THE MINUTES OF THE 743RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 12 JULY 2024, 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 9:06 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		
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Kareema Abu Saab (Commerce Department)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Kyle O'Connor (Department of Public Property)	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		
Matthew Treat (Department of Planning and Development)	X		

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

The following staff members were present:
Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner I
Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
Izzy Korostoff, Community Initiatives Specialist
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:
Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
Aaron Miller
Aaron Moselle, WHYY News
Adam E. Laver, Esq., Blank Rome LLP

Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Alexander Roederer
Amber N. Wiley, Ph.D.
Amber Wiley
Amy Lambert
Andrea Korb
Andrew Goodman, Councilmember Gauthier's Office
Andrew Zakroff
Ann Marie Dimino
Anurag Sagar
Barry Grossbach
Benjamin Cromie
Bob Littlewood
B. Seitchik
Ca-Tisha Adams
Christie Bloom
Christopher Mejia-Smith
Colin Murphy
Colin Rupp
Jack McGovern
Daryl DeBrest
David Fecteau, PCPC Staff
David Orphanides, Esq.
David Richards
David Roos
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Deborah Gary, Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia African American Assets
Dennis Carlisle
Dimitri Boufidis
Drew Moyer
Eric Leighton, cbp Architects
Eric Santoro
Evan Litvin, LO DESIGN
Francine Sandrow
Frank L. Chance
George Poulin
Georgia Faino
Greg Berzinsky
Greg Fisher
Gregory Montanaro
Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Harrison Haas
Heather Calvert
Hillary Wittich
Inga Saffron, Inquirer
Jabari Jones
Jacob Adams
Jamie Angelo
Jamie Vann
Jason Cohen
Jay Farrell

Jay Ifert
Jeffrey Saunders
Jenine Sanzari
Jim Kelly, Esq., City Law Dept.
Joel Cohen
John Hunter
Jonathan Hessney
Joshua Zugerman
Judith Robinson
Julia Hayman
Julie Bush
Justino Navarro
Kat Lambert
Kathy Dowdell
Kevin Flynn
Kevin Levy
Kevin McMahon
Kim Schmucki
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City Philadelphia
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Laura Line
Laura Nanda
Leah Silverstein
Leonard Bonarek
Lia Schifitto
Linda Choing
Margherita Larson
Maris Leo
Mark Dichter
Mark Dominus
Mark Brack
Mary Berzinsky
Mary Costello, Esq., Phila Law Dept.
Mary McClenaghan
Mary McGettigan
Mason Carter
Matt Dunphy
Melvin Sharpe
Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Michael Bufalino
Michael Koep
Michael Mattioni, Esq., Mattioni Ltd.
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Michaelle Bond
Michiko Quinones
Mike Hugel
Mike Rose
Nancy Pontone
Noah Ostroff
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Pamela Beasley

Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Civic Association
Patrick Bayer
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Peg Wright
Peter Angelides, Econsult Solutions
Rachael Pritzker
R. Hagen
Rich Gallagher
Richard DeMarco, Esq.
Robert Hotes
Robert Kirschner
Robert Sher
Robert Weinberg
Sam Katovitch, Toner Architects
Sam Ressin
Sanford Coker
Sharon Fleming
Stanley Uhr
Stephanie Pennypacker
Steven Peitzman
Suzanna Barucco
Sylvia Hamerman-Brown
T. Arti
Taylor Kessinger
Timothy Reimer
Tony West
Tre Ambroise
Tyra Duhan
Wesley Parrott
Will Tung
Yvette Forrest

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 742ND STATED MEETING, 14 JUNE 2024

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:00

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 742nd Stated Meeting, held 14 June 2024. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 742nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 June 2024. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 742nd Stated Meeting of the PHC **MOTION: Adopt minutes** **MOVED BY: Thomas** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

WASHINGTON SQUARE WEST HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Multiple
Nominator: Washington Square West Civic Association
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application This nomination proposes to designate a large historic district comprised of 1,441 resources spanning approximately 26 city blocks in the Washington Square West neighborhood of Center City Philadelphia. The nomination ascribes various types of significance to the district, including social, architectural, cultural, and archaeological significance, arguing that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, F, I, and J. The nomination contends that the proposed Washington Square West historic district illustrates the development of Philadelphia's residential and commercial core over more than two centuries, from the establishment of the Mikveh Israel Cemetery in 1740 until the solidification of the neighborhood as an LGBTQ+ community in the 1980s.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Washington Square West Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, F, I, and J.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:32

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Cooperman recused from the review of the continuance request, owing to her involvement in the preparation of the nomination.

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham explained that the request was proffered by multiple property owners and that the additional time would allow for those owners to continue to gather information about the designation process and the implications of designation. He noted that the Historical Commission is not required to open the floor for comment when it is merely scheduling a matter.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the Washington Square West Historic District to the 13 September 2024 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Continuance **MOTION: Continue Washington Square West Historic District to Sept. PHC mtg.** **MOVED BY: Mattioni** **SECONDED BY: McCoubrey**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman				X	
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	10			1	

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2024

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:16:30

DISCUSSION:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 208-12 Vine Street and 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front Street. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda **MOTION: Adopt Consent Agenda** **MOVED BY: Thomas** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 208-12 VINE ST
Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: John Stortz
Applicant: Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
History: 1780; John Stortz and Son Store; Existing structures approved for demolition, 2023.
Individual Designation: 12/31/1984
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a six-story building with roof deck at 208-12 Vine Street. The Historical Commission previously approved the demolition of the complex of buildings on the site, finding that they could not be feasibly reused. The proposed building would include 35 residential units and a seven-car garage accessed from New Street. The exterior of the building would be clad in a mix of brick, vertical metal siding, and fiber cement siding, with metal bands and cornices. Windows would be metal-clad wood.

