REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 21 OCTOBER 2016, 9:30 A.M.
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
EMILY COOPERMAN, PH.D., CHAIR

PRESENT
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Jeffrey Cohen, Ph.D.
Bruce Laverty
Douglas Mooney, M.A.
David Schaaf, R.A., Philadelphia City Planning Commission

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT
J.M. Duffin
Brett Peanasky, Klehr Harrison
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Kathy Dowdell
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Annie Bennett, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Suzanna Barucco, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Caroline Slama, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Arielle Harris
Fred Mauer
Joseph J. Menkevich
John C. Manton
William O'Brien
David Barnes
Grace Barnes
Fred Maurer
Henry Clinton
Jimmy Low
Ralinda Golback
Alex Palma
Jeff Allegretti, WICA
Evan Schneckler
Georgiana Devlin
Ethel Weeden
Rebecca Miller
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel

DRAFT

Nicole Norcross, Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel
Kay Sykora
Robert Pupo
Nicole Botts
Aaron Wunsch, University of Pennsylvania
Justin McDaniel
Stephan Salisbury, Philadelphia Inquirer
Fon Wang, Ballinger
Richard Spitzberg
Kevin Dolan, LaSalle University
David Rybas
Katie Low
Chen Chang
Mary Anne Ritten
Ted McCall
Ashley Hahn, Plan Philly
Laura Keim, Historic Germantown/Stenton
William Martin
George Thomas
David Fellman
J.F. McCarthy, Historic Germantown
Nancy O'Donnell
Mary McGettigan
Fozan Ehmedi
Kathleen Kelly
Rev. Charles Fenwick
Barbara Davis
Robert Mills
Ben Leech
Stephen Wagner
Hayden Mitman, PhillyVoice
Mark Richardson
Ron Williams
Vaughan Piccolo, WICA
Donna Rilley
George N. Bottos
Sarah Seraphin, LaSalle University
Jeff Reinhold, Reinhold Residential
Helma Weeks, Powelton Village Civic Association
George Poulin, Powelton Village Civic Association
Jim Mundy

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Messrs. Cohen, Laverty, Mooney and Schaaf joined her.

DRAFT

100 S INDEPENDENCE W ML
Name of Resource: Rohm & Haas
Proposed Action: Designation of building, public interior, and objects
Property Owner: KPG-IMW Owner, LLC
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: These nominations propose to designate the building, public interior, and chandeliers at 100 S. Independence W. Mall as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nominations collectively argue that the building, interior and chandeliers are significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, F, G, H and J. The building nomination contends that it is one of Philadelphia's most significant mid-twentieth century buildings, satisfying Criteria A and J, for its association with the Rohm & Haas Company, the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, who were heavily involved in its development. The nomination further argues that the building's high-profile location next to Independence Mall, and the influence that the setting had on its design, satisfy Criteria G and H. Finally, the building nomination contends that the involvement of architect Pietro Belluschi satisfies Criterion E, while the building's Modernist characteristics and innovative incorporation of modern materials satisfies Criteria C, D, and F. The interior nomination proposes to designate the public interior portions of the north pavilion ground floor lobby and south pavilion commercial space. The nomination contends that the public interior portions of the ground floor are one of Philadelphia's most significant Modernist interior spaces, satisfying Criteria C and D, and are tied to influential modern designers Pietro Belluschi and György Kepes, satisfying Criterion E. The nomination further argues that the incorporation of Plexiglas into the design of the building, symbolizing the importance of that material to the success of the Rohm & Haas Company, satisfies Criterion A. The object nomination covers the three Plexiglas chandeliers that are located along the west perimeter of the north pavilion in an area of the building designed and used for non-public functions. The remainder of the chandeliers is included in the public interior nomination. The object nomination contends that the chandeliers are significant under Criterion A, for the incorporation of Plexiglas into the design of the building, symbolizing the importance of that material to the success of the Rohm & Haas Company, and under Criterion E, for their association with influential modern designers Pietro Belluschi and György Kepes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nominations demonstrate that the building, public interior, and chandeliers at 100 S. Independence W. Mall satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, F, G, H, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the joint continuance request to the Committee. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee on Historic Designation does not have the authority to table or continue matters outright. It is an advisory Committee and makes non-binding advisory recommendations to the Historical Commission. Only the Historical Commission itself may grant a continuance. This Committee, if it agrees with the continuance request, may decline to review the nomination on its merits and simply recommend that the Commission table the matter and remand it back to this Committee at a later date.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it back to the Committee for review at its 14 December 2016 meeting.

559 RIGHTER ST
Name of Resource: Amos Barnes House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: James & Grace Barnes
Nominator: Historical Commission
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 559 Righter Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and I. The nomination contends that the Gothic Revival building is an example of the ornamental farm house made popular by American landscape gardener Andrew Jackson Downing's *Cottage Residences*, which popularized Victorian Cottage styles in the mid to late nineteenth century, satisfying Criteria C and D. The nomination further contends that the building is associated with the lives of individuals significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A, including Jonathan H. Levering, the owner of the property in 1850 at the time of the construction of the house; architect Amos Barnes, who lived in the house for 52 years, during which time he designed numerous buildings throughout Philadelphia; Dr. Frances Druck, an early advocate of cremation who lived in the house in the 1870s until her death in 1885; and sculptor Henry Manger, brother-in-law to Druck, who crafted sculptures that stand in west Fairmount Park and abroad and who lived in the house with Druck. Finally, owing to its location at the crest of the ridge along a Native American trail, which became an early turnpike, the nomination argues that the large, primarily open site is likely to yield information important in pre-history and history, satisfying Criterion I.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 559 Righter Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and I.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the continuance request to the Committee. Attorney William O'Brien and property owner Grace Barnes and her son David Barnes attended the meeting.

Mr. O'Brien explained that Ms. Barnes wishes to consult with her tax advisor and an architectural historian about the property. He opined that, if things go well, his client may support nomination. Ms. Cooperman asked Ms. Barnes if she wished to speak, but Ms. Barnes declined. Mr. Barnes confirmed that he has Power of Attorney and can speak for his mother. Mr. Barnes stated that his mother would rather not go through this designation process, no one consulted her, and the designation will adversely impact the value of the property. He stated that she may have to sell the house to pay for her memory care facility. He stated that his father recently passed away. He stated that the house has been in the family for many years, and he has a cousin who wants to reuse it as a funeral parlor. He summarized that his mother does not want this interference.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it back to the Committee for review at its 14 December 2016 meeting.

ADDRESS: 706 SANSOM ST
Name of Resource: Henry C. Lea Publishing House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: RP Sansom Street LLC
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 706 Sansom Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination states that the Henry C. Lea Publishing House, which stands on the site, was designed by the architectural firm of Collins & Authenrieth for publisher Henry C. Lea and constructed in 1866. The nomination stipulates that the period of significance is 1866 to 1922. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, G, and J.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria A and J, owing to association with the Henry C. Lea and his publishing house. The nomination provides a history of the publishing house and of Lea's construction of the headquarters building at 706 Sansom. The nomination demonstrates that Lea and his firm had "significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation" and that the property "is associated with the life of a person significant in the past," Lea. The nomination also demonstrates that the publishing house "exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community." On page 24, the nomination contends that Lea purchased the properties on both sides of the subject property "to expand his publishing firm," in contradiction to the nomination for 704 Sansom Street, which contends that the building at 704 Sansom was owned by Lea but leased to an independent business.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion C, owing to its architectural style, and Criterion E, owing to its association with the firm of Collins & Authenrieth. The nomination identifies a distinctive architectural style, albeit not by name, and successfully explains, albeit succinctly, how the style reflects an environment characterized by that style. Regarding Criterion E, the nomination successfully demonstrates that Collins & Authenrieth was a firm that significantly influenced the development of the city.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion G, that it "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." The nomination briefly and imprecisely describes the 700-block of Sansom Street, but if offers no evidence that the block in question is a "distinctive area" that should be preserved in a particular manner. The area cannot be described as a park or square. The brief discussion of Jewelers' Row provided in this section of the nomination relates to a time period after the end of the proposed period of significance. The fact that the property is located in a National Register historic district offers no evidence that the property satisfies Criterion G.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated above, the staff recommends to the Committee on Historic Designation that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 706 Sansom Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, and J, but not G.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorneys Michael Phillips and Carl Primavera represented the property owner and the equitable owner. Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Grossi read a prepared statement, noting that he believes the nomination makes a sound argument for why this property belongs on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Further, the building on its own merits speaks strongly to the selected Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, and J. 706 Sansom Street is what might be called an example of vernacular commercial architecture in the mid-nineteenth century. It is reflective of the block's transition from one of speculative rowhouses in 1799 to a commercial corridor, first as a publisher's row, and then more commonly a Jewelers' row, as we know it today. The building was designed by Collins & Authenrieth, a celebrated German-American firm best known for its work on Market Street's Lit Brother's building, and is associated with Henry C. Lea, a significant figure. Mr. Grossi noted that he suspects to hear some questions about the integrity of the property, but stated that integrity is not a required threshold for listing on the Philadelphia Register. He noted that there is other precedent throughout the city for commercial storefronts that have changed over time but that are listed on the Philadelphia Register. He provided the example of three commercial buildings on the 700 block of Chestnut Street that were nominated by the Preservation Alliance and designated in 2015. He noted that all three feature prominent alterations to the ground-floor storefronts, and were added to the Register with enthusiasm. Furthermore, he continued, 706 Sansom is a contributing resource to the National Register Center City West Commercial Historic District, which was established in 1984. Not only is it a contributing resource in a district that comprises hundreds of buildings, this building is one that was explicitly called out in the National Register nomination to highlight the district's significance and broader character. He summarized that for all of these reasons, the Preservation Alliance believes that this property is an excellent candidate for local designation.

Mr. Steinke thanked Mr. Grossi for his coverage of the architectural significance of the property. On a history side, he noted, this building is significant in large part because it was the publishing house of Henry Lea's publishing company. That company traces its history back to Matthew Carey, who worked for Benjamin Franklin, and later opened in 1802 the first true publishing house in the United States. Henry's father Isaac married into the firm and became Carey's chief executive later in that century, and then turned it over to his son Henry Lea. In the circa-1860 era, the firm was growing rapidly, so it commissioned this building by Collins & Authenrieth to be its new headquarters. Construction began in 1865 and was completed in 1866, and during the period of occupancy in this building from 1866 to 1922, Lea & Febinger grew to become the largest medical publishing company in the United States. They also licensed from England *Gray's Anatomy* and published a version of that book out of this building for many decades. In 1922, the firm relocated to Washington Square and the limestone jewel box building that remains there today. This building is one of a family of buildings built for publishers that made this neighborhood one of the nation's publishing capitals during the nineteenth and a large part of the twentieth centuries. Other publishers, in addition to Lea, included Curtis, Saunders, and Lippincott, all of whose buildings have been preserved and adaptively reused beautifully. Mr. Lea passed away in 1929, and is remembered to this day by a school named after him at 47th and Locust Streets. Around the time that the firm moved from this building to Washington Square, the transformation of this block from a publishing district to a jewelry district was nearly complete, Mr. Steinke noted. Many of the skills that printers had at the time, such as engraving, were used in the jewelry industry, making for a seamless transition from printing and publishing to jewelry making.

