REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

THURSDAY, 17 MARCH 2016, 9:30 A.M.
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
JEFFERY COHEN, PH.D., ACTING CHAIR

PRESENT
Jeffery Cohen, Ph.D., acting chair
David Schaaf, R.A., Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Bruce Laverty
Douglas Mooney

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

ALSO PRESENT
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joseph Menkevich
John Manton
Oscar Beisert
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Emily Cooperman, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP
Gregory Lattanzi
Kathy Dowdell, AIA Philadelphia
Ken Milano
Murray B. Dolfman
Frances H. Dolfman
Jean Bruno
George Thomas
Michael Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr LLP
Sonja Lengel, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Claire Sasko, Philadelphia Neighborhoods
Malcolm Burnley, Philadelphia Magazine
Darin Steinberg
Deirdre Godin
John Toner
Michael Timeo
Reaves Lukens
Celeste Morello
Dana Fedeli
Brian Dragon
Leon Brantley, State Representative Jason Dawkins
Andy Mulson
Steve Orszewski
Joe Bergan

DRAFT

David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Sean Whalen, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
Rich Orlow
Andrew Fearon
J. M. Duffin
Justin K. Coleman
Jason Nusbaum
Darrell R. Bradsbery, Second Baptist Church of Frankford
Pat Loeb, KYW
Paul Horros, Elm Street Management
Debbie Klak
Bob Smiley, Frankford Gazette
Evan Graves
Hakim Mubarak, Councilwoman Maria D. Quinones Sanchez
Rafael Alvarez, Councilwoman Maria D. Quinones Sanchez
Aaron Wunsch

CALL TO ORDER

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

101A, 109, AND 111 W GRAVERS LANE (FORMERLY 101 W GRAVERS LANE)

Nominator: Jennifer Robinson
Owner: 101 Gravers LLC

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 101A, 109, and 111 W. Gravers Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. At the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of the consideration of the nomination, the property was known as 101 W. Gravers Lane. Since the initial notice was sent, the property has been subdivided into 101A, 109, and 111 W Gravers Lane. The proposed boundary in the nomination includes all three parcels.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, H, I, and J. The nomination argues that the single-family residence, with the main block constructed by stonemason Lewis Headman in 1867 and 1868, is a well-preserved example of a vernacular interpretation of an architect-designed dwelling. The nomination also contends that the building is significant for being a visual landmark in Chestnut Hill, owing to its location on a corner lot, and that the site may be likely to yield information important in history, as the house sits approximately on the site of the former Union Chapel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 101 W. Gravers Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, but not Criteria H and I. The staff suggests that Criterion H, which reads “Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City,” should be reserved for truly unique locations and buildings with truly singular characteristics like City Hall, Philadelphia Museum of Art, New Market Headhouse, Fairmount Waterworks, and Boathouse Row. Regarding Criterion I, the archaeology criterion, the staff notes that records indicate that the former Union Chapel was not

located at this property, but on an adjacent 30' x 50' site that is now part of the roadbed of Shawnee Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Gregory Lattanzi represented the nomination. Attorney David Fineman represented the property owner.

Mr. Lattanzi stated that the nominator, Jennifer Robinson, emailed the staff of the Historical Commission on 8 March 2016 to request that he represent the nomination and speak on her behalf at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Mr. Lattanzi explained that those who support the nomination have been working with the developers of 101A, 109, and 111 W. Gravers Lane to come to an agreement. He stated that the nominator would like to withdraw the properties at 109 and 111 from the nomination and pursue the designation of 101A W. Gravers Lane only. Mr. Fineman commented that the property owner does not object to Mr. Lattanzi's request.

Mr. Lattanzi asked the Committee if he would need to revise the nomination's boundary description to reflect the change under discussion. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff would revise the nomination before it is presented to the Historical Commission to reflect the withdrawal of the two vacant parcels adjacent to the parcel on which the house stands.