The Architectural Committee reviewed this project in concept in May 2024 and recommended denial, owing to incompleteness. The Historical Commission reviewed a supplemented version of the application, which had more information about the proposed materials as well as elevations and renderings showing the surrounding context of the site, and approved it in concept.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Construct a six-story building with roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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 of the proposed building is compatible in scale with the immediate surroundings, which is comprised primarily of newly constructed apartment buildings.
    - The use of brick along Vine Street responds to the immediate surroundings as well as the historic district as a whole.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the brick wraps an additional bay at the third to fifth floors; the metal cladding is a panel system rather than corrugated; and the color palette of the metal and cement-board sidings is lightened, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST
Proposal: Convert church to residential; construct addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Pollard Allen OCF LLC
Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects
History: 1870; Imaculate Conception Catholic Church and Rectory; Edwin Forrest Durang, architect
Individual Designation: 4/12/2019
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to convert the former Immaculate Conception church and rectory in Northern Liberties to residential use and construct an addition on the site.

The Historical Commission approved the rehabilitation in-concept at its January 2023 meeting. The updated plans largely reflect the 2023 in-concept approval. The application proposes to insert additional floor levels and install a combination of casement and plate windows and spandrels in the existing window openings, and construct shed dormers on the steep gable roof on the east and west elevations. The stained glass rose window and transoms on the north elevation will remain. Revisions to this application for final approval includes the proposed use of asphalt shingles instead of synthetic slate shingles on the church roof; a revised decorative roof shingle pattern to relate to the new dormers; a revised dormer configuration with wider window openings; and the demolition of a small garage on Pollard Street constructed after the rectory was completed, which will allow for access to a rear ADA ramp.

A three story, nine-unit, flat-roofed annex is proposed to the west of the church building. It does not physically attach to the designated buildings. Unlike the church rehabilitation, this proposal has not been considered by the Architectural Committee or Historical Commission previously. The primary visibility of the annex building is from W. Allen Street.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Install additional floors in church
- Install windows and doors
- Replace roofing
- Alter openings
- Demolish small garage
- Construct three-story annex

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary or pictorial evidence.*
  - The proposed windows reflect the consistent horizontal rectangular proportions and divisions of the historic windows.
  - The existing rectangular grey slate roofing is in poor condition, and if original, is over 150 years old, having outlived the standard service life of slate roofing. The proposed

asphalt shingle in a rectangular shape could approximate the historic appearance of the roofing.
    - The existing front door slabs are not original. The staff recommends basing the design of the new doors on the drawings and historic photographs of the original doors.
    - The application complies with Standard 6.
- *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 height and slope of the existing roof would make it difficult to reuse without the insertion of windows. The proposed shed dormers are small and low in relationship to the large sloping roof, which maintains its full slope at the front and rear of the roof. The application satisfies the Roofs Guideline.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The proposed annex building is not physically connected to the church or rectory.
    - The proposed annex building is contemporary in style and includes design elements such as the brick cladding and vertical windows on the north and east facades that relate to the church and rectory.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the original roofing pattern is better replicated; and revising the window pattern on the east and west facades and revising the dormer windows to a single, rounded light of glass are considered; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 331 LAWRENCE CT
Proposal: Construct dormer and roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Kristien Verbeke
Applicant: Mary McClenaghan, 39' North Architects
History: 1812
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application initially proposed to remove a historic rear dormer and construct a larger shed dormer with roof deck on the rear of this residence located at the intersection of Lawrence Court and Lawrence Court Walk in Society Hill. The Redevelopment Authority rehabilitated this building, along with the similar buildings at 327 and 329 Lawrence Court, in 1959. The matching rear additions at 331 and 329 Lawrence Court were constructed in 1977. The rear dormer and deck at 329 Lawrence Court were added in 1992; they were altered in 2020; the Historical Commission approved both projects. The rear dormer at 331 Lawrence Court, which would have been removed with the initial application, appears to be original.

Based on comments from the Architectural Committee, the applicant has revised the application to incorporate the Committee's recommendations. The historic dormer is now proposed to be retained and used as a doorway to a deck that has been set back from Lawrence Court Walk, making it inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. The original roof slope and the original 1970s roof slope will both remain on the Lawrence Court Walk side.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Modify rear dormer and construct rear deck.

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 removal of the original rear dormer does not satisfy Standard 2.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
  - The proposed deck and shed dormer are located on a corner property and will be highly conspicuous when viewing the property from the side and rear, from the public right-of-way. This work does not satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:18:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Mary McClenaghan represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- There were no photographs in the application documenting the existing conditions of the rear dormer.
- If the rear dormer window is found to have been installed before the year 1959, it should be stored on site for future potential restoration activities.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application satisfies Standard 2 because the historic dormer will not be lost.
- The revised application satisfies the Roofs Guideline because the rear deck will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the existing dormer is documented and the dormer sash is retained and stored on site if original, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 331 Lawrence Ct **MOTION: Approval with conditions** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Carney**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
O'Conner (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				

ADDRESS: 336 N FRONT ST
Proposal: Construct three-story building
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: Roy Aharonovich
Applicant: Gabriel Deck, Gnome Architects
History: Vacant lot
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes new construction at 336 N. Front Street, a non-contributing vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. This application proposes to construct a three-story building with a mezzanine and two decks. The four-unit building will be used for visitor accommodations. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over this construction on an undeveloped site is review-and-comment only.

SCOPE OF WORK:
- Construct a three-story building with a mezzanine and two decks.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:
The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be*

differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

- The proposed building would be compatible with the Old City Historic District if the primary façade color is changed from gray to red to reflect the brick red in the area, and the over-scaled features like the very large windows are redesigned to better reflect the scale, rhythms, and features of the neighboring buildings.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:28:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Colin Rupp represented the revised application. He explained the revisions completed included the reduction of floor and window heights by one foot on the second, third, and fourth floors. Mr. Rupp reported that 30 inches was removed from the roof height and the dormer height was also reduced. He noted that details such as the roof deck railing and siding details were added in response to the Architectural Committee's comments.
-

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Matt Dunphy commented in support of tan brick.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION COMMENTS:

The Historical Commission commented that:

- The application was revised to address some of the Architectural Committee's concerns about building height and window scale.
- The tan brick is not in keeping with the general aesthetic of red brick in the Old City Historic District.
- The dormer height remains oversized in comparison to window openings in the historic district.
- The proximity to the billboard signage mitigates some of the Historical Commission's concerns about the new building's height.

ADDRESS: 4045-61 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct multi-unit residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Robert and Dave Littlewood
Applicant: Eric Leighton, cbp Architects
History: 1869; Littlewood & Co., Dyers and Bleachers
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Main St Manayunk Historic District, Significant, 12/14/1983
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a multi-unit residential building at 4045-61 Main Street at the corner of Main Street and Shurs Lane in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The site is in the floodplain and the proposed building is designed to be sufficiently resilient to survive occasional flooding. The proposed building would be seven stories tall and

include 162 residential units, 160 parking spaces, residential amenities, and a loading dock. Occupied space and mechanical equipment would be located on and above the second floor, above the Design Flood Elevation. Walls from the mill complex along Main Street would be retained and incorporated into the new building. Windows and doors in the old walls would be restored. The new building would be clad in brick and corrugated metal.

A historic mill complex stands on the site at 4045-61 Main Street. At its 10 May 2024 meeting, the Historical Commission determined that the mill complex at the site cannot be feasibly adaptively reused and approved its demolition. At the same time, the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an earlier version of the proposed multi-unit residential building, finding that the proposed building would be too large in size, scale, and massing for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The current application proposes a revised design for the building that is intended to address the Historical Commission's concerns expressed in May. The cover letter with the application enumerates the revisions, which include additional setbacks and other features around the historic facades to give them more three-dimensionality, additional setbacks at the upper floors to reduce the height and size, and additional articulation of the facades to reduce the massing. The application materials include a series of comparisons of the original and revised design that show the setbacks, reductions in height, and other changes.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a seven-story building, incorporating the retained facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
    - The construction of the proposed new building will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed building will be differentiated from the old sections of the mill complex that will be retained. The size, scale, and massing of the proposed building have been revised from the previous iteration of the design so that it will be compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing with the historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:41:04

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Adam Laver, architect Eric Leighton, developer Andrew Zakroff, economic consultant Peter Angelides, flood resiliency consultant Kevin Flynn, planning consultant Benjamin Cromie represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Laver stated that he represents 4045 Main Street, LLC, the equitable owner of the subject property, and its parent entity, Urban Conversions. He requested that the Historical Commission incorporate the record from the 10 May 2024 review for this

property as well as the records of related committee reviews into this meeting's record. He noted that Robert and David Littlewood, the fifth-generation stewards of the family business at this site, G.J. Littlewood and Sons, care greatly about the future of this site and their family's legacy. He reminded the Historical Commission that Hurricane Ida decimated this site and destroyed the business that had operated there for more than a century and a half. He noted that the property is located at the very edge of the historic district and that this segment of Main Street desperately needs reactivation. People who have a vested interest in this area and who would be most impacted by the development have embraced the proposed transformation of this site. He stated that the underlying zoning really only allows self-storage, which would be a poor use for the site. This is a project that will further the Administration's goals for much needed housing, the District Councilmember's vision for a revitalized Main Street corridor, and nearby business owners desperate desire for residents to shop, dine, and patronize local businesses that have struggled to weather floods, a pandemic, social unrest, and economic downturns.

- Mr. Leighton, the architect, summarized the revisions to the design of the proposed building that had been implemented since the Historical Commission's earlier review of the project. He stated that the revisions are intended to address the Historical Commission's concerns about the scale, size and massing, and proportions of the proposed building. He described the site and the proposed building. He described the changes intended to highlight the preserved segments of the historic facades. He stated that they provided more breathing room around the historic features. He displayed many drawings juxtaposing the original and revised designs. He explained how the proposed building would relate to a building planned for the adjacent site at 11 Shur's Lane. He showed how they had lowered the height of the building along Shur's Lane to reduce the massing. He noted that the change resulted in the loss of some units. He noted that the site is in the floodplain and explained how the building was designed to accommodate flooding.
- Mr. Angelides, the economic consultant, explained the economic reasons behind the need for the seventh floor. He stated that, among other things, the seventh-floor revenue supports the onsite parking.
- Mr. Leighton continued to describe the revised design. He presented information on all of the exterior cladding materials. He explained how they broke the large building down into smaller segments with material and plane changes. He displayed numerous renderings of the proposed building. He discussed the historic context and offered images of buildings in Manayunk and similar sizes.
- Mr. Flynn, the flood resiliency consultant, discussed flooding at the site and the design features intended to accommodate occasional flooding.
- Mr. Leighton discussed historic preservation projects that his firm and his client's firm have undertaken. He then summarized the material choices and the design revisions to give the historic walls more independence and three-dimensionality. He stated that they made many changes to the design to ensure that the historic walls did not look like "wallpaper." He also discussed the height of the proposed building and the need to accommodate flooding, which means that all occupied spaces must be located above the Design Flood Elevation. He provided information on the structure and its implications for floor-to-ceiling heights. Mr. Leighton summarized the support for the project from near neighbors. He concluded that this project will bring vitality to a desolate block of Main Street.
- Mr. Angelides stated that the seventh floor of the building is needed to make the project viable. He also noted that constructing the garage will be very expensive and

additional rental space is needed to offset the cost of the garage. He concluded that multi-family residential is the best use for this site. Other possible uses will detract from Manayunk. This project will be additional vitality to Manayunk.

- Mr. Flynn stated that he provided an updated design review report. He asserted that the current design incorporates best practices and the most current technical guidance for flood resilient design. It goes above and beyond the regulatory requirements. The project team has participated in a flood protection scoping meeting with the Department of Licenses and Inspections, and will continue to coordinate appropriate reviews and approvals with City agencies as the project moves forward.
- Mr. Cromie, a city planning consultant, emphasized that the height and scale of the proposed redevelopment is consistent with numerous other high-density, multi-family developments in the near neighborhood, and consistent with the heighten and mass of the nineteenth-century mill and industrial buildings in the area. The project will contribute to the neighborhood. It will be an attractive, sustainable, transit-oriented development, and will provide new neighbors and customers for the Main Street commercial corridor and create an economic boost for the neighborhood.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee appreciated the efforts to reduce the apparent mass and bulk of the building with setbacks and reductions in heights. However, the Committee still found that the proposed building is too large for Main Street.
- Ms. Carney congratulated the team on the very clear presentation that highlighted the changes. She stated that she really appreciated the lowering of the amenity floor on the corner at Shur's Lane and the variation and articulation of the brick facade areas. She concluded that it is a great project for a very difficult site.
- Mr. Mattioni stated that the building will be a very handsome addition to Manayunk and contribute greatly to its economic success. He commended the design team and the work it has done.
- Mr. Thomas stated that architecturally and in terms of the massing and site, the proposed building works extremely well. He stated that he appreciated the revisions to the design. He noted that Shur's Lane is very steep and observed that a building of this height will not appear tall from the neighborhood above. He stated that he appreciates the effort involved in preserving pieces of the historic facades. He stated that it is unfortunate that the ground floor cannot be used for commercial space but acknowledged that the flooding risks make that impossible. He stated that he appreciated the material choices. He concluded by remarking that he strongly supports this project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that his organization opposes the application because the proposed building is still too big.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that the building should look like a traditional industrial building. The proposed building is not appropriate for Main Street.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the narrow vertical indentations with metal panels on the Main Street facade are entirely unnecessary. They accentuate the verticality and make the building seem taller.
- John Hunter, the zoning chair of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council, opposed the proposal. He stated that the building will be too large for the site and its context.

- Judith Robinson stated that the Diamond Street Historic District should be considered the city's first historic district, not Main Street Manayunk.
- Mason Carter stated that the Historical Commission should push back on the developer to get a better design.
- John Godsey, the owner of Quaker City Motorsport at 3901 Main Street, voiced his support for the application. He stated that this project will revitalize a desolate section of Main Street.
- Timothy Reimer opposed the application and stated that he objects to any construction in the floodplain.
- Kathleen Lambert, a longtime resident of the 4500 block of Smick Street, about one mile from the site, objected to the application. She stated that the building is inappropriate and unattractive.
- Jay Farrell opposed the application, contending that the proposed building is too large.
- Mike Rose, a business owner across the street from the site, supported the application, stating that it would enliven a desolate section of Main Street and revitalize businesses in the area.
- Jack McGovern stated that he owns several properties in the immediate vicinity and runs an accounting firm on Main Street. He stated that the 4000-block of Main Street is desolate and dangerous at night. He strongly supported the application.

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

- The property at 4045-61 Main Street is located in the floodplain.
- At its 10 May 2024 meeting, the Historical Commission determined that the mill complex at 4045-61 Main Street cannot be feasibly adaptively reused and approved its demolition.
- The design of the proposed building has been significantly revised since the Historical Commission reviewed it at its 10 May 2024 meeting.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The construction of the proposed new building will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed building will be differentiated from the old sections of the mill complex that will be retained. The size, scale, and massing of the proposed building have been revised from the previous iteration of the design so that the proposed building will be compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing with the historic district. The proposed building satisfies Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 5.

ITEM: 4045-61 Main St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Carney					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair		X			
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman		X			
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey		X			
Michel		X			
Treat (DPD)		X			
Total	6	5			

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 26 JUNE 2024

SPRUCE HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT, SOUTHEAST QUADRANT

Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Multiple
Nominator: Spruce Hill Community Association
Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes designating the Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The proposed district includes 572 properties in West Philadelphia that are primarily residential and commercial buildings. This district is the first of four anticipated in Spruce Hill, encompassing an area that will eventually include approximately 2,000 properties. For administrative purposes, the area was divided east to west at 43rd Street, and north to south at Spruce Street, into four quadrants and each of the four quadrants is being nominated separately and sequentially, owing to the complexities of nominating large numbers of properties simultaneously. It is anticipated that nominations for the other three quadrants will follow as the inventories are completed. The boundaries of the district currently proposed are generally 43rd Street to the west; Spruce Street to the north; 39th Street to the east; and Baltimore and Woodland Avenues to the south.

The nomination states that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that Spruce Hill has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development of West Philadelphia where public transportation drove speculative development of a high caliber that still retains its architectural integrity. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination states that Spruce Hill reflects the environment in an era characterized by distinctive architectural styles and that the buildings embody distinguishing characteristics of mid to late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century architectural styles, including Italianate, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Neo-Grec, Second Empire, and Georgian Revival. Under Criterion E, the nomination outlines the significant architects commissioned to design buildings in Spruce Hill, including Samuel Sloan, Theophilus P. Chandler, G.W. and

W.D. Hewitt, and Willis G. Hale. Lastly, under Criterion J, the nomination argues that Spruce Hill exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community, as an exemplary representation of West Philadelphia's development as a streetcar suburb.

To add clarity to the nomination, the staff suggests that the Historical Commission change the name of the proposed district from the Spruce Hill Historic District Southeast Quadrant to the Spruce Hill Southeast Historic District if and when it designates it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates the proposed Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates the proposed Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:12:53

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Mattioni recused from the review.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the incorrect and incomplete request, continuance request, and nomination, in that order, to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney David Orphanides, preservation consultant Sharon Fleming, and Janine Sanzari of the Spruce Hill Community Association represented the nomination.
- Numerous property owners and owners' representatives participated in the discussions.

DISCUSSION – INCORRECT AND INCOMPLETE REQUEST:

- Ms. Chantry stated that Michael Phillips, an attorney representing Campus Apartments and University City Housing, has requested that the Historical Commission reject the Spruce Hill Historic District Southeast Quadrant nomination as incorrect and incomplete. His objections are enumerated in several letters provided to the Commission and made available to the public online. Ms. Chantry suggested that the Historical Commission address the incorrect and incomplete claims before continuing with the rest of the historic district nomination review. She noted that Mr. Phillips has asked the Historical Commission to postpone the review of the district nomination for 90 days if it does not find the nomination incorrect and incomplete.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that the Committee on Historic Designation found the nomination to be correct and complete, with the boundary as proposed in the nomination. She acknowledged that there may be other areas of the Spruce Hill neighborhood which merit historic designation as well, but this district as proposed merits historic designation.
    - Mr. Thomas agreed.
- Attorney Michael Phillips presented his request to find the nomination incorrect and incomplete, and referenced the three letters he sent to the Historical Commission. He stated that this is a procedural objection, not an argument of the merits of the district. He stated that his position remains that it is not understood what is being

reviewed in terms of a district, because of the language and words used in the nomination. He stated that the language of the nomination repeatedly states that the nomination is setting forth the merits of the Spruce Hill Historic District, but that it has been broken up into quadrants for administrative purposes. He opined that the southeast quadrant is not treated as its own independent district. He claimed that the nomination and inventory therefore do not match up. He stated that the nomination must address the merits of the southeast quadrant independently and be of a narrow focus. He stated that, by reviewing this nomination and assessing the merits of the southeast quadrant, the Historical Commission is preordaining the future designation of the remaining quadrants in Spruce Hill because this nomination speaks about the significance of the Spruce Hill neighborhood as a whole. He stated that this is unprecedented. He stated that if the intent of the nomination is to nominate all four districts of Spruce Hill, the nomination must be returned to the staff per the Rules and Regulations, to await the submission of a full inventory of all properties in Spruce Hill. He stated that alternatively, if this nomination seeks to designate the southeast quadrant as an independent district that stands on its own merits, the nomination should be returned to the staff so that the description and merits can be clearly limited to the southeast quadrant. He claimed that this process is depriving owners in other quadrants of their due process rights. He stated that if the Historical Commission decides to move forward with the nomination, he requests a continuance to allow additional time to assess the merits based on the properties within this quadrant.

- Mr. Orphanides provided comments on behalf of the Spruce Hill Community Association, the nominator of the historic district. Mr. Orphanides stated that Mr. Phillips is misrepresenting what is in the nomination. He referenced maps that show the southeast quadrant boundaries only, and captions that state that the subject of the nomination is the southeast quadrant. He stated that maps showing other possible districts in the neighborhood are for reference. He stated that one cannot take a particular area in a vacuum, and that there are other areas which surround any particular neighborhood or district, and to not reference them at all would make a nomination deficient. He stated that the area proposed for designation is defined by a very specific geographic boundary with an extremely high density of contributing properties; the area proposed for designation stands alone in and of itself. He commented that the effort to designate this area has been going on for decades; the process has not been rushed. He stated that this latest effort started in 2021, and there was a community meeting one year ago, which Mr. Phillips's client attended. He concluded that the only people who appear to be confused by the boundary are Mr. Phillips and his clients.
    - Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Orphanides's points.
- Mr. Phillips restated that the nomination speaks to the merits of the entirety of Spruce Hill, but only one quarter of the properties are being nominated. He stated that the staff should collect all of the quadrants, review them separately, and then present it as a unified Spruce Hill Historic District boundary.
- Mr. Thomas contended that there are good reasons to designate an area as a series of smaller districts. He noted that every property included in this proposed district boundary is accounted for in the inventory.
- Mr. Orphanides stated that nominating a smaller area instead of a larger area is not in violation of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations. He stated that the term "quadrant" implies a total quantity of four, but that they do not know if there will be three more district nominations submitted. For this reason, he continued, the staff

could remove that reference and just call it “southeast.” He stated that the boundaries of this proposed district capture all of the privately owned properties, which were purposefully chosen; the boundary is located where the public realm and the private realm meet.

- Mr. Reuter attempted to add clarity to the discussion. He stated that, legally, the Historical Commission has the discretion to consider this district or postpone the matter until the other district nominations are submitted. He commented that the proposed district is somewhat unique in the way it is being done, and the request from Mr. Phillips is also somewhat unique. He stated that there is no specific rule or law or regulation that requires the Historical Commission to take one position or another. He suggested that Mr. Phillips’s argument was an issue of the district boundary and description.
- Mr. Farnham clarified, noting that there is a very clear boundary description for the area under discussion, and all property owners within that proposed boundary were notified of this review. He noted that the inventory includes all of the properties within the boundary and no properties outside of the boundary. He noted that the description of the area in the nomination is different from the boundary description. He stated that it includes a historical description of the development of the area and includes a larger area, but that is the case with nearly every historic district nomination, because no area is an island unto itself, but rather it develops in relationship to the areas around it. Because of this, the statement of significance does discuss areas around it. He referred to the statement of significance for the Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District, which has an extensive discussion of the history of Manayunk even though there are no properties within Manayunk included in the inventory. This is because the history of Roxborough cannot be told without telling the history of Manayunk. He opined that this is the case here as well, which is inherent to the nature of writing history. He stated that the staff could amend the nomination, at the Historical Commission’s direction, to clarify the intent to designate one discrete, complete historic district called the Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant, or perhaps more clearly could be called Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District. He added that it is probable that the community organization will try to nominate future districts in this neighborhood, but that the Historical Commission will have the opportunity to review those inventories and statements of significance for any subsequent districts, and the property owners will be notified and will have an opportunity to participate in those reviews. He opined that it is only a due process problem in the future if the Historical Commission does not act in a responsible manner and hold thoughtful and thorough discussions with all parties. He summarized that this is a standalone historic district, for which a boundary, statement of significance, and an inventory have been provided for only the properties within the boundary, and every property owner within the boundary has been notified.
- Mr. Thomas suggested a slight change to the district name would help to clarify the area in question.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that some easy edits would provide clarity, including using the term of “Spruce Hill neighborhood” rather than “Spruce Hill Historic District” and changing the district name to “Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District.” She stated that historic districts are defined, in part, by what is at the edge of them.
- Mr. Farnham concurred that the staff could make these edits. He stated that this would not change the meaning of the nomination but would provide additional clarity.
- Ms. Cooperman suggested amending the nomination for clarity and changing the district name to the Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District.

- Mr. Phillips argued that words matter, and this would be a significant change which needs to be sent back to the staff, rather than proposing "on the fly name changes."
- Mr. Orphanides reiterated that Mr. Phillips and his clients are the only ones unclear on what is being proposed for designation.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the Historical Commission recently designated a historic district under a different name than what was proposed by the nominator, being Christian Street Historic District which was designated as the Christian Street/Black Doctor's Row Historic District based on discussions during the Historical Commission's review of the nomination.
- Mr. Reuter clarified that every nomination considered by the Committee on Historic Designation is supposed to be correct and complete, but amendments can still be made to them after such a determination.
- Mr. Farnham clarified that what is means for a nomination to be correct and complete is that all of the required parts are there for the Historical Commission to judge the nomination and determine first if the criteria are met, and second if it is good public policy to designate. It does not mean that the nomination is finalized.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the nomination being correct and complete. He commented that this is the oldest section of the Spruce Hill neighborhood, and that many historic districts are microcosms within larger areas.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to affirm that the nomination is correct and complete. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant **MOTION: Affirm nomination is correct and complete** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Lech**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	10			1	

DISCUSSION – CONTINUANCE REQUEST:

- Mr. Phillips explained that, owing to the Historical Commission's finding that the nomination is correct and complete, he is requesting 90 days to review the merits of the district, to hire a consultant, to review the classifications of properties, and to review the boundaries as proposed.

- Mr. Orphanides countered that Mr. Phillips could have been doing this work all along, given that his clients have been aware of the proposed district for at least one year. He claimed that it is inappropriate for Mr. Phillips to have put "all of their eggs in a basket of completeness" and then to say that they need time to do everything else since that did not work out. He questioned the reason for the continuance. He stated that it puts his client at a disadvantage and does not acknowledge the time and efforts made with community outreach for the last couple of years.
- Ms. Cooperman asked for the date the notice was sent to property owners within the district.
    - Mr. Farnham responded that notice was sent to property owners on 14 February 2024, in addition to a newspaper advertisement being placed and posters hung in the area.
- Mr. Phillips stated that his request is not an eleventh-hour request because they have not known what they are assessing in terms of boundary and scope. He stated that his first letter sent to the Historical Commission was on 5 April 2024 stating his procedural objections. He noted that the Historical Commission just granted a continuance for the Washington Square West Historic District. He stated that his continuance should be granted because this is a large, significant district which requires additional time to review based on its merits.
- Mr. Orphanides stated that there has never been a dispute that this specific area was proposed for designation, and Mr. Phillips should have been prepared.
- Mr. Phillips noted that this is the first continuance request made, and for the Historical Commission to stand in opposition to a continuance request for a substantial historic district is problematic. He stated that 90 days is completely reasonable.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that all properties within the proposed district received notice back in February 2024. She acknowledged that Mr. Phillips makes a good point that the Historical Commission typically grants continuances to property owners, and 90 days would be most appropriate given that 30 days puts the matter on the August agenda where many people are on vacation, and 60 days puts the matter on the same agenda as the Washington Square West Historic District.
    - Mr. Orphanides suggested that, if a continuance is granted, it could be for 60 days because there is no guarantee that Washington Square West will be heard at that meeting, as they could request an additional continuance.
    - Mr. Phillips responded that he requested 90 days because that is how long it will take to retain an expert and conduct a detailed review of the properties owned by his clients. He stated that a continuance should be granted also because of the clarification issues discussed earlier.
    - Mr. Orphanides asked that, if a continuance is granted for 90 days, Mr. Phillips provide his submission materials much sooner to the Historical Commission so that everyone has an opportunity to review it.
    - Mr. Phillips responded that he does not see a reason to deviate from the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations.
    - Mr. Farnham clarified that the Rules and Regulations do not provide good guidance regarding the submission of responses to nominations; it does provide good guidance for building permit application reviews. He suggested that, if a continuance is granted, the Historical Commission should establish a timeline for the submission of additional materials that gives all parties sufficient time to review the materials.
    - Mr. Phillips stated that he may not be producing any written materials.

- Mr. Orphanides mentioned the letter from Councilmember Jamie Gauthier which requested a decision on the designation question without delay.
- Mr. Farnham reminded the Commissioners that Mr. Phillips represents one group of property owners, but that there are many other property owners who are waiting for an opportunity to participate in the meeting.
- Mr. Lech commented that the Historical Commission has always been very generous with granting continuances.
- Mses. Carney and Michel excused themselves from the meeting.

OWNER AND PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Eric Santoro, a neighbor and former president of the Spruce Hill Community Association, opposed the continuance request. He referred to it as a stall tactic and said the argument for it is not credible.
- Julie Bush, a member of the Spruce Hill Community Association Board and the Spruce Hill Historic Preservation Committee, opposed the continuance request. She commented that Mr. Phillips and his clients have had plenty of time in the past year to consult with experts. She outlined the multiple community outreach efforts starting in the fall of 2022. She noted that Mr. Phillips's client attended a June 2023 panel discussion in the neighborhood.
- Reika Hagen, a Spruce Hill resident, opposed the continuance request. She stated that Mr. Phillips's firm and his clients are sophisticated organizations that can get this done in 30 days.
- Kathy Dowdell, a West Philadelphia resident, opposed the continuance request. She noted that continuances place a burden on public participation at Historical Commission meetings, and many people took time from work to participate today.
- Timothy Reimer, a West Philadelphia resident, opposed the continuance request.
- Jamie Vann, the owner of 4222 Osage Avenue in the proposed historic district, opposed the continuance request.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, opposed the continuance request. He stated that this is his neighborhood because he lived in it for many years. He suggested that an owner appeal if they believe that their property has been classified incorrectly.
- Mark Brack, an architectural history professor, opposed the continuance request.
- Jay Farrell opposed the continuance request.
- Amy Lambert, the board president of the University City Historical Society, opposed the continuance request. She commented that numerous professional historians have been involved in efforts to designate a historic district in Spruce Hill for decades.
- Oscar Beisert opposed the continuance request and referred to it as "insulting."
- George Poulin, a Powelton Village resident, opposed the continuance request. He commented that he is "deeply offended" by the request.
- David Roos, a West Philadelphia resident, opposed the continuance request.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Lech moved to continue the review of the nomination to the October 2024 meeting of the Historical Commission. No one seconded the motion.

ACTION: Mr. Lech moved to deny the request to continue the review of the nomination to a future meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant MOTION: Deny request to continue review of nomination to future meeting MOVED BY: Lech SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	8	0		1	2

DISCUSSION – DESIGNATION:

- Mr. Orphanides introduced the project manager for the nomination, Sharon Fleming of Constant Springs Preservation Consulting.
- Ms. Fleming stated that this particular part of Spruce Hill contains some of the earliest historic resources. She explained that this area is a very high integrity district, with only six percent of the properties classified as non-contributing. She commented that the area is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places. She noted that there are several smaller districts within this proposed district which are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, all of which underwent their own review process. She briefly outlined how the district satisfies the Criteria for Designation called out in the nomination. She added that the properties at 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue are classified as non-contributing based on an earlier determination by the Historical Commission to omit the properties entirely from the historic district on that block.
- Numerous property owners participated in the discussion.
    - Attorney Michael Phillips, representing Campus Apartments, University City Housing, and other undisclosed property owners, commented that his clients did not take a position on the merits and did not analyze the merits of the nomination. He stated that this is because they did not know if they were reviewing the southeast quadrant on its own with respect to a narrative and determining whether the boundaries should be based on the unifying tie of this so-called southeast quadrant, or if they were basing questions of merit, appropriateness of boundaries, and classification of properties on the whole of the Spruce Hill Historic District. He noted that his clients own properties that are already individually designated or designated as part of an existing historic district, so there could be questions about the appropriateness of the boundaries given that properties are already designated. He stated that they did not know until the earlier discussion that the Historical Commission may change references in the nomination text to provide clarity. He stated that they continue to object to the review of the nomination on procedural grounds. He stated that they have been prejudiced and unable to properly assess the merits and boundaries. He

clarified that his clients are not seeking to delay this designation for the purpose of delay, or opposing for the purpose of opposing, but rather the opposition is procedural. He reiterated that they have been prejudiced and precluded from reviewing the merits in the context of the southeast quadrant insofar as it sounds like the narrative in the description could be edited. He asked the Historical Commission to reconsider its effort to review the nomination today. He stated that it will create unnecessary procedural and appellate issues, when all his clients are asking for is a chance to review the inventory in the context of the Historical Commission's earlier discussion and come back before the Historical Commission to state whether there are any objections to the merits, classifications of properties, or boundaries. He stated that they have not been afforded that ability, owing to the lack of clarity in the nomination, and that they reserve their objection and reserve all of their rights moving forward.
    - Mr. Thomas suggested that Mr. Phillips could always come back to the Historical Commission with a proposed amendment to the nomination.
    - Mr. Phillips responded that it goes beyond amendments, and the request for additional time was so an expert could be hired to review the nomination. He stated that it is a shame they have been denied that opportunity, owing to a host of procedural issues that would not have been necessary had the continuance been granted.
  - Jamie Vann, the owner of 4222 Osage Avenue, spoke in support of the designation.
  - Attorney Michael Mattioni, representing the owners of 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue, referenced his written request submitted to the Historical Commission to list these two properties as vacant at the time of designation, owing to the complete demolition permits obtained recently. He noted that both properties were classified as non-contributing.
    - Ms. Cooperman suggested directing the staff to change the status in the inventory once the buildings have been demolished.
    - Mr. Farnham clarified that there is precedent. In a previous case, the Law Department advised the Historical Commission that some properties should be considered undeveloped sites because demolition permits for the buildings had been issued, even if the buildings themselves were not yet demolished. The Law Department advised that the buildings were legally "demolished" at the time of designation. This would mean that the sites could be considered undeveloped and any building permit applications for new construction would trigger review-and-comment jurisdiction, not full jurisdiction.
  - Jenine Sanzari, the owner of 4214 Osage Ave, spoke in support of the designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Eric Santoro, owner of 4535 Pine Street, just outside of the district boundary, and former president of Spruce Hill Community Association, spoke in support of the designation. He stated that Philadelphia is a World Heritage City, and that Spruce Hill has a remarkable collection of intact Victorian houses that should be preserved.
- Tony West, a property owner just outside of the district and a long-term park activist in Clark Park, commented in support of the designation.
- Amy Lambert, the board president of the University City Historical Society, commented in support of the designation.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation.
- Sylvia Hamerman-Brown commented in support of the designation.

- Mark Brack, an architectural history professor, commented in support of the designation.
- Taylor Kessinger, a renter in West Philadelphia, commented in opposition to the designation. He stated that the designation will be good for the property owners in the district and bad for everyone else, including renters, residents of other neighborhoods, and the city, because it will make it harder for people to live here. He suggested that historic designation would prevent any increase in housing units and would encourage gentrification. He concluded that the Historical Commission should consider factors such as the City's comprehensive plan and the need to encourage responsible, transit-oriented development.
- Kathy Dowdell, a West Philadelphia resident and former co-president of the University City Historical Society, spoke in support of the designation. She noted that she was very involved in previous efforts to designate Spruce Hill as historic. She expressed the need for local incentives for designation.
- Mary McGettigan, a West Philadelphia resident, commented in support of the designation.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in support of the designation.
- Julie Bush, a Spruce Hill resident, commented in support of the designation. She commented that the neighborhood is already 80 percent renters and 20 percent owners, and the Spruce Hill Community Association is not trying to change that ratio. She noted the 1,000 plus units are being built along Chestnut Street, and opined that zoning is what impacts the development of these units, not historic districts.

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

- The nomination includes the required parts and is therefore correct and complete and able to be evaluated.
- A continuance was requested by an attorney representing two owners of multiple rental buildings in the neighborhood.
- Councilmember Jamie Gauthier, and multiple property owners and community members, opposed a continuance.
- The Historical Commission's staff may edit a nomination for clarity if directed by the Historical Commission.
- The proposed boundary is clearly defined in the nomination.
- Additional areas of the Spruce Hill neighborhood may be proposed for historic designation in the future, and the Spruce Hill Community Association has been transparent about this through community outreach events over the past two years.
- Editing the historic district name to "Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District" will provide clarity as to the area included in the designation.
- Editing nomenclature in the nomination to clarify the distinction between the Spruce Hill neighborhood and district will provide additional clarity.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development of West Philadelphia where public transportation drove speculative development of a high caliber that still retains its architectural integrity, satisfying Criterion A.
- The Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District reflects the environment in an era characterized by distinctive architectural styles and that the buildings embody

distinguishing characteristics of mid to late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century architectural styles, including Italianate, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Neo-Grec, Second Empire, and Georgian Revival, satisfying Criteria C and D.

- Significant architects designed buildings in the Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District, including Samuel Sloan, Theophilus P. Chandler, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, and Willis G. Hale, satisfying Criterion E.
- The Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community, as an exemplary representation of West Philadelphia's development as a streetcar suburb, satisfying Criterion J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Spruce Hill Historic District, Southeast Quadrant satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the staff to edit the nomination to reflect a name change to the Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District and edit nomenclature as needed to clarify the distinction between the Spruce Hill neighborhood and this district, and with the properties at 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue listed as undeveloped lots at the time of designation. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 0.

ITEM: Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District **MOTION: Designate; Criteria A, C, D, E, and J; with change to name** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	8			1	2

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1402-04 W OXFORD ST

Name of Resource: Barber's Hall
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 1402 West Oxford Street Realty Holding Company
Nominator: Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia African American Assets
Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes designating the property at 1402-04 W. Oxford Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building, constructed as an Italianate rowhouse between 1863 and 1868, and then renovated into a clubhouse for the Quaker City Wheelmen in 1895, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J. The nomination argues that the façade, which dates from the 1895 renovation, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Renaissance Revival style, satisfying Criterion D. The nomination further argues that the building's use by a wide variety of social clubs including several cycling clubs, the Philadelphia Section of the National Council of Jewish Women, the Arion Gesang Verein, and the National Barber's Sunshine Club makes it eligible for designation under Criterion J. Finally, the nomination argues that the history of musical performances at the building by acts including Boyz II Men satisfies Criterion A.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination in November 2023. After the Committee's review, the Historical Commission continued the review for six months at the request of the nominator. During the continuance, the nominator, the Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia African American Assets, requested to withdraw the nomination. The withdrawal request is made in an attached letter.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1402-04 W. Oxford Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:21:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to withdraw the nomination for 1402-04 W. Oxford Street to the Historical Commission.
- Deborah Gary of the Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia African American Assets represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

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

- The collaboration of the nominator with the property owner on methods of preservation apart from designation to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places will be a positive outcome.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrated that the property met Criteria for Designation A, D, and J.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to grant the request to withdraw the nomination of 1402-04 W. Oxford Street. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1402-04 W Oxford St **MOTION: Grant request to withdraw** **MOVED BY: Cooperman** **SECONDED BY: McCoubrey**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
Kindt (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	9				2

ADDRESS: 2313 GREEN ST
Proposal: Demolish garage, construct three-story residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Laura and Anil Nanda
Applicant: Lea Litvin, LO Design
History: 1908; garage built 1954
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:
This application proposes demolishing a non-historic garage and constructing a three-story residential building at the open rear area of 2313 Green Street. The new construction would face Wallace Street and would not connect to the historic building. In December 2023, the new building was proposed as 5,194 square feet with five residential units. The cladding material was a mix of red brick and gray metal standing-seam siding. The most visible area of the building would be the north and west elevations with the north elevation visible from a driveway entry along Wallace Street.

Although the Architectural Committee recommended approval at its 5 December 2023 meeting, neighbors and local community groups communicated their concerns about the project at the Historical Commission meeting of 12 January 2024. The Commission voted to table the application to allow time for the applicant to engage with concerned community members.

Between January and June 2024, the applicant worked to incorporate community feedback and revised the proposal, which has been submitted for final review.

The revised proposal is a three-story building with a significantly reduced footprint and massing. The building is now proposed as 2,629 square feet with three residential units. It is limited to the footprint of the existing non-historic garage and preserves the open space of the property's rear yard. The first two floors of the exterior are proposed as red brick, and the third floor is proposed as slate or similar material.

SCOPE OF WORK:

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

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
  - The proposed new building is limited to the footprint of the existing non-historic garage that will be demolished as part of this project. It preserves the open space of the main house's rear yard. The first two floors of the exterior are proposed as red brick, and the third floor is proposed as slate or similar materials. The materials, features, size, scale, and proportion of the revised design are compatible with the historic site and environment of the Spring Garden Historic District satisfying Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
  - Since the new construction is separated from the historic building, the application satisfies Standard 10.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:29:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Evan Litvin represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Attorney Richard DeMarco spoke on behalf of Thomas Leonard, the owner of 2315 Green Street. Mr. DeMarco stated they are in support of the revised application and thanked the applicant for their efforts.
- Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association stated their support for the revised application. He expressed appreciation for the applicant's collaborative

efforts with the Spring Garden Civic Association, Community Development Corporation, and neighbors.

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

- Applicant worked closely with local community groups and neighbors on the revised proposal.
- The new building's massing was reduced by 50 percent. The new building will be limited to the footprint of the extant garage building currently on the site.
- The open space in the main house's rear yard will be preserved as shown on historic maps and atlases.
- The revised material pallet of red brick and slate is compatible with the historic materials in the Spring Garden Historic District.
- The visibility of the new building from the public right-of-way is greatly reduced.
- The new building will be constructed on a concrete slab and will not require excavation. Since excavation for a foundation is removed from the project scope, this substantially reduces the risk of damage to neighboring buildings and structures.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The revised application satisfies Standard 9 as the scale has been significantly reduced from the original proposal and will be limited to the footprint of the non-historic garage. The materials, features, size, scale, and proportion are compatible with the historic property and the Spring Garden Historic District.
- The revised application satisfies Standard 10 as the new construction is separated from the historic building and preserved the open space of the main house's rear yard.

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

ITEM: 2313 Green St **MOTION: Approval of revised application** **MOVED BY: McCoubrey** **SECONDED BY: Washington**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	9				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:46:34

ACTION: At 3:32 p.m., Ms. Washington moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment **MOTION: Adjourn** **MOVED BY: Washington** **SECONDED BY: McCoubrey**					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Abu Saab (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)					X
Cooperman	X				
O'Connor (DPD)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	9				2

PLEASE NOTE:

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

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

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

(a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
(b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
(c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
(d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
(e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;

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