of the façade is a benefit and mitigates the addition.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- All comments from the Architectural Committee meeting were reviewed by applicant and majority were incorporated into the revised application.
- Architectural Committee comments not addressed in the revised drawings including the addition roof configuration, the insertion of the window, and the addition setback, were explained in detail by the applicant to the Commissioners, who agreed that the revised application was acceptable.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application preserves and restores the features of the historic front façade and south elevation, meeting Standard 5. The staff will work with the applicant to approve new windows, doors, woodwork, and masonry repairs.
- The materials, massing, size, and scale of the proposed addition in the revised application meet Standard 9. The application has been updated to show cement clapboard for the addition cladding, window and door details, and rear wood railings.
- All demolition of historic fabric is limited to the rear roof and rear openings. In the future, if the addition was removed, the essential form and integrity of the property would remain; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 7701 Ridge Ave **MOTION: Approval with staff to review details** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Mattioni**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				3

ADDRESS: 2000-24 ARCH ST
Name of Resource: Gulf Gas Station
Proposed Action: Rescind designation of parcel and designate building as an object
Property Owner: 2000 Arch Street Associates LP
Applicant: Robert Careless, Esq., Cozen O'Connor
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: A small gas station building stands along 20th Street south of Arch Street, at the eastern edge of the property at 2000-24 Arch Street. The gas station is being moved to a new site to facilitate the redevelopment of the Arch Street property. This request proposes to rescind the designation of the property at 2000-24 Arch Street when the gas station is moved to its new location. The gas station would be redesignating as an object so that its designation travels with it.

The gas station was constructed in 1930 for the Gulf Refining Company. The Historical Commission designated the gas station as historic in 1981, soon after it ceased operation. The property was designated for the gas station only; there are no other historic resources on the large property, which is used as a surface parking lot.

In 2019, the Historical Commission began discussions with consultants working for a new owner of the property at 20th and Arch Streets, who sought to relocate the structure for use as a public amenity to be managed by Philadelphia Parks and Recreation. On 14 May 2021, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application to move the gas station. At the time, the plan was to move the gas station to Aviator Park at Logan Square. Since that time, the plan has been revised and the gas station will now be moved to Fairmount Park, near the Sedgley Porter's House, where it will be restored and used by a non-profit. The Law Department reviewed the Historical Commission's approval of the relocation of the gas station of 14 May 2021 and determined that the approval is valid for moving the gas station to any publicly owned and accessible site in Philadelphia because the primary regulatory question decided at the time was whether the gas station could be moved from its original site, not whether the gas station should be moved to a particular new site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that Historical Commission amend the designation of the gas station building by rescinding the designation of the property at 2000-24 Arch Street and designating the gas station building as an object satisfying Criterion for Designation J, pursuant to Section 5.14.a of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations, which addresses the amendment of designations.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that Historical Commission amend the designation of the gas station building at the time of its relocation by rescinding the designation of the property at 2000-24 Arch Street and designating the gas station building itself as an object as satisfying Criterion for Designation J, pursuant to Section 5.14.a of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:02:19

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Robert Careless and architect Sam Olshin represented the current property owner.
- Robert Allen of Philadelphia Parks and Recreation represented the future property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Careless confirmed that Parkway Corporation is committed to relocating the gas station. He stated that the company has hired a contractor and a mover and is actively engaged with the City to ensure the safe transfer of the gas station building from 20th and Arch Streets to Fairmount Park. He added that it will be installed in its location at Fairmount Park.
- Mr. Allen introduced himself as the Director of Property and Concessions Management for Philadelphia Parks and Recreation. He stated that his organization is ready to receive the building. He stated that it will be installed in a great location and have a great adaptive reuse with the Bicycle Coalition and the Schuylkill Navy.

- Mr. Olshin confirmed that before the building is moved it will be completely stabilized. He stated that Parkway has engaged Wolfe House and Building Movers to relocate the building. He stated that everything will be done in coordination with the Historical Commission and in accordance with historic preservation standards.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Historical Commission designated the property at 2000-24 Arch Street for the historic gas station in 1981. The Historical Commission has not identified or designated any other historic resources at the site.
- The Historical Commission approved the removal of the gas station building from 2000-24 Arch Street in 2021.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The gas station building represents the early years of the automobile age in Philadelphia, thereby satisfying Criterion J.
- The nomination for the gas station may be amended, rescinded the designation of 2000-24 Arch Street and designating the gas station as an object, because the Historical Commission has not identified or designated any other historic resources at 2000-24 Arch Street.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to amend the designation of the gas station building at the time of its relocation by rescinding the designation of the property at 2000-24 Arch Street and designating the gas station building itself as an object as satisfying Criterion for Designation J, pursuant to Section 5.14.a of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 2000-24 Arch St **MOTION: Rescind designation of 2000-24 Arch St and designate building as an object** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Carney**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				3

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:13:40

ACTION: At 2:37 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment **MOTION: Adjourn** **MOVED BY: Mattioni** **SECONDED BY: Cooperman**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)					X
Kindt (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)					X
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	9				3

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory committees are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.
(1) Criteria for Designation.
A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

(a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
(b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
(c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
(d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;

DRAFT

(e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
(f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
(g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
(h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
(i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
(j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.

DRAFT