Mr. Laverty asked for a clarification on how Criterion H is interpreted and whether it was a staff-generated interpretation. Mr. Farnham read the definition, which states that Criterion H allows the Historical Commission to designate a property if, owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, it represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City. Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that in the past the Historical Commission has agreed with the staff's interpretation of the criterion, although perhaps not explicitly, and explained that many recent nominations proposed that properties be designated under Criterion H. The staff felt that the criterion was being overused, and agreed that the language of the criterion emphasizing a *unique* location or *singular* physical characteristic was important to differentiate sites that meet the criterion from sites that, while visually interesting, did not rise to the same level to be deemed unique and singular. The staff proposed a definition of the criterion to include, for example, properties along Boathouse Row, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, or City Hall. Because of their location on a river, an important corner, or the end of a boulevard, they were truly unique and indeed had singular physical characteristics that distinguished them from sites that held a significant and interesting building but one that does not necessarily rise to the level of the examples stated. Mr. Farnham added that the staff will defer to the Committee on the interpretation of the criterion. Mr. Laverty responded that it seemed to be the first time he had gotten clarification that included examples to indicate that the site or building needed to meet a certain threshold.

Mr. Cohen commented that the nomination had stronger arguments for Criterion J, in that the building is characteristic and important in the local setting rather than being unique in a larger context. Mr. Schaaf applauded the staff for clarifying aspects of the nomination, which had previously placed the Union Chapel on one of the parcels originally under consideration for designation. The staff had determined that the Union Chapel was located at an adjacent site, now part of the roadbed of Shawnee Street. Mr. Schaaf felt it was an important clarification.

Mr. Cohen asked whether the property under consideration is in the 9th Ward. After some discussion, it was confirmed that the property is located in the 9th Ward.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property, as amended to include 101A W. Gravers Lane only, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

30 W CHESTNUT HILL AVENUE, EDWARD V. DOUGLAS HOUSE

Nominator: James A. Ounsworth, neighbor (prepared by Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.), Neighbors of 30 West Chestnut Hill Avenue
Owner: David and Judith Buten

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. The nomination contends that the property is significant as a reflection of the distinctive architectural style of the environment of the 1880s in the suburban parts of the City; that it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Queen Anne style; and that it is a representative work of important Philadelphia architect T.P. Chandler.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Darren Steinberg, attorney for the neighbors who submitted the nomination, and architectural historian Emily Cooperman, who prepared the nomination, represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman explained that she prepared the nomination relatively quickly, but that the arguments for designation were extraordinarily clear. She noted that the building is significant because it represents a particular class of important architecture by architect T.P Chandler in the City of Philadelphia. Although a smaller-scale project than many of his better-known commissions, she continued, the property still embodies the earmarks of Chandler's design style, and is a relatively rare surviving example of Chandler's work in Philadelphia. She noted that the materials of the building were carefully chosen, and that it was impressive that the original windows, which have unique designs, are still present, as are the other features such as its rear porch with its historic railing and details. She noted that it was a pleasure to write the nomination because it was nice to think about the building as well as its context in Chestnut Hill, and the heritage of the City.

Neighbor John Toner, a resident of 20 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue and member of the Neighbors of 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue group, stated that the neighbors ardently support the nomination, and have collected signatures from 250 neighbors in support of the designation of the property. He noted that he prepared additional comments, but given the length of the meeting agenda, would forgo those; however, he commented that more members of the community would attend the Commission meeting to voice their support. He asked that the Committee rule favorably on the nomination for the neighborhood, and for the preservation of Chestnut Hill. He asked that, if this property could not be saved, which property in Chestnut Hill could be.

Lori Salganicoff, executive director of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society, voiced her organization's support of the nomination. She stated that the Historical Society has hosted several community meetings with the developer, and is interested in seeing the building preserved.

The representative of the owner, attorney Sean Whalen of Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg, stated that the owner objects to the nomination. He distributed a letter to the Committee members, noting that he had submitted the same letter that morning to the Commission's staff. He requested that the letter be added to the record. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Whalen to provide his fundamental argument. Mr. Whalen responded that there is a pending Board of License & Inspection Review appeal, scheduled for 5 April 2016, and stated that there was a "sordid history" on the project and the timing of the nomination. Mr. Whalen noted that, with the length of the Committee's agenda, it did not warrant discussion at that time. Mr. Steinberg responded that the neighbors would strenuously oppose the appeal, if it occurs.