Mr. Steinke questioned the staff's decision not to recommend that the property satisfies Criterion G as part of or related to a square part, or *other distinctive area* that should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif. Mr. Steinke opined that Jewelers' Row deserves such a distinction because of its unique historic, cultural, and use over many decades.

Attorney Michael Phillips spoke on behalf of the owner of RP Sansom Street, Robert Pupo. Mr. Phillips argued that Mr. Pupo and the majority of the owners of properties on Sansom Street oppose this nomination. He asked to briefly address the merits of the nomination and also speak to a second point. As to the merits, Mr. Phillips argued that, when one looks at this property and reads the nomination, it is described as a "mid-nineteenth century commercial building of cast iron and red brick." Mr. Phillips opined that that is all the nomination says about the architectural design of the building, and that there is no evidence as normally accompanies nominations relating to the distinct architectural design of this building. He opined that there is no evidence of what the building looked like when it was designed, other than its dimensions and that it was of cast iron and red brick. He argued that the building has undergone substantial renovations over the years, as evidenced by looking at the building with the limestone details and the large windows. He opined that without knowing what the property looked like originally, it is impossible to claim that the building is architecturally significant, and that the fact that it was built in 1866 and was a commercial property should not be the benchmark for designating a property as historic. As for the architectural firm, he continued, just because this building was designed by a prominent firm that also designed the Lit building, which, he agreed, deserves merit and to be recognized as historic, does not mean that every property by that firm merits designation.

Mr. Phillips conceded that Mr. Lea and his family were well-known and prominent Philadelphians, but noted that their publishing company occupied 13 locations over 207 years and were located in various areas of the city from 1866 to 1923. He argued that this is not the first place in Philadelphia where publishing was performed, and that there is no other significant event other than the fact that they became a large medical publishing company that would warrant this building standing out as a testament to Mr. Lea's life and work that merits designation.

Lastly, Mr. Phillips asked to discuss what he described as the almost unanimous objection to these nominations by the owners. It is telling, he argued, that there is a quote from a November 1865 newspaper article in the nomination, immediately prior to the Bibliography, that speaks to the redevelopment of these properties as the block turned over from a residential street to what became Publishers' Row, and, in the twentieth century, to Jewelers' Row. He argued that, as the world changes, the demographics of the property change, and now this street is in need of revitalization again. He stated that the property owners are the interested parties here, and they wish for this entire street to get that breath of revitalization again.

Ms. Cooperman thanked Mr. Phillips for his comments, but asked that he speak solely to the merits of the nomination. Mr. Phillips responded that he believes that he is speaking to the merits of the nomination, because it speaks to the significance of this building as creating that turnover that has happened numerous times. He argued that it is in the interest of the property owners to continue to let that happen, and opined that the demolition and redevelopment of this property will not detract from the street.

Mr. Phillips presented a petition signed by 27 unit owners all in opposition to the nomination, and in support of the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the property. Mr. Phillips encouraged the Committee members to look to the architectural merits of the building and what the nomination says about the merits of the building, which he opined is very little. He also encouraged the Committee to look at the fact that a prominent publishing house was only there for approximately one-quarter of its history, and whether those two things merit designation. He opined that the building is not significant enough to warrant designation, and the nominations

are simply being used to thwart development and prevent Mr. Pupo and other owners on Jewelers' Row from being able to redevelop their properties.

Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Pupo would like to speak. Mr. Pupo responded that the only thing he would say is that he and the other owners are looking for something to bring the economy back to Jewelers' Row. He lamented that the block is down to mom and pop in the stores, and there are no more employees, and they need something to generate business. The internet is stealing all the business. The people who signed the Preservation Alliance petition do not come to Sansom Street, except maybe to change their watch batteries, he said.

Attorney Carl Primavera stated that his comments for this nomination could be incorporated into the next nomination for 704 Sansom Street. Mr. Primavera noted that he would not address the underlying merits of the nomination, but submitted a letter describing what he believes to be the legal impediments, owing to the pending demolition permit. He also distributed copies of a letter recently issued by the Historical Commission concerning 4046-48 Chestnut Street, which was written by Mr. Farnham. Mr. Primavera noted that the letter discusses how the Commission dealt with a very similar situation. He reiterated that the equitable owner objects to the nominations for both 706 and 704 Sansom Street.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment.

Richard Spitzborg, vice-president of the Washington Square West Civic Association (WSWCA), stated that the association's interest in the nominations is two-fold. First, he noted, the property under consideration is within the boundaries of the WSWCA. Secondly, he continued, this building and the other properties on the street are part of the fabric of their neighborhood. For the record, the boundaries of the WSWCA are from Chestnut Street to South Street and from 7th Street to Broad Street. The Association is the City's designated RCO for this area. But the compelling reason for their interest in the property, he noted, can be best described in the Association's mission statement, which is, "to protect and enhance the quality of life in our neighborhood and preserve its heritage." Being the oldest civic association in Philadelphia, founded in 1935, he continued, it is not surprising that the Association values the landmarks that enrich the lives of the community today. 706 Sansom Street is such a landmark. As the Preservation Alliance has documented, the individual buildings have a rich history, but more importantly, they have given character to a street that holds an important place in the social and economic development of our city, Jewelers' Row. The WSWCA takes pride in the landmarks of the neighborhood, and feels that, like many others, this building is worthy of designation. He stated that the WSWCA recommended that the Historical Commission support the nomination and list 706 Sansom Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Kathy Dowdell stated that she does not have a comment about the merits of the nomination. Instead she requested that, when materials are brought to a public meeting, a copy be made available for the public by projecting it on the screen, or to be passed around for the public to share. She stated that it is difficult for members of the public who are following an issue to be completely informed if copies are not made available to the public prior to the meeting minutes coming out several weeks later.

Mr. Grossi asked to respond to some of the comments made by the attorneys. He noted that what is and is not the purview of the Committee has already been established, and he likewise does not think this is the appropriate venue for the legal question. Regarding how the block has changed over time, however, he agreed that cities evolve. He noted that this is often presented to the Alliance as a preservation advocacy organization as a counter to preservation, as though

preservation is somehow trying to fossilize buildings, which is not at all the goal. As was demonstrated, he noted, at the turn of the twentieth century, the buildings evolved, but are still here, and are positioned to evolve again. He opined that the decision to tear down buildings in the mid-nineteenth century was anachronistic to urban planning, zoning, and professional preservation, and that we have different knowledge, values, and expertise today. What might have been recognized as liabilities in the past, we are now wise enough to see as assets, and this is one of them, and the designation seeks to cement that.

Suzanna Barucco, representative of the board of the Preservation Alliance, stated her support for the nomination, and asked that the people in the audience in support of the nomination please stand. Mr. Grossi noted that the petition in support of the nomination has garnered upwards of 6,000 signatures.

Mr. Steinke recited text from the 1981 National Register nomination, which reads: "706-708 Sansom: Victorian refacing; four bays separated by shallow brick piers with recessed panels framing windows; elaborate corbelled cornice; original base remains in place with cast-iron pilasters, by Samuel Creswell, Race Street." Mr. Steinke noted that that is all extant, and the center pilaster is stamped with Creswell's name.

George Bottos, owner of 721 Sansom Street, stated that he has been on the street since 1969, and that most of the buildings are not the same as they were.

Mr. Cohen responded to Mr. Phillips' assertion that it is unknown what the building looked like historically, noting that part of the nomination references a fire insurance survey that has a long description of what the building looked like, so there is, in fact, very good documentation of what the front and plan of the building were in 1866. Mr. Cohen directed attention to page 16 of the nomination, which features a two-page description of the property.

Mr. Cohen addressed the question of Criterion G. He argued that in this specific case, there is a distinctive area that has long been recognized by many people in Philadelphia for its character. He opined that this may be an even more significant criterion than the Henry Lea connection. Jewelers' Row, he argued, is a place whose cohesive character, even with all its variety, is one of the things that makes is special. It is also a matter of scale in terms of the height as well as the horizontal in terms of the changes every 16 or 32 feet that gives it cohesion. So in this case, even though it is not part of a square or a block, it is part of a distinctive area even within this limited format of three to four stories and 15-34 foot fronts is very characteristic.

Mr. Schaaf agreed, but noted that the period of significance is listed from 1866-1922, but Jewelers' Row name or place name is not associated with the block until after that period of significance. Mr. Cohen suggested that the period of significance be extended. He agreed that there should be more about the architecture of the building in the nomination. He reiterated his desire to see Criterion G remain in the nomination, despite the staff's opinion. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff's opinion of this portion of the nomination was predicated on what the staff read in the nomination and not on its own or Dr. Cohen's interpretation of the architectural quality of the block. He noted that the staff had the same concerns as Mr. Schaaf, that the arguments for Criterion G seem to be predicated on the building as part of Jewelers' Row, but the period of significance as described in the nomination ends at the period when it was transitioning from a publishing row to Jewelers' Row. Mr. Farnham stated that he would be object generally to any claim that simply because a property is within a National Register Historic District that it satisfies Criterion G, which is a claim that appears to be made here and has been made in previous nominations.

Mr. Laverty agreed that Criterion G is a major component of this nomination and should remain in the Committee's recommendation to the Historical Commission. He argued that this block, when it was created as a residential block, essentially set the rhythm for building in Philadelphia. Even today, he noted, it serves as a microcosm for the story of development in the city, where the basic infrastructure of the 16 or 32 foot street front that has both a horizontal as well as a vertical scale to it, adds to the very life of the city. To separate the property from its context here, and probably this has a better pedigree of any street in the city, would be a mistake. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

Mr. Schaaf commented that it is a happy situation that 700 Sansom Street still exists as a testament to the original residential character of the block, because it is possible to see the very module replicated on both sides of the street, and it plays out in buildings of another age and another time as another expression.

Mr. Cohen commented that in some ways, the Committee's role is two-fold. One part of the Committee's role is to judge the merits of the nomination, but another is to make reference to the actual subject and place, and to appreciate aspects of it that may not be so assertively presented in the nomination. He noted that there may be things that could be improved in the nomination, but that he does not want to beat up on the nominators. He suggested that there should be a mechanism to improving nominations.

Ms. Cooperman disagreed with Mr. Phillips' earlier assertion regarding the architects, arguing that just because the building is not the Lits building does not mean it is not significant. Mr. Phillips responded that he meant that the Lits building is significant, and that there can be other buildings of significance by the same architects, but that that does not mean that every single building designed by those architects is worthy of the same distinction as the Lits building. He opined that it is problematic that nominations are prepared with haste. He noted that the citation for the fire insurance survey is covered up by a photograph, so anyone who goes online to read the nomination as a matter of public record is not able to see the citation. Mr. Cohen agreed, and expressed his hope that there could be an internal procedure to improve nominations from the time they are accepted to the time they are reviewed.

Mr. Cohen argued that this block features architect-designed, commercial buildings of the mid-nineteenth century that are similar in intent and design to the assemblage of the Lit Brothers buildings. He stated that he does not see a distinction between the merits of the buildings.

Mr. Laverty commented that one of the buildings in the Lit Brothers complex was built for the Lippincott Company. He argued that if there are any other Collins & Authenrieth buildings out there, he would be happy to see them nominated.

Ms. Cooperman opined that the Historical Commission as a whole has the power to determine whether a property meets a Criterion or not, and that does not necessarily have to depend uniquely on what is in the nomination. She noted that the Committee's role is advisory to the Commission. Mr. Cohen added that the 27 signatures of the Jewelers' Row unit owners represent one interest group, but that there is a larger interest group, and that is the public, which is interested in Philadelphia's heritage. He opined that the petition signed by the members of the public needs to be weighed against the interest of the property owners.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend to the Historical Commission that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 706 Sansom Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, G, and J.

ADDRESS: 704 SANSOM ST
Name of Resource: Electrotype Foundry
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: 704 Associates
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 704 Sansom Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination states that the Electrotype Foundry, which stands on the site, was designed by the architectural firm of Collins & Authenrieth for publisher Henry C. Lea, constructed in 1877, and altered in 1890 by the same firm. The nomination stipulates that the period of significance is 1877 to 1922. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, and J.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria A and J, owing to association with the Henry C. Lea & Co. publishing house. The nomination provides a history of the publishing house that is taken verbatim from the nomination for 706 Sansom Street, where the publisher was headquartered. Much of the history of the publisher proffered in the nomination predates the construction of the building in question. For example, the significant publication of the first American edition of *Gray's Anatomy* dates to 1866, a decade before the building in question was constructed. The staff contends that significance of the building at 704 Sansom should not be predicated on the significance of a publishing house that was located on an adjacent property. Henry C. Lea was the developer and owner of the building in question, and he may be historically significant as a real estate developer, but the nomination makes no such case. The nomination claims that the Electrotype Foundry was "one of many commercial buildings developed by Lea in the second half of the nineteenth century," but it offers no evidence of Lea's significance as a developer beyond a list of street addresses where he may have constructed buildings. Lea was unquestionably significant as a publisher, but that significance does not flow unabated into his activities in other realms including real estate speculation. The nomination includes several attenuated claims that the businesses operating out of the Electrotype Foundry were associated with Lea's publishing empire, but again no proof is offered. The nomination states that "part of the printing process [of *Gray's Anatomy*] may have also been contracted to" the firm, but no evidence is provided. It claims without documentation that "Lea no doubt contracted his electrotype work to the firm." And it proffers the unsubstantiated claim that "it is very likely that the firm did a great deal of work for its landlord and neighbor, Henry C. Lea & Co." The property may be historically significant under Criteria A and J, but the nomination does not make a cogent case for the satisfaction.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria C and D, owing to its architectural style, and Criterion E, owing to its association with the firm of Collins & Authenrieth. The nomination identifies a distinctive architectural style, albeit not by name, and successfully explains, albeit succinctly, how the style reflects an environment characterized by that style and how the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of that style. Regarding Criterion E, the nomination successfully demonstrates that Collins & Authenrieth was a firm that significantly influenced the development of the city.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion G, that it "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." The nomination briefly and imprecisely describes the 700-block of Sansom Street, but if offers no evidence that the block in question is a "distinctive area" that should be preserved in a particular manner. The area cannot be described as a park or square. The brief discussion of Jewelers' Row provided in this section of the nomination relates to a time period after the end of the proposed period of significance. The fact that the property is located in a National Register historic district offers no evidence that the property satisfies Criterion G.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: For the reasons stated above, the staff recommends to the Committee on Historic Designation that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 704 Sansom Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, but not A, J, and G.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorneys Louis Lipski and Carl Primavera represented the property owner and the equitable owner. Patrick Grossi and Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked that comments be limited to information that was not discussed during the preceding review of the nomination for 706 Sansom Street.

Mr. Grossi noted that his comments for the previous nomination stand for this nomination as well, but added that the polychromatic brickwork on this façade is stunning. He noted that the fourth floor was added in 1890, but was made intentionally consistent with the rest of the façade. He speculated that original material may exist under the vinyl siding on the first floor.

Mr. Steinke commented that this building represents a clear evolution in the stylistic tendencies of the firm Collins & Authenreith. Whereas the 1866 building may be more subdued, he noted by the 1890s, the firm was evolving and was perhaps influenced by architects such as Frank Furness and Willis Hale. He noted that the firm was likely looking to make a stronger statement using more recently developed materials, and they clearly did. Secondly, he countered Mr. Farnham's point regarding the property as speculative development, arguing that it was built specifically to house a profession or trade that supported Lea's needs at his publishing house. It was not built purely for speculation, but to accomplish a goal for the operation of his business.

Mr. Steinke read the citation for this property from the National Register nomination form. "Handsome, four-story refacing by Collins & Authenreith in 1890 for H.C. Lea with elaborate red brick, now pointed yellow; piers flank windows; capped by incised ornamented bluestone lintels; pressed metal cornice with Eastlake detail; first floor altered with aluminum siding with new brick." Mr. Steinke presented a photograph discovered the day before that shows the property in 1945, including what the storefront looked like historically. Mr. Grossi explained that 704 Sansom is on the left of the photograph, which shows incredibly intact details and what may be underneath the siding. Steinke pointed out that 706 Sansom is visible on the right with the original cast iron façade and brick above, as is the case today. Mr. Steinke opined that the façades could be easily restored.

Mr. Primavera spoke on behalf of the equitable owner, and also submitted a letter from Louis Lipsky, the attorney for the current property owner. Mr. Primavera expressed the frustration of property owners who have personal expectations and years of estate planning invested in the properties. He noted that popular sentiment is important and is a civic value, but for the people whose livelihoods are tied up in these properties, they find the nomination process very

disconcerting because they feel blindsided by these nominations. When people first get the Historical Commission's notice letter, it is very disconcerting.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment.

Richard Spitzborg of the Washington Square West Civic Association stated the Association's support for the nomination, and directed the Committee's attention to his comments on the previous nomination.

Jane Tyse, a tenant in the building, commented that she took a jewelry class in high school and came to Jewelers' Row when she was 18, and has had studios in the building for 40 years. She noted that she does not begrudge the current owner for selling the building, but does not understand why it needs to be torn down. She stated that she loves the building like it is a family member. She opined that it is a living entity, and has a wonderful, creative energy about it. She noted that she cannot imagine this building not being there anymore; once it is gone, it is gone forever. She noted that the father of the current property owner moved in in the 1940s and became a major producer of fine jewelry for many years. She opined that the building is a beautiful part of the heritage of the city, and is on various tourist routes. She noted that the floral detailing, lintels, and polychromatic brickwork are beautiful.

Joe Menkevich agreed with Ms. Tyse that buildings sometimes have a spirit of their own. He wondered why the Mayor or City Council has not spoken about this matter, and opined that they are stagnant on historic preservation. Mr. Farnham responded that the Mayor issued a statement regarding Jewelers' Row on 12 October 2016. Mr. Menkevich responded that he acknowledges that the Mayor did issue a statement, but opined that it meant nothing.

MaryAnn Ritter, a tenant in the building, noted that she has been on the block since she was 20 years old. She learned her craft on this street, and sat beside the jewelers who are the history of Jewelers' Row. She emphasized that she cannot imagine living her life not continuing her trade on Jewelers' Row, which is a key part of the city of Philadelphia. She noted that Philadelphia happens to be one of very few cities filled with such culture and history. She stated that many historic things have happened on this street, including presidents buying jewelry on this street. She noted that she gave the Preservation Alliance a copy of a check signed by Dwight D. Eisenhower, who bought a Bulova watch from her store. She noted that people do not realize that it is a community of jewelers, and who wonder how the block can survive having so many of the same type of store next to one another; however, she opined, that is what makes the block survive. She noted that one can walk down the street and find a huge variety of things made by creative people. She opined that bringing larger, modern buildings will not change things, and stated that we need to preserve our buildings so that we can celebrate what was there before us, not erase it from our past.

Jean Hoffinus, a tenant in the building, noted that it is very nice to revitalize, but not by bulldozing down history.

Katie Dylan, resident on the block, noted that she recently moved into studio space in this building. She explained that she has been a resident of the city of 10 years, and until recently she did not know that there was anything she could do to help preserve the history of the city. She opined that that is why many people are here today, because they want to fight for their history and heritage. She noted that she walks through history every day, and the city is very lucky to have these historic streets and historic buildings.

Chen Lee Chang, a tenant in the building, noted that the building is integral to her art projects, because she produces art with an emphasis on the human connection and cultural identity, with a strong influence from the city's architectural environment. She noted that she only moved into the building a few months ago, but found the rich interior of the building as compelling as its beautiful exterior. There is an untouchable synergistic energy in the building that one rarely finds in buildings today. She noted that it is a thriving community of jewelers, artists, craftsmen, and small businesses who contribute to this living, breathing building. She opined that the whole block should be recognized by the city for its historic and cultural significance. She noted that it is already recognized by the National Register, and could transition seamlessly onto the local register. She added that she is a first-generation Chinese-American Philadelphia native. Her father and grandfather both played key roles in continuation of the Chinese cultural heritage and lineage by building Chinatown, and contributing to the history of Philadelphia. From them, she learned an invaluable lesson that you can always make more money, but can always make more time. She asked the Committee to help save Jewelers' Row.

Suzanna Barucco expressed her support for the nomination.

Mr. Cohen commented that much of the discussion for 706 Sansom applies to this nomination as well. He stated that he would certainly include Criterion G. In many ways, however, he noted, this building is remarkably different in design than the other building, even though they are both by the same architectural firm. This building, he opined, strives for visual distinction. He suggested that the period of significance should be extended, and noted that the nomination rests more on the importance of Henry C. Lea, but it intimates how much this architectural distinction in a setting where each building has accrued a set of distinctions. He noted that the incredible variety of the block that creates a cohesive environment even though the pieces are different.

Mr. Cohen opined that this building is fascinating, because it is almost unique in Philadelphia. He noted that he does not know how the German-trained architects in Philadelphia created this design, but opined that it is the German version of the High Victorian Gothic. He noted that it is almost unique in Philadelphia to have this much polychromy in the 1890s that does not derive from the English High Victorian Gothic. He mused that the architects could have been looking at Willis Hale. Ms. Cooperman noted that the Neo-Grec detail is a very interesting combination. Mr. Schaaf noted that Eastlake is mentioned as a possible influence. Mr. Cohen responded that Eastlake can be either very narrow or very broad, but this building falls into a category that is not well studied. He opined that it would be great if the nomination had explored whether there were any German parallels to this design, or whether it is something that Germans coming to Philadelphia were picking up from Furness and Hale and others. Mr. Schaaf opined that he cannot think of anything else like this. Mr. Cohen noted that there are many places where one sees the incision, but that it is not common to see it with this palette of color. Ms. Cooperman noted that it is an unusual building for this date.

Ms. Cooperman commented that she would accept the fact that there was an association between the occupants of this building and Lea in terms of his building, but noted that those dots were not connected strongly enough in the nomination.

Mr. Cohen addressed the staff's recommendation against Criteria A, J, and G. Mr. Cohen noted that he wished there was more discussion of the coalescing of Jewelers' Row, because that would directly respond to the economic, social, and cultural history of a community for Criterion J. He noted that there is some discussion of that history, but it is not as strong as it should be. He opined that Criterion A is omnibus, and does not need to be added.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend to the Historical Commission that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 704 Sansom Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, G, and J.

2101 W CLARKSON AVE
Name of Resource: Mary & Frances Wister House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: La Salle University
Nominator: Arielle Harris
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Mary & Frances Wister House at 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the house and associated land satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The nomination contends that the house, constructed in 1868 by William Rotch Wister, is significant as part of the mid-to-late nineteenth century development of the Germantown community, which was home to several important Quaker families including the Fishers and Wisters. Those families molded the development of the area as it transitioned from that of large country seats for the wealthy to a more suburban character. The nomination further contends that the building is significant as the birthplace and early home of Frances Anne Wister, one of the founders of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and an important figure in Philadelphia history. The nomination also argues that the property, attributed to local architect James C. Sidney, is architecturally significant for embodying distinguishing characteristics of the picturesque Rural Gothic style, popularized by architects such as Andrew Jackson Downing and Alexander Jackson Davis.

The nomination proposes designating a portion but not the entirety of the very large tax parcel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Carl Primavera and La Salle general counsel Kevin Dolan represented the property owner. Arielle Harris represented the nomination.

Ms. Harris read a prepared statement:

> 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue, now known as the Frances and Mary Wister Studio, is an important remnant of east Germantown's mid nineteenth-century suburban landscape. The house was built in 1868 by William Rotch Wister, the "father of American cricket" and grandson of William Logan Fisher, who acquired Belfield, the 105 acre ornamental farm developed by painter Charles Willson Peale, in 1826. William Rotch Wister was raised in Belfield with his five brothers, and as an adult was allowed to build a number of cottages on the Belfield tract in order for he and his siblings to maintain close physical ties to the family estate. The construction of the house, too, is reflective of the "cottage and villa" suburban ideal that emerged in the middle decades of the 19th century. In Germantown in particular, Quaker families such as the Wisters and Fishers built family enclaves for this very purpose. Just up the road, Awbury Arboretum is an example of this

phenomenon and is a cherished resource for its preserved historic architecture and landscape.

While La Salle University might argue that the period of significance for Belfield land holdings may just be the time period during which Charles Willson Peale lived on site, I would like to state for the record that Peale lived at Belfield for 16 years while the Wister and Fisher families lived there for 158, from 1826 to 1984.

La Salle's faculty and staff have recognized the significance of their land holdings. The history of Belfield and its associated properties, including 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue and Little Wakefield, both of which are under consideration today, are touted on the university's website. Emeritus Professor of English James Butler has given many talks on the history and evolution of Belfield and the Wister family, also available online and in La Salle University's Special Collections. An informal university outreach group has recently formed among current faculty, staff, and neighbors to strategize about, recognize and capitalize upon historic resources on campus.

Walking into Belfield today, it is apparent that the interior has undergone a series of radical transformations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Yet, it is still listed as a National Historic Landmark for its association with Peale. By contrast, the interior of 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue retains its original floor plan, as well as intricate moldings, plaster ceiling ornament, doors, hardware, stairs, and floors. In fact, the university has more recently seen value in the property- replacing the wood porch in kind. Any erosion of the building's historic context is attributable to the work of the current owner, who demolished nearly all of the other cottages that were part of the "pod" of cottages in the latter half of the twentieth century.

As my nomination argues, there is strong circumstantial evidence that the house was designed by local architect and landscape designer J. C. Sidney. Supporting evidence comes in the form of a house at 81 E. Logan Street, a contributing resource in the East Logan Street local historic district for its architectural merit.

Finally, the site is significant as the birthplace of Frances Anne Wister, a Philadelphian who made her name as a civic leader in Philadelphia. She served in a number of roles for the Philadelphia Orchestra, which still honors her legacy in the form of a fundraising campaign. She was also passionate about historic preservation. She founded the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, an organization tasked with saving her family's ancestral homestead, Grumblethorpe, located blocks away from her birthplace, and Powel House in Society Hill. Her contributions to Philadelphia institutions have been recognized in the form of many awards issued by local groups, the city of Philadelphia, and the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. If this house is not significant as her birthplace, I would suggest that the historical commission take a look at other properties on the local register listed for this same criteria and ask, given her contributions to the city, how Frances' Wister's birthplace could be different.

Mr. Primavera distributed copies of a report by Powers & Company, which had originally been submitted to the Committee on Historic Designation to request a boundary clarification for the Belfield designation, but which was withdrawn prior to the Committee meeting. Mr. Primavera noted that around the same time that La Salle was assembling the boundary clarification request, the nomination for the property in question was submitted. Ms. Cooperman expressed her desire that the report be submitted in advance of the meeting so that the public would have

an opportunity to read and respond to it, and noted that the Committee members cannot read a full report while they are sitting at the meeting. Mr. Primavera responded that he has additional copies available. Mr. Primavera opined that it is part of the public record that La Salle submitted a boundary clarification request. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the report is in the Commission's files, but the report was withdrawn prior to this meeting. Mr. Primavera noted that it is dated 7 September 2016.

Mr. Primavera explained that originally La Salle had submitted an application to re-delineate the larger historic designation of 2101 W Clarkson, which includes this property and Belfield, noting that at the time of the original designation in the 1950s, the boundary was not precise. Mr. Primavera noted that, as La Salle was proceeding with the boundary clarification request, a nomination to individually designate this property was submitted. He explained that La Salle does not believe the original designation for Belfield intended to include the Wister house. He noted that La Salle as an institution is looking to grow and, like most universities, is looking to put student housing on campus, rather than in the community where it has presented some challenges. He opined that the perhaps well-intended nomination of the Wister house is going to create complications downstream. He reiterated that La Salle is looking to eliminate the Wister house from the designation. He opined that, in terms of understanding the campus and the collection of properties that La Salle has, La Salle does not believe this one is worthy of designation or that it is anything special.

Mr. Primavera asked Mr. Dolan, as general counsel for La Salle, if he has been living through discussions about this building. Mr. Dolan replied that La Salle has a great appreciation for the historic resources they do have on campus, noting that Belfield is a huge part of the campus, but that they do not believe that this building has the same historic significance. He noted that La Salle places greater value on the relationships in the community, and one of the priorities for the new administration at La Salle is to look at how they can bring some of the off-campus students back on campus and to be better neighbors to the community. He opined that locking up this part of the parcel of land would deter La Salle from being able to accomplish that goal. Mr. Cohen asked whether La Salle disputes the argument for the historic value of the property. Mr. Primavera responded that the Powers & Company report basically says that the original Belfield designation was focused on the relationship with Charles Wilson Peale, and that the important area and personage fall outside of the Wister connection. He noted that the original way the Commission created nominations was not precise, as it is today. He explained that Mr. Powers asserts that this building was probably not intended to be part of the original Belfield designation back in 1955. He opined that Mr. Powers believes that this building probably should not have been included as part of the original Belfield designation, or that it may not have been at all, and that this property does not represent the significance of Belfield. He reiterated that La Salle disputes the scholarship of this nomination and significance of this property. He suggested that the nominator may have recognized that this building was not important as part of the original assemblage of Belfield, and that is the reason she nominated it separately.

Mr. Cohen attempted to summarize Mr. Primavera's position, noting that it seems he has two arguments: first, that there is some ambiguity about the intent to designate this building as part of the Belfield designation originally, and secondly, that La Salle disputes the historical value of this building. Mr. Dolan responded that much of the significance in the nomination is tied to Frances Wister, who only lived in the property for two years, and lived at the nearby Wister Mansion longer. Mr. Primavera reiterated La Salle's desire to carve out the Wister house from the designated parcel is in conflict with a nominator now coming forward and finding some renewed value in this building. Mr. Primavera reiterated his opinion that the Wister house was mistakenly included in the 1955 Belfield designation, and expressed frustration that before La

Salle had a chance to carve the property out of the designation, they are under siege by someone seeking to have it individually listed in its own right. Mr. Primavera reiterated that La Salle and nominator are going in two different directions, and that La Salle feels the Wister house should never have been included in the Belfield designation.

Ms. Harris asked to respond to Mr. Primavera's and Mr. Dolan's comments. Ms. Cooperman allowed Ms. Harris to speak so long as she would speak to the content of the nomination. Ms. Harris opined that it is impossible to know what the Historical Commission intended the designate in the 1950s, because of the vagueness of the process at that time. Ms. Harris clarified that, in terms of understanding the history of La Salle's campus, when this group of cottages was still intact, they were rented out to students, so it was part of the campus dynamic for a long time. She noted that the Wister Mansion was demolished by the Fairmount Park Commission to make an arboretum adjacent to the campus that was never fully realized. She explained that the Wister house was also used as the Fine Arts studio for about 10 years, so it was also significant at an academic level as well as a residential one. Regarding the "renewed value," which Mr. Primavera mentioned, Ms. Harris noted that La Salle just replaced the porch of this property in kind, so they are investing in the property, and perhaps are interested in remaining stewards of this historic property.

Ms. Harris asked Mr. Farnham for his opinion of the process that Mr. Primavera referenced previously. Mr. Farnham apologized that he had stepped out of the room and did not know what Mr. Harris was referencing. Mr. Primavera explained that he had asked Mr. Farnham to speak to the designation process back in the 1950s. Mr. Farnham replied that the Historical Commission did not adopt a standard nomination form or designate by nomination until the 1970s. He noted that Belfield was designated in 1956, and at that time it was designated by its name and general street address. He explained that Belfield was part of a very large parcel at the time of designation, but the Historical Commission never defined a boundary for the designation. Therefore, although the Wister house stands one the designated property, there is an open question as to whether or not the Historical Commission intended to protect this house with its designation of Belfield in 1956.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. La Salle student Alex Palma commented that clearly there is some complexity and ambiguity to the parcel designation, but that he believes the Frances and Mary Wister house should be recognized for its own historical significance, and the best way to do that is through its individual designation.

Oscar Beisert expressed his support for the nomination. He asked to clarify a few things he had heard earlier, noting that he had seen a plan for La Salle that showed the extension of a parking lot over this building. He also disputed the claim that La Salle was a great steward of historic properties, arguing that La Salle is just finishing constructing a building immediately adjacent to a National Historic Landmark (Belfield) that has no sensitivity to the historic building, and that it demolished the designated Jewish Foster Home on Church Lane without a permit.

Ms. Cooperman reiterated the need to confine comments to the merits of the nomination.
La Salle graduate Jim Mundy noted that he was a student at La Salle in the 1970s and attended art classes in this building. He opined that the contention that there is nothing historic about the building is absurd, and argued that William Rotch Wister, who built the house, is one of the more prominent and important nineteenth-century Philadelphians, especially to the Germantown community. He suggested that the fact that La Salle is part of an organization called Historic Germantown, which in theory is promoting historic preservation, appreciation and understanding of not only the built history of the community, but also its overall general history, is absolutely

disgraceful. Mr. Mundy opined sometimes one must save institutions from themselves, and that La Salle needs to be saved from making a horrible mistake and demolishing one of, if not the most, architecturally significant buildings on campus, aside from Belfield. He summarized that the building is important for its architecture, the people who built and lived in it, and for the larger community.

Mr. Laverty asked if this building was included as part of the nomination from 1956, and whether designating it would just be doubling up before they decide whether to change the boundary of the designation. Mr. Cohen responded that La Salle withdrew the request to amend the Belfield designation boundary. Mr. Laverty asked if this building is on the Register. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that it shares an address of a larger tax parcel that is listed on the Philadelphia Register, and it would be a question for the Historical Commission as to whether this building was intended to be included in the designation of Belfield in 1956, but it is subject to debate. She noted that the Committee and Commission saw a similar situation with the individual designation of the Francis Strawbridge house that is located on the same parcel as Alden Park, but which was separately nominated and designated for its own significance in 2015. Ms. Cooperman asked if this nomination should be considered as an amendment or a new nomination. Mr. Farnham responded that it can be treated either way, as both would essentially have the same effect. He noted that, if the Committee chooses to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that this property satisfies the Criteria for Designation and the Commission agrees, it will erase the ambiguity of the 1956 designation. With that ambiguity in place, he noted, the property owner could submit a demolition application and argue to the Commission that the building is essentially non-contributing, and therefore able to be demolished without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest. Mr. Farnham noted that, if the Committee elects to recommend that this building satisfies one or more Criteria and the Commission agrees, it would add to the protection of this particular building and remove the ambiguity around the designation of the parcel from 1956.

Mr. Laverty argued that, even without the relationship to the Wister family, which is extraordinarily important to the neighborhood and to the city, the building is architecturally significant as an excellent example of mid-nineteenth century suburban architecture that flourished particularly in Germantown. Mr. Cohen added that it points out a particular family enclave design, specifically of Quaker families, that is really distinctive and well documented and explained in the nomination. Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination is well-written and well-researched. He stated that he is in favor of removing the ambiguity of the designation, and hoped that there is not already a demolition permit for this building. Mr. Farnham responded that he is not aware of a demolition permit. Mr. Cohen suggested that the Committee consider the nomination on its own in order to provide clarity. He noted that there are many losses of historic buildings at institutions such as universities, which often consolidate large parcels with numerous buildings, and individual properties do not always get considered or get their due consideration in terms of preservation. He noted that universities constantly have needs for new buildings, and historic buildings can sometimes be looked at as the opportunities for parking or permeable coverage, and it is important to be more discriminating about big tax parcels to ensure that individual buildings are identified and preserved. He recommended considering this nomination on its own.

Mr. Schaaf opined that it was important and fascinating that the author found a building at 81 E. Logan Street that is within a local historic district, and is nearly identical to the building under consideration. He noted that it is known that the building on E. Logan Street was designed by the architect J.C. Sidney. He agreed with Mr. Cohen that this property should be considered on its own merits. He questioned why the Historical Commission would not want to designate a

building that is identical to an already-designated property less than a mile away. Mr. Cohen agreed with the similarity Mr. Schaaf observed, noting that Sidney has a very distinctive hand in his stonework and the way dormers erupt through the cornices and eaves. Ms. Cooperman agreed, commenting that the vocabulary of the building also shows up in houses in Chestnut Hill on Summit Avenue and other streets, which are also by Sidney. Mr. Cohen stated that Sidney was a very important architectural figure during this period of the 1850s through the 1870s. Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Schaaf that this building that looks very similar to one that is already designated, and if anything, this one has more detail.

Mr. Cohen opined that Criterion E might also be applicable for the building's association with a particular architect. Ms. Cooperman agreed, but noted that it is within the realm of possibilities that the design of the building is actually by T. U. Walter, particularly given the fact that Walter did work at nearby Awbury Arboretum. The Committee members agreed that suspicions are high that it is a design by J.C. Sidney, but agreed that Criterion E was not necessary to the nomination.

Mr. Laverty disclosed that he is also a graduate of La Salle College.

Mr. Mooney encouraged La Salle to amend the nomination for Belfield to include Criterion I for archaeological potential. He stated that unbelievable artifacts associated with the Peale family could likely be found on the site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2101 W. Clarkson Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

1701 LINDLEY AVE
Name of Resource: Little Wakefield
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: La Salle University
Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 1701 Lindley Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the house known as Little Wakefield and associated land satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The nomination argues that Little Wakefield, constructed in 1829 for Thomas Rodman Fisher, is significant for its association with the Fisher family, who founded the nearby Wakefield Mills, one of the earliest "modern" knitting mills in America. It also argues it is significant for its association with other important and interrelated families of Germantown, including the Logans, Carpenters, and Wisters.

The nomination also argues that the house and gazebo are significant for their association with the National League for Women's Service (called the National League of Workers in the nomination), a women's organization founded in 1917 to provide wartime aide. Little Wakefield was used by the particularly active Germantown branch of the organization as an educational facility and demonstration center, and the gazebo was constructed as part of this role.

The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as a modest, Quaker interpretation of the Federal and Greek Revival styles.

The nomination proposes designating a portion but not the entirety of the very large tax parcel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the portion of the property at 1701 Lindley Avenue known as Little Wakefield and the Gazebo satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The staff, however, recommends moving the extensive biographical information to an appendix from the body of the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Carl Primavera and La Salle general counsel Kevin Dolan represented the property owner. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert commented that many people thought this building did not exist anymore, and remarked at its modest design. He noted that he found numerous period photographs of the property, likely owing to the fact that it was the home of George Washington Carpenter. Carpenter and his wife, Mr. Beisert noted, were socialites, and Carpenter had grown up in one of the largest houses in Germantown and moved to one of the most modest mansions in Philadelphia, Little Wakefield.

Mr. Laverty asked why this property was called Little Wakefield, noting that he remembered Wakefield itself on Lindley Avenue being quite a bit smaller than this building. Mr. Beisert responded that he was not able to find out when it started to be called Little Wakefield, but was built by descendants of the people who built Wakefield, so that was likely the reason. Mr. Beisert opined that this property has a much more quaint appearance than the higher-style Wakefield.

Mr. Primavera noted that the gazebo was recently destroyed by a fire. Mr. Dolan clarified that it was destroyed by a wind and rain storm in April 2016. Mr. Dolan commented that all that is left standing is the concrete pad.

Mr. Primavera asked Mr. Dolan to explain La Salle's concerns about the nomination of this property. Mr. Dolan responded that La Salle does not understand the architectural significance of the building. He noted that the building is occupied currently and the university does not have plans to do anything else with it, but do not know their long-term plans for the parcel. He expressed concern that the boundary identified in the nomination ties up a decent amount of the land around the building as well. Mr. Primavera reiterated the university's concerns over future campus planning, and expressed concern over the uncertainty that comes with designated properties and development on the larger parcel. He noted that there is not a project in the works currently, but opined that there will be one at some point in the future. He stated the opposition to designation is not for a lack of appreciation of the historic resources, but for the challenges that accompany designation. He opined that, while this property may be interesting, he does not feel it is crying out for a nomination at this point, and the university would like to have more elbow room as they plan their campus.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Ms. Cooperman noted that she had wondered whether it was appropriate to associate the gazebo with the house, but noted that that question is now moot.

Ms. Cooperman questioned whether the Historical Commission has the authority to amend the boundary. Mr. Farnham responded that the Committee could recommend to the Commission

that it reduce the boundary, but could not suggest that the boundary be expanded without providing additional notice to the property owner.

Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination brings out the remarkable fact of what this building was, and that its strongest attributes are looking at the property as an example of Quaker restraint in a country seat. He appreciated the comparison to the meeting house, but noted that the stronger comparison would be with other houses of the period. Nevertheless, he concluded, the argument for its architectural significance was strong.

Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman agreed with the staff's recommendation that the majority of the genealogical discussion should be moved to an appendix. Mr. Cohen remarked that it is good to have an understanding of the familial interconnectedness of the Quaker enclave model in Germantown. He noted that a summary of the family connections would be sufficient, but that the extraneous details should not be included in the body of the text, as they do not add to the argument for significance.

Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman agreed that the nomination makes a case for all of the Criteria it sets forth.

Mr. Cohen questioned the section in the building description that discusses the porch being extant throughout the history of the property, but noted that some of the photographs in the nomination show it and some do not. Mr. Beisert responded that there are some photographs that show it enclosed, removed, and then there again. Mr. Cohen suggested that the photographs should all be dated. Mr. Beisert responded that some of them are undated.

Ms. Cooperman made a general comment to nominators regarding the citation of images. She stated that, unless express permission has been given by an individual or organizations, citations should not read "Courtesy," but rather "Source." Mr. Cohen agreed, and noted that photographs should be numbered as figures and be referred to in the text.

Ms. Cooperman asked to address the question of the boundary, noting that there are two issues at hand, a buffer zone for the property, and the removal of the gazebo. Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Farnham what a boundary amendment recommendation might look like. Mr. Farnham responded that the Committee may recommend any constriction of the boundary that the members deem appropriate. He noted that, if the Committee decides that the portion of the site that housed the gazebo is no longer relevant since the gazebo has been lost, it could opt to remove that portion of the parcel from consideration. Mr. Farnham noted that, since the boundary is not dimensioned, he would suggest that the Committee define a boundary based on features in the area. Ms. Cooperman opined that one of the crucial aspects is the viewshed of the main elevations of the building. Mr. Schaaf noted that one of the issues brought up in the nomination itself is that the alignment of the hairpin driveway has been a feature of the arrival sequence of the house since the time it was built in the 1820s. He suggested that it would be wrong to take that out of the nomination. Ms. Cooperman agreed. Mr. Cohen suggested that a boundary reduced to just west of the former gazebo would give La Salle more room to operate without compromising the approach and breathing room of the mansion.

Mr. Schaaf asked if there are archaeological considerations that should be given to the gazebo or the property in general. Mr. Mooney responded that the entire property has high archaeological potential, as it is situated on high ground between two streams. Right at a stream confluence, it will have a high potential for Native American artifacts over the entire parcel. Not only that, but also any historical archaeological resources associated with the occupants of the

property since the 1820s. Mr. Mooney stated that the property is primed for archaeological artifacts.

Mr. Cohen asked if Criterion I should be added to the recommendation. Mr. Mooney responded that he does not believe that is an option, if the argument was not made in the nomination. Mr. Farnham clarified that there is nothing in the Rules & Regulations that necessarily precludes the Committee from adding a Criterion; however, doing so at this point could create a grounds for objection by the property owner that it did not have the opportunity to review documentation for that claim of significance. He noted that the Committee's recommendation is advisory, so, although it is accepted practice not to supplement a nomination with additional Criteria not cited in a nomination, the Committee may make any recommendation it chooses, and the Commission may accept or reject that recommendation. Mr. Cohen asked, if the nomination were to go through as-is, whether it could be amended at a later date to add Criterion I. Ms. Cooperman responded that an amendment can always be made. Mr. Farnham noted that no one has ever appealed a designation owing to the insertion of Criterion I, and so an addition of the Criterion is untested waters. Mr. Mooney responded that he is confused, because the Committee used to recommend the addition of Criterion I regularly, but then Mr. Farnham sent an email saying that they should not add Criteria ad hoc. Mr. Farnham responded that that was the direction that he received from the Historical Commission a few years ago. He noted that the Commission never adopted formal resolution on that question, but simply offered informal advice expressing concern over the addition of Criteria that were not addressed in the nomination, and the potential for putting designations at risk owing to additional, unsubstantiated Criteria. Mr. Mooney asked for additional clarification. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff can seek clarification from the Commission, but that he cannot currently provide any additional clarification beyond the concerns expressed by individual Commission members at Commission meetings.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1701 Lindley Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, J, and that the property furthermore satisfies Criterion I, although it not addressed in the nomination.

1642 FITZWATER ST
Name of Resource: Tabor Chapel and Mission School
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: The First Colored Wesley Methodist Church
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1642 Fitzwater Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the church is significant under Criteria A and J for its association with the African American church and community in Philadelphia, and as a representation of the physical development of the larger Presbyterian Church through the establishment of mission chapels or congregations by the Philadelphia Sabbath-School Association. The nomination further argues that the Samuel Sloan-designed church is significant as an early example of his commissions, satisfying Criterion E, but little information is provided as to how the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, mentioned in the nomination as Italianate or Italian

Romanesque, and how the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by said distinctive architectural style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1642 Fitzwater Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. The staff contends that the nomination, not the building itself, does not make a cogent argument for Criteria C and D. Additionally, the staff notes that the correct address for the church building is 1642 Fitzwater Street, rather than the 1640 Fitzwater Street address that is found on the nomination form and throughout the body of the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Mark Richardson represented the property owner. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert stated that the congregation requests a continuance. He stated that the building is in the process of being sold, and the congregation may consider remaining in the building for the purposes of worship. Mr. Richardson stated that the property owner learned of the proposed designation at the time of closing, and that sale has been postponed for 30 days to allow time for the church board and membership to review the nomination and the designation process. He requested that the nomination be continued to the December 2016 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it back to the Committee for review at its 14 December 2016 meeting.

10751 AND 10725 KNIGHTS RD

Name of Resource: Byberry Township Public Burial Ground
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: City of Philadelphia
Nominator: Joseph J. Menkevich
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the site at 10751 and 10725 Knights Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that site is significant under Criteria for Designation A, B, G, I, and J. The nomination contends that the Byberry Township Public Burial Ground is the first and oldest known public burial ground in existence in Philadelphia, established circa 1683 by John Hart, an important legislator of Pennsylvania, satisfying Criteria A, B and J. The nomination further argues that the site was laid out as a “rectangular square” similar to the several public squares and burial grounds within the center of Philadelphia which came later, satisfying Criterion G. Lastly, the nomination argues that the site has survived for more than 333 years in near-original condition, lying near a known Native American path, and may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, satisfying Criterion I.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the site at 10751 and 10725 Knights Road satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, G, I, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Henry Clinton represented six adjacent property owners. No one

represented the City of Philadelphia as the property owner. Joseph Menkevich represented the nomination.

Ms. Broadbent stated that a letter was received earlier in the meeting from Councilman Brian O'Neill, which states that he supports the immediate neighbors in their request for a continuance. Mr. Menkevich distributed a letter that he wrote in opposition to the continuance request. Mr. Clinton confirmed that he is the attorney for six of the neighbors whose properties surround the alleged burial ground, but who do not claim to be partial owners of the subject property. He explained that he was recently retained, and has not had sufficient time to analyze the lengthy nomination. He stated that the neighbors request addition time to analyze the nomination and come back before the Committee with a coherent position. Mr. Menkevich responded that he did not nominate the neighbors' properties for a good reason, which is that he did not want interference from the neighbors. He opined that the neighbors' rear yards could be nominated as potential archaeological sites in the future. He stated that the neighbors do not have standing. He suggested that they address the continuance request to the City Solicitor. He stated that the neighbors are encroaching on the burial ground. Mr. Clinton responded that the neighbors are part of the public and this is public land, therefore the neighbors have standing, although they are not the specific owners of the subject parcel. Ms. Cooperman stated that continuance requests typically come from the property owner, and not from adjacent property owners. Mr. Menkevich questioned the suggestion that the neighbors would conduct a study or review of the nomination or site. He compared Mr. Clinton to Donald Trump. Mr. Clinton responded that he considered the comparison an insult. Mr. Menkevich suggested that the City undertake the study.

Mr. Menkevich stated that there is a deed restriction, described in the nomination, which states that there should be a 15-foot buffer zone between the rear of the neighbors' properties and the burial ground. Deed restrictions are enforceable through the courts and not through the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He opined that the buffer zone was put there because of the burial ground when Crestmont Farms was developed, but has been forgotten over time. Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Menkevich that deed restrictions are enforced through the court. He stated that he will bring the deed restriction and any evidence of it being violated to the attention of the City Solicitor, and the Solicitor can elect whether or not to take action. He stated that, under the preservation ordinance, if the Historical Commission seeks to solve the problem of encroachments, it has one mechanism. This mechanism is that it can request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect the designated property, and the Department of Licenses & Inspections can seek to bring a property into compliance by issuing a violation. In this case, the Department would be issuing a violation to the City itself. If the property is in violation, there are mechanisms by which it can be addressed, perhaps through the deed restriction, that would be more direct and effective than through the Historical Commission. He stated that he will speak to the Commissioner of the Department of Public Property and have her look into the issue of potential encroachments, and he will speak to the Law Department and have the City Solicitor look into whether or not the deed restriction has been violated and whether or not an action is appropriate. But the mechanism that is available through the Historical Commission designation is not an effective mechanism in this particular circumstance. Mr. Menkevich responded that he appreciates Mr. Farnham's comments, but would still like for the Committee to review the merits of the nomination at this meeting.

Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Cohen asked about the precedence for a continuance request from persons other than property owners and nominators. Mr. Farnham responded that he does not recall a request for a continuance from a non-property owner, but that does not mean that it has not occurred in the past. He stated that he did attempt to elicit an opinion of the nomination from

the Commissioner of the Department of Public Property, but did not receive a response and therefore does not know the Commissioner's position on the designation. He continued that, in general, when there is a request for a continuance, the staff has urged the Committee and Commission to grant the continuance, because additional study of the nomination should not be precluded. The property will remain under the control of the Historical Commission. These property owners believe that they have an interest in this designation, and giving them an opportunity to consider the merits of the nomination and the impact of the designation is an appropriate action. The better informed that they are to participate in the discussion, the better the decision will be that eventually comes out of the Commission. He reiterated that the jurisdiction remains during the continuance period, but, if the Committee moves to address the merits of the nomination today, there may be individuals who wish to participate in the discussion and have not had the opportunity to inform themselves sufficiently to participate fully. Mr. Menkevich commented that he distributed a letter that quotes Mr. Farnham as saying that the Committee has no authority to grant continuances, and should rule on the merits of a nomination. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee's role is advisory to the Commission, and the Committee would only be making a recommendation either about the merits of the nomination, or about a recommendation to continue the consideration of the nomination, as has been done several times already at this meeting.

Mr. Cohen commented that the Committee may be setting a precedent, in that anyone can ask for a continuance. Mr. Farnham responded that if the Committee were to make a recommendation that the Commission table this nomination, it would not be binding itself to make such a recommendation in every case. It may have a case where the request is frivolous and the Committee can choose to move forward with the review of the merits of a nomination. Mr. Cohen agreed that, in this particular case, it will be a stronger hearing if both points of view are represented during the Committee review. He suggested that the Committee request clarity from the Commission as to who should be awarded a continuance. Mr. Menkevich opined that the Committee will be encouraging the encroachment that is taking place by recommending that the nomination be continued.

Mr. Menkevich stated that the neighbors intimidate people who visit the burial ground. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee has read what he wrote about that topic in his nomination. Mr. Menkevich responded that he included it to warn readers, should they decide to visit the site. Mr. Clinton stated that Mr. Menkevich should not take an incident that may have happened to him and suggest that it is going to happen to anyone else. Mr. Menkevich retorted that Mr. Clinton is naïve. He opined that the Commission should be more proactive. He commented that he nominated the Byberry Township African American Burial Ground previously, and there is no protection of the site by the City.

Mr. Farnham commented that he was reminded of a recent request for continuance from someone other than the property owner. The Frankford Community Development Corporation requested a continuance of the review of a nomination of the Penn Fruit Supermarket, which was granted.

Mr. Cohen suggested to Mr. Menkevich that he restructure his nominations so that the argument addressing the Criteria is first, and any supporting documentation is put in an appendix. Mr. Menkevich acknowledged that the nomination is lengthy, and explained that he has been researching the property for years. He distributed *The Dreams of Benjamin Rush*, by Carl A.L. Binger, M.D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it back to the Committee for review at its 14 December 2016 meeting, and that the Commission provide clarification with respect to who may request a continuance.

During the motion, Friends of Poquessing Watershed member Fred Maurer stood in the audience. Immediately following the motion, Mr. Maurer stated that he came to speak, and asked when he could speak about the nomination. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission will consider the recommendation for a continuance at its 10 November 2016 meeting, and the next Committee on Historic Designation meeting is on 14 December 2016. Mr. Maurer asked when he would get a chance to speak. Mr. Cohen responded that he can address the Committee on 14 December 2016. Mr. Maurer asked if the continuance will be granted by the Commission. Ms. Cooperman responded that she cannot guarantee it, but it is likely. She suggested that, in the meantime, Mr. Maurer can address the Commission in writing. Mr. Maurer responded that he has addressed the Commission twice, and has been denied twice. He stated that he had a pending nomination, and Mr. Menkevich cannot speak for him ever again. He suggested that Mr. Menkevich used his photographs in the nomination without his permission. He stated that he has been a caretaker for the site for nine years, and he does not want to be ignored in this session because of Mr. Menkevich. Ms. Cooperman responded that Mr. Menkevich is credited as the preparer of this nomination, and the Committee has no knowledge of other nominators. Mr. Maurer responded that he complained that Ms. Broadbent wrote a wrong denial of his letter, and he told Mr. Farnham that he did not want a denial from Ms. Broadbent; he wants a denial from the Commission itself. He stated that he has objected on record through his letters, and stated that he has a pending nomination with both the Historical Commission and the state. He stated that he does not want to be postponed forever. Mr. Menkevich responded that he will not speak for Mr. Maurer, but will say that Mr. Maurer nominated the property 10 years ago, and it was not Ms. Broadbent who wrote the letter of rejecting the nomination as incorrect and/or incomplete, but rather Erin Cote, a preservation planner who is no longer a member of the Commission's staff.

2041-55 CORAL ST
Name of Resource: Harbisons' Dairies
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Fozan Ehmedi
Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia, LLC
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2041-55 Coral Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the four buildings and iconic milk bottle water tower formerly owned by Harbisons Dairy satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, F, H, and J. The nomination argues that Harbisons Dairy developed into a leading dairy company that served many Philadelphians through what began as a home milk delivery service and later expanded into a large-scale production facility. The nomination asserts that owners Robert and Thomas Bartly Harbison were significant Philadelphians, owing not only to their role in establishing and growing the prominent dairy business, but also for their involvement in educating and promoting the safe storage and transport of milk products. The nomination further contends that the milk bottle water tower is significant for its innovative use as an advertisement and as a familiar visual feature of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2041-55 Coral Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, F, H, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney William Martin represented the property owner. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Martin stated that the property is currently used as a warehouse by its owner, Ehmedi Fozan, for his supermarket operations. Previously, he added, the property served as the Kensington service plant for Harbisons Dairy. Mr. Martin then stated that he is requesting that the review be continued to the first Committee on Historic Designation meeting in 2017. He indicated that a key portion of the nomination is the milk bottle water tower, described in the nomination as "the Eiffel Tower of Kensington," and noted that two-thirds of the photographs in the nomination are of the water tower. The reason for the continuance request, Mr. Martin continued, is because the property owner has engaged Fred Baumert of Keast & Hood Structural Engineers to complete a condition assessment of the water tower. Mr. Martin commented that the engineer and a historic consultant have made multiple site visits and noted a variety of potential issues regarding the condition of the metal and the wood decking of the tower's support structure. The tower, he asserted, has received minimal or no maintenance during the last 50 or more years. Mr. Martin elaborated that a continuance would allow them time to receive the work product and to share it with the Commission and nominator. He remarked that following the recommended course would provide all parties with a better foundation for proceeding.

Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee's rubric is to consider the merit of the specific criteria rather than any structural issues. She then stated that the Committee can recommend a continuance.

Mr. Beisert commented that he is not opposing the continuance and added that he wanted to note that the community had already begun writing the nomination on their own. He added that he helped format the nomination and is ushering it through the process. He remarked that there is a great deal of community support, not just for the designation of the milk bottle water tower but for the dairy itself, and the community would like the entire property to be designated and reused in the future.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination for 2041-55 Coral Street and remand the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its February 2017 meeting.

2345-49 E SUSQUEHANNA AVE
Name of Resource: Fifth Reformed Dutch Church
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Church of the Living Word, Inc.
Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2345-49 E. Susquehanna Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Fifth Reformed Dutch Church satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. The

nomination contends that the property represents the working- and middle-class German-speaking population in Kensington and served the community as a place of worship for one hundred years. The nomination also asserts that Rev. Dr. Gustavus E. Gramm is a person of local significance for his role in founding the church and as an early practitioner of homeopathy. Finally, the nomination contends that the building characterizes a distinctive architectural style, or, as the nomination argues, "a form and trend in the architectural motifs of small congregations with specific, but proud congregations."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2345-59 E. Susquehanna Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. While the property may satisfy Criterion C, the staff contends that the nomination does not make a cogent argument for its satisfaction.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Property owners James and Ethel Wheadon attended the meeting. Oscar Beisert and Aaron Wunsch represented the nomination.

Mr. Wheadon stated that he and his mother were present on behalf of Reverend James George Wheadon, Mr. Wheadon's 87-year-old father who had served as the church's pastor for 56 years. He noted that his family has been active in the church at Susquehanna Avenue since 1969. Owing to his father's failing health, Mr. Wheadon continued, he has been faced with a difficult year that has caused the congregation to list the church building for sale. On June 28, he explained, the church was placed on the market, and he and his family received notification of the nomination on August 30. At the time, Mr. Wheadon stated, there was an agreement of sale based on some contingencies, and the buyer wanted to convert the building into condominiums. He commented that during an inspection, the potential buyer found that the structural needs were greater than his funds and backed out of the sale. The church, he added, went back on the market. Mr. Wheadon stated that he does not oppose the process if it is good for the building, and that the building is loved by his family and the congregation. With 11 members remaining and his father retiring, he continued, the church's funds will only allow them to pay bills for two months. Mr. Wheadon indicated that, if designation were to inhibit the selling process, he would oppose the nomination.

Ms. Wheadon stated that she would not want to see the church get demolished and that she and her husband would like the building to continue as a church. She commented that its continued use is not plausible, as they have tried to identify a buyer. The church, she added, requires too much work, and though they do not wish to sell the building, they have no other options. She reiterated that she and her family would oppose the nomination only if it interfered with the sale of the property. Mr. Wheadon explained that there would be a potential personal liability issue if the building does close.

Mr. Laverty asked if the church constitution or bylaws indicate the ownership and inquired if Mr. Wheadon has a dissolution clause. Mr. Wheadon answered that the members own the church and the procedure would be to donate it to an independent mission. Mr. Laverty asked if the congregation has acted on a solution yet. Mr. Wheadon responded that they have and are in a majority agreement for sale of the church. Amendments to the bylaws have been made, he added.

Mr. Cohen asked how much structural remediation was needed. Mr. Wheadon replied that the cost was estimated at $25,000. The potential buyer's plans, he continued, were to maintain the main façade and convert the interior to condominiums. Mr. Cohen inquired whether the estimate

included the cost of the conversion. Mr. Wheadon clarified that the $25,000 estimate was only for structural repairs.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Schaaf inquired about the Historical Commission's decision on a different church property that was made at its 14 October 2016 meeting. He added that a church in near West Philadelphia was essentially in the same condition and the owners had requested a continuance to allow time to explore options prior to designation. Ms. Keller replied that the property was located at 4101-05 Ludlow Street and that the property owner requested a continuance of 120 days to allow them time to consult with various organizations to identify funding.

Mr. Cohen asserted that the nomination focused extensively on people rather than the building and argued against identifying each pastor in the church's history as significant. Instead, Mr. Cohen continued, the nominator needs to focus on the nomination's arguments. One of the best potential arguments, he noted, was for Criterion C relating to architecture, which is not well developed in the document. Ms. Cooperman agreed and added that the nomination read as a paraphrased congregational history, which invariable focuses on the church's pastors. She reiterated Mr. Cohen's argument for extracting significant figures from the list of pastors rather than evaluating each equally. Mr. Cohen encouraged the nominator to place the church, with its brownstone extensions, into the family of buildings to which it relates. He added that there are likely several dozen related buildings in the city. Ms. Cooperman supported Mr. Cohen's statement, adding that the building should be placed into a specific context of a relevant building type and should be examined against its cohort.

The Committee members discussed procedures for allowing the nominator to revise the nomination. Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee could make a recommendation that the Commission remand the nomination back to it to allow the nominators time to strengthen the arguments. She stated that the Committee is of the opinion that portions of the argument should be strengthened before a final recommendation is made. She asked whether the property would remain under the Commission's jurisdiction if the Committee required revision. Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee had several options. The Commission, he explained, could return the nomination to the nominator as incorrect and incomplete, and the document could be resubmitted. In that situation, he continued, the Commission's jurisdiction over the property would lapse and would not recur until a new nomination was submitted, found correct and complete, and notice was sent to the property owner. Another option, he added, would be to recommend to the Commission that it table the matter for a certain amount of time to allow the nominator to revise and resubmit the nomination. Mr. Farnham used the nomination of 2503 W. Oxford Street as an example in which the Commission indicated that it did not want to hold onto jurisdiction over the property for an indeterminate amount of time and required that the time allotted to the nomination's revision be limited. He elaborated that, if the Committee is concerned about a building permit being submitted, it can make the recommendation that the Commission return the nomination to the nominator with the suggestion that specific revisions be made under a short timeline.

Mr. Beisert asked the Committee if members agreed the nomination demonstrated that the property satisfies Criteria A and J. Mr. Cohen concurred that the nomination satisfied Criterion J, but questioned the inclusion of Criterion A.

Mr. Schaaf inquired whether the church was at one time free-standing, noting that the rear does not appear to be engaged with the adjacent rowhouses. He asked about the function of the

wings, why they were added, and how they became part of the streetscape. Mr. Cohen asked if the wings functioned as circulatory space. Mr. Wunsch affirmed, adding that he was unsure whether the wings served exclusively as circulatory space. Mr. Schaaf asked how members of the church historically entered the church, and stated that that question should be addressed in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the consideration of the nomination of 2345-49 E. Susquehanna Avenue to permit the nominator to strengthen the arguments for Criteria C and J, provided the nominator takes no more than 30 days to revise and resubmit the nomination.

3514-30 LANCASTER AVE

Name of Resource: Greenville; Mission House of the Protestant Episcopal Church; Pennsylvania Working Home for Blind Men; Old Quaker Building
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: JAR Old Quaker Property, LP
Nominator: Powelton Village Civic Association
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3514-30 Lancaster Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J. The nomination argues that the earliest building on the property, Greenville, is associated with significant Philadelphians Samuel Blodget and Rebecca Smith Blodget. The nomination also claims significance for the property's association with the Protestant Episcopal Church, which used the main building as a mission house, and the Pennsylvania Working Home for Blind Men, which constructed the Workshop and Factory buildings to provide living and working facilities for blind men.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3514-30 Lancaster Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. While the property may satisfy Criteria D and E, the staff contends that the nomination does not make cogent arguments for the satisfaction of these criteria. The staff also recommends moving extraneous detail included in the body of the nomination to an appendix.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Owner Jeff Reinhold represented the property. George Poulin of Powelton Village Civic Association, sponsor of the nomination, and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman inquired why the caretaker's house was excluded from the nomination. Mr. Beisert explained that the building sits on a different parcel. Mr. Cohen asked if the property had already been certified. Ms. Cooperman answered that the group of buildings is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and had received tax credits.

Mr. Poulin indicated that, as a resident of Powelton Village, he was surprised to learn about the building's history and the people who resided at Greenville. Greenville, he continued, is the oldest structure in Powelton Village, dating to 1799, but based on the exterior he had always assumed the building was an 1860s Italianate mansion. Through Mr. Beisert's work, he added, he has discovered a more interesting story.

Mr. Reinhold commented that he has owned the property since 2006 and owns a number of designated properties throughout the city. He asserted that he does not fully support the designation of this property and added that he agreed with the staff recommendation that the nomination does not satisfy Criteria for Designation D and E. Greenville, he continued, is extremely old, but comprises a very small part of the property. He contended that other elements have been constructed over the years that are not architecturally significant, though they are also old and part of the property. Mr. Reinhold argued that the Factory is historic but not architecturally significant, though he acknowledged that the property as a whole and its history is significant. Mr. Reinhold stated that he is trying to understand the benefit of historic designation and discussed the National Register listing and subsequent tax credit project. He expressed concern that, as a private owner, designation may have a detrimental impact. Mr. Reinhold explained that his concerns relate not to the Historical Commission staff nor to the permitting process but to the potential negative economic impact if and when he sells the property. He assured the Committee he currently has no intention of selling the property.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public discussion. Mr. Poulin opined that Powelton Village is primarily a residential neighborhood with some commercial activity along Lancaster Avenue. The industrial heritage, he continued, has not been explored prior to this nomination. He argued that the Factory and Working Home for Blind Men hold significance in the development of Lancaster Avenue and serve as unique architectural statements in terms of industrial architecture in West Philadelphia.

Mr. Cohen applauded the nominators on their research and their work to link Samuel Blodget, a significant historical figure, to West Philadelphia. He expressed his sympathy for Mr. Reinhold's economic concerns, but added that he believes the site's history contributes to the property's value and appeal, noting that the buildings serve as a historical anchor to the neighborhood. Mr. Reinhold responded that he markets the property as historic. He argued that with designation, however, the list of potential buyers dwindles, because some individuals will not purchase a historically designated property. He explained that the potential financial loss occurs at the time of the sale.

Mr. Reinhold discussed the notification process and expressed dissatisfaction at learning of the nomination through the notice letter to the property owner sent by Mr. Farnham. He indicated that he was caught off guard and remarked that he would have helped the nominators, had they revealed to him that they were proposing to nominate the property. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Reinhold to imagine a different kind of owner who would immediately file a demolition permit upon learning of a potential nomination. Mr. Reinhold acknowledged that possibility, but stated that it is not a concern in this situation. Several Committee members responded that the property owner's reaction cannot be known prior to notice being sent. Mr. Cohen added that it could create a real vulnerability for the property. Ms. Cooperman opined that an ideal situation would allow for the inclusion of the property owner at the beginning of the process. Mr. Beisert asserted that the neighboring block of Lancaster Avenue, the 3600 block, was slated for demolition and that Powelton Village Civic Association has responded by seeking to protect the most important properties in the neighborhood, one of which is Mr. Reinhold's property and the Quaker meetinghouse.

Mr. Cohen argued that the Factory reflects some of the best work of architect John Ord. He elaborated that the design reflects an institutional building as much as it does a factory and is highly embellished to celebrate its philanthropic purpose.

Mr. Schaaf explained that the country's capital was planned to be moved to Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and in anticipation of that move, Lancaster Avenue was created as an arterial route from Philadelphia to Lancaster in 1794. Five years later, he continued, Greenville was constructed and probably stands as the first grand house built on Lancaster Avenue.

Mr. Cohen asked if any exterior image exists of the original house. Mr. Beisert compared the exterior of Greenville to a building neighboring Andalusia. Mr. Cohen contended that the dimensions and some original features exist. With these elements, he continued, an axonometric view of the exterior could be developed.

Mr. Mooney suggested that the nomination include Criterion I, since much of the property was sealed in the mid-nineteenth century by the construction of stables and other structures, which would have preserved any archaeological deposits in those backyard spaces. Additionally, he indicated that there is a high probability of finding artifacts associated with a significant family. Mr. Beisert requested that an archaeologist assist with developing a case for that Criterion.

Mr. Schaaf agreed with the staff recommendation that the property may satisfy Criteria D and E, but the nomination does not make cogent arguments for their inclusion. He inquired whether the Committee would want those criteria further amplified. Ms. Cooperman concurred with the staff recommendation in stating that details within the nomination should have been relegated to an appendix. She opined that, while some arguments for Criteria D and E were included, they could have very usefully been strengthened. Mr. Cohen argued that the Committee recognizes that the property is significant for those Criteria, even if the argument has not been sufficiently developed in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3514-30 Lancaster Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J, and that the property furthermore satisfies Criterion I, although it not addressed in the nomination.

Mary McGettigan, a resident of the Spruce Hill neighborhood, asked for procedural clarification from the Committee. She expressed concern over the speed of the nomination process and specifically of tabling or continuing nominations. In her neighborhood, she continued, residents have been waiting 29 years for district designation. She supported Mr. Menkevich's opposition to the continuation of the nomination of 10751 and 10725 Knights Road. She further expressed her dissatisfaction over the ability of lawyers to ask and be granted continuances, which causes delay to the designation process. Ms. Cooperman countered that those individuals requesting continuances are not exclusively lawyers and that the Committee often recommends continuances that are requested by the property owner. Often property owners are represented by attorneys, she clarified. In this specific case, Ms. McGettigan noted, the request came from an attorney representing near neighbors and not a property owner. Ms. Cooperman asserted that the Committee discussed the request at length, owing to the implications of a recommendation for a continuance requested by a third party. Ms. McGettigan stated that there does not seem to be a set of clear regulations the public would be able to understand to determine when a nomination will be continued. Ms. Cooperman responded that earlier in the meeting the Committee asked to receive that clarification from the Commission at a future date. Ms. McGettigan asked if there would be any objection to the Committee devising a set of regulations that it could follow in the future. Ms. Cooperman replied that the Committee does not have the authority to create its own rules and must abide by the Rules & Regulations of the Commission as a whole. She advised Ms. McGettigan to appear before the Commission and voice her concerns. Ms. McGettigan requested clarification on the amount of time required when

notifying a property owner of a nomination and asked if the requirement is 30 days. Ms. Cooperman affirmed and stated that the Rules & Regulations stipulate that property owners must receive notice of a pending nomination 30 days in advance of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Mr. Farnham clarified that 30 days notice is required for an individually nominated property and 60 days notice is required for a district nomination. Ms. McGettigan suggested that the stipulated number of days provides sufficient time to allow the property to prepare a challenge.

48-62 E PENN ST
Name of Resource: Mifflin-Cope House
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Waring House LLC
Nominator: Historic Germantown
Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 48-62 E. Penn Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and E. The nomination contends that the Mifflin-Cope House exemplifies upper-middle-class Victorian architecture from the first period of suburban development in Germantown. The nomination also asserts that the property merits designation based on its association with architect Addison Hutton and owners Lloyd Mifflin, Marmaduke Cope, and the Waring family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 48-62 E. Penn Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and E.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property. Joe McCarthy of Historic Germantown represented the nomination.

Mr. McCarthy remarked that, as a near neighbor, he has watched the building deteriorate over time. He indicated that the house once served as the headquarters of the Germantown Settlement and has had no other use for approximately 15 years. Since the disuse of the building, Mr. McCarthy continued, it has been sold by the FDIC to a blind LLC. He stated that efforts to contact the owner have failed. The structure, he continued, is part of an assembly of like buildings on the unit block of E. Penn Street that were erected by like-minded Quakers. The property at 48-62 E. Penn Street, Mr. McCarthy noted, is integral to the block. He described the sensitive historic addition to the building and the structure's general evolution since construction.

Mr. Cohen commented that he found the nomination to be impressive with its genealogical content and fire insurance documentation

Mr. Schaaf observed that the relationship to architect Addison Hutton is significant, particularly because Hutton was a Quaker who served as a principal designer and supported the enclave on E. Penn Street.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 48-62 E Penn Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and E.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

(a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;

(b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;

(c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;

(d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;

(e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;

(f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;

(g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;

(h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;

(i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or

(j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.

DRAFT