Mr. Cohen asked for additional public comment; hearing none, he directed the Committee's attention back to the nomination. Mr. Schaaf opined that the nomination demonstrates sufficient evidence that the property merits designation under Criteria C, D, and E. He stated that the nomination is complete, and there is nothing missing. He noted that, in light of the fact that many Chandler houses in Chestnut Hill have been lost, it would be prudent of the Commission to designate the property.

Mr. Cohen noted that it is a terrific house, and similar to a neighboring house, which he called its "twin separated at birth." He opined that the property is stronger as an inventive work of an important architect than for a particular architectural style. He noted that it is intriguing how similar it is to the nearby Dunn house, a building constructed within one year of the Douglas House. Mr. Cohen stated that he completely endorses the nomination of the property.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 30 W. Chestnut Hill Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

1105-09 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed as two separate buildings in the late nineteenth century, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, but that the nomination does not make cogent arguments for Criteria C and H. The staff suggests that Criterion H, which reads "Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City,"

should be reserved for truly unique locations and buildings with truly singular characteristics like City Hall, Philadelphia Museum of Art, New Market Headhouse, Fairmount Waterworks, and Boathouse Row. The staff recommends that the nomination be edited for clarity, conciseness, and the elimination of typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. Owners Reaves Lukens, Ed Paul, and Michael Timeo represented the property.

Mr. Beisert noted that the Society for Industrial Archaeology had deemed the property the "earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown." Mr. Laverty responded that he read that in the nominations for this string of properties, but noted that it is hard to prove a negative.

Mr. Schaaf lamented the lack of information presented in the nomination on the history of the specific building as it related to the larger complex of buildings. He explained that 1105-09 Frankford Avenue was the office and belt machine department, that 1111-13 was the electric and gear department, but none of the histories of the specific buildings that were part of the complex of buildings in the Morse/Otis elevator companies are discussed. He noted that the complex is composed of nine properties, all of which likely comprise what the Society of Industrial Archaeology was referring to, and questioned why Mr. Beisert only nominated some of them. Mr. Beisert responded that he had limited volunteer time and that he chose the buildings along Frankford Avenue because Frankford Avenue is losing much of its historic fabric to new construction. He stated that the complex of buildings has a strong presence on Frankford Avenue, and that the whole complex could be nominated. Mr. Schaaf reiterated that he would like to see more in each individual nomination about the activities that occurred in the building, noting that there is documentation of the building uses on the 1916 Sanborn map.

Community members Ken Milano, Andrew Fearon, and Dana Fedeli advocated for the designation of the Frankford Avenue properties. Mr. Milano commented that the other buildings in the complex have been rehabilitated and have uses, and thus are not as threatened as the properties along Frankford Avenue. Mr. Milano argued for Criterion H, opining that Frankford Avenue is one of the gateways to Fishtown, and when one exits off of Delaware Avenue, these properties are some of the first buildings visible in the neighborhood. He noted that their industrial quality provides context for the neighborhood, and the neighbors would like to keep them. Mr. Beisert proffered that La Colombe was an excellent example of the adaptive reuse of an industrial building. Mr. Fearon noted that the landscape of the area is rapidly changing, and members of the community support the retention of Fishtown's industrial heritage. Ms. Fedeli, a representative of 17 neighbors who comprise a group known as the Neighborhood Preservation Alliance, also voiced her support for the nomination, noting that the neighbors feel strongly that the buildings should be saved.

Mr. Paul stated that he has owned the properties at 1105-09 and 1111-13 Frankford Avenue for over 20 years, and has sustained great cost to own the properties, partially because the City has not performing its regulatory functions sufficiently. He noted that, until its recent renovation, the property next door was causing damage to his property. He opined that it was a vagrant property, and that people would climb out the second-floor windows of the adjacent property onto his roof and cause damage. He stated that his property was so damaged that he had to pay exorbitant insurance premiums, and that they had to get Lloyds of London insurance, which is of the poorest quality and highest price. Mr. Paul claimed that he sought the City's help with the problem building, which he did not receive, and objected to the potential impediment of designation.

Mr. Timeo opined that no one cared about the property for over one hundred years until the current ownership, who, he claimed, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to improve the property over the last 30 years. Now, he objected, someone else wants to come in and regulate the property. The only thing important about the properties, he commented, is their age. He stated that the only reason the properties are still standing is because of the current ownership.

Mr. Lukens, a co-owner, opined that designation would add insult to injury, after the property had already sustained thousands of dollars in damage by the neighbors, who destroyed the roof. The building has also had a recent sewer repair, he noted. Mr. Lukens stated that they are trying to make something of the building, and do not need any help.

Mr. Cohen mused that the building complex would be better as a historic district, and asked Mr. Farnham if that was a possibility. Mr. Farnham responded that the area has the potential for a historic district, but the nominations at hand are for individual properties. He noted that the Committee acted on the first of four nominations for the complex of buildings at its last meeting, and nominations for the other three buildings are now under consideration. Mr. Cohen noted that the arguments for designation are nearly identical for all of the properties (1101-03, 1105-09, 1111-13, and 1115-27 Frankford Avenue).

Mr. Schaaf noted that the staff suggested that the nominations only satisfied Criteria A and J. He opined that the Commission had already designated the most high-style building in the complex with the designation of 1101-03 Frankford Avenue. Mr. Beisert disagreed.

Mr. Schaaf remarked on the profound legacy of the Morse Elevator Works, suggesting that this complex might be the most significant site in elevator technology in the country. He opined that the Morse and Otis legacy may make the complex one of the longest running sites in elevator history, having lasted from the mid nineteenth century to 1946.

Mr. Cohen sympathized with the owners, but noted that the Committee's review is limited to the merits of the nominations, and that the nominator made a cogent argument for the Criteria A and J. Mr. Paul replied that, as an architect, the properties are not architecturally significant. Mr. Laverty responded that they have discounted the architectural criterion, and that the Criteria for Designation A and J relate to the historical significance, rather than the architectural significance, of the properties. Mr. Schaaf reiterated the significance of the long-running Morse and Otis elevator companies, adding that it might be one of the longest-running in the world. Mr. Timeo asked whether Mr. Schaaf knew if it was, in fact, the oldest. Mr. Laverty noted it may not be the oldest, but perhaps the longest-running.

Mr. Laverty noted that the nomination forms for 1105-09 and 1111-13 Frankford Avenue list Mr. Beisert, the nominator, as the owner of the properties, and suggested that they be corrected.

Mr. Cohen addressed Mr. Beisert, noting that the nominations relied too heavily on pages-long quotations, and that he should distill that information, and avoid such quotations in future nominations. He noted that these nominations did not need to provide a history of the neighborhood from the beginning, but could have begun with nineteenth-century Fishtown industry. Mr. Schaaf agreed, reiterating that he would like to see more specific discussion of each building.

Mr. Timeo asked if Criteria A and J impacted the whole building, or just the façade. Mr. Schaaf responded that there are 10 Criteria for Designation, and that a nomination only needs to meet

one to qualify it for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf noted that the Committee's recommendation is advisory to the full Commission, and that the owners were welcome to attend the Commission meeting in April to make their case there as well. Mr. Farnham clarified that the Committee seems to be proposing that the building satisfies two Criteria for Designation, and if the Historical Commission agrees, it then has the opportunity to designate the property. He noted that the Commission may, but is not required, to designate a property if it meets one or more of the Criteria. He added that, when the Commission designates, it designates the site, any buildings on the site, and the exterior envelopes of those buildings, including roofs and walls, but nothing in the interior, nothing buried within the building. That being said, he continued, the Commission has a long-standing practice of treating parts of the exterior that are out of the public view or that are secondary with much lower standards than it treats the primary, street-facing facades.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

1111-13 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Frankford Avenue Properties, Inc.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1111-13 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1899, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, but that the nomination does not make cogent arguments for Criteria C and H. The staff suggests that Criterion H, which reads "Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City," should be reserved for truly unique locations and buildings with truly singular characteristics like City Hall, Philadelphia Museum of Art, New Market Headhouse, Fairmount Waterworks, and Boathouse Row. The staff recommends that the nomination be edited for clarity, conciseness, and the elimination of typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. Owners Reaves Lukens, Ed Paul, and Michael Timeo represented the property.

Mr. Cohen asked if there were any additional comments that had not been made in the previous nomination's review.

Mr. Timeo opined that the reason the community members are here today is because of the countless dollars that the owners have put into the properties over the years. Neighbors Ken Milano and Dana Fedeli disagreed. Mr. Timeo stressed that it is unfair that the properties are being nominated now, and questioned where the concerned neighbors were 20 years ago. Mr. Milano responded that the owners have been sitting on the properties for over 20 years, and the buildings are now danger of being demolished. Mr. Timeo responded that that is false.

Mr. Cohen directed the conversation to historic significance of the properties, noting that the historical significance is the only pertinent topic for the Committee. He sympathized with the owners' expenditures, expressing his hope that the properties appreciate in value, but noting that that is outside the Committee's purview. Mr. Timeo responded that the neighbors have that on their side. Mr. Cohen responded that neither of those things is pertinent to the Committee. Mr. Laverty stated that historical significance can be different than architectural significance, which is why they removed Criterion C from the previous recommendation.

Mr. Mooney noted that designation does not preclude adaptive reuse or redevelopment of the properties, and in fact, that is encouraged as a way to preserve the buildings. Mr. Farnham agreed, adding that the Historical Commission does not seek to prevent change to buildings, but only to manage that change so that it satisfies historic preservation standards. He indicated that there would certainly be opportunities to redevelop the properties if placed under the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. Schaaf reiterated his point from the previous review that he would like to see a discussion of what occurred in these buildings in the nominations. He commented that 100 years ago, this property was the Electric and Gear Department of Otis Elevators, and there should be some discussion of that in the nomination. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Beisert whether that could be a friendly amendment, and whether he could write about the distinct activities for each building. Mr. Schaaf noted that there was an intricate floor plan, and that he thinks discussing the uses of the properties and their adjacencies is important.

Mr. Laverty recommended checking whether there was a Hexamer General Survey prior to 1916. Mr. Beisert responded that there was one, but it only included some of the buildings in the complex.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1111-13 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

1115-27 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: (Owner of Record) Driscoll Construction Co.; (New owner) 1115-27 Frankford Dris, LP.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1115-27 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1902, is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works (1886-1910), and the Otis Elevator Company (1910s-1940s), as well as for its association with Steven A. Morse, an eminent inventor and manufacturer. The nomination further contends that the property is architecturally significant as representative of the Italianate style and architectural forms that were popularized by large industrial enterprises

of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The nomination opines that the complex is the earliest, extant, coherent industrial complex in Fishtown, and as such, represents a familiar and established visual feature of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1105-09 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, but that the nomination does not make cogent arguments for Criteria C and H. The staff suggests that Criterion H, which reads "Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City," should be reserved for truly unique locations and buildings with truly singular characteristics like City Hall, Philadelphia Museum of Art, New Market Headhouse, Fairmount Waterworks, and Boathouse Row. The staff recommends that the nomination be edited for clarity, conciseness, and the elimination of typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. New owner Jason Nusbaum represented the property.

Community member Ken Milano stated that he would not have been here 20 years ago, but that the current building would not have been in danger of being demolished. He noted that houses are being built on the lot next door, which extends to Shackamaxon Street. He stated that he assumes this whole block of buildings will be demolished. Mr. Beisert commented that he is in attendance mainly because the buildings are historic.

Mr. Nusbaum stated that he and his partner recently purchased the property, along with the vacant land next to it, and the vacant property across the street. He noted that they own several properties above Girard Avenue along Frankford Avenue, and have been looking at these parcels for the last five years trying to get the owners to sell them because they felt they are a blighting influence on the neighborhood. He opined that their reputation speaks for the type of work that they do, and presented a letter for the record. Over the past 25 years, he noted, he and his partner have rehabilitated and redeveloped more than 20 properties in the Philadelphia area, some of which are in historic districts. He stated that their moral compass as a developer is to try to preserve historic heritage and fabric of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Cohen asked the name of Mr. Nusbaum's firm. Mr. Nusbaum responded that his company is City Living Philly and his partner is Roland Kassis of Kassis Development, and that they purchased the property in February of this year.

Mr. Nusbaum objected to the idea of being "hamstrung" by yet another Commission that has to have a say in the ultimate development of the parcels. He noted that the area has recently been remapped from I-2 Industrial to CMX-2.5, and with that comes bonuses of additional height and density. While he would like to adaptively reuse the property and retain the façade, he would like to know that the Historical Commission understands the complexities of such a development and will work with them to achieve a development that is economically viable for the neighborhood.

Mr. Nusbaum stated that the goal of historic preservation is incumbent upon every property owner in Philadelphia for the betterment of the city, but what concerns him is the "zealot" approach of Mr. Beisert. He opined that it is an abuse of the preservation code to allow someone who does not have an economic stake in a property to go around the city and nominate properties for designation to the point where Mr. Beisert's nomination forms

mistakenly identify himself as the property owner. Mr. Nusbaum noted that he and his partner are not totally averse to a designation, but do contend that the process of designation should be examined. He opined that designation is a slap in the face to owners who try to do the right thing.

Mr. Laverty responded that it was never his intention to imply that Mr. Beisert attempted to deceive the staff or the Commission into thinking he was the property owner, but that he just wanted to point out an error and have the paperwork corrected. He opined that Mr. Beisert has done a fine job in his work in nominating properties all over the city.

Community member Dana Fedeli disagreed with Mr. Nusbaum, speaking on behalf of neighbors for whom these properties hold family ties. She commented that these buildings are part of their lives and the lives of their family members who worked there and lived in the community. Ms. Fedeli added that there is plenty of new construction, but for long-time residents to remain in the community, there needs to be room for saving historic buildings. She sympathized with the economic concern of the owner, but noted that there are economics in place that would allow the properties to be reused. These properties are one of the first things that people see when they enter Fishtown, Ms. Fedeli continued, and that is one of the things that attract people to the area.

Community member Andrew Fearon expressed his support for the nomination, stating that these properties have significance to the neighborhood. He noted that he is concerned that buildings in the neighborhood are being demolished at an alarming rate, and he is nominating buildings to save them. He noted his willingness to work with developers to make the properties economically viable. Ms. Fedeli commented that they have worked with developers in the past to adaptively reuse buildings in the neighborhood, but agreed that the process of designation is frustrating. She stated that they are not anti-development, but that they care about these places.

Mr. Nusbaum agreed with the neighbors, but reiterated his objection to designation. He noted that his partner has preserved many buildings such as La Colombe and Frankford Hall without the Historical Commission's review. He agreed that this is a gateway corridor from Columbus to Girard Avenue. He reiterated his point that the designation process is flawed, and added that he would like to work with the community and to generally preserve the façade, but would like to have the ability to develop it economically. He noted that they would like to have the flexibility to add floors if necessary, and to make changes to the façade to make it more inviting and adaptively reusable without having to appear before the Historical Commission, which is just another added layer of organizational input.

Mr. Beisert responded that he was insulted by Mr. Nusbaum's comments, noting that he had identified a problem with demolition in Philadelphia, that he has heard people in communities say that they are disturbed by the amount of demolition in their communities. He stated that his efforts are largely volunteer efforts, and that it is his right to nominate buildings. He opined that only two to three percent of Philadelphia's built environment is designated, which is a much smaller percentage than most cities on the East Coast. Mr. Nusbaum asked Mr. Beisert if he had preserved any properties himself. Mr. Beisert responded that he renovated three houses.

Mr. Schaaf encouraged Mr. Nusbaum to work with the professional staff of the Historical Commission, who he stressed were an excellent resource for enhancing the value of a project. He noted that the staff would provide technical assistance pro bono. Mr. Nusbaum responded that he has worked with Randy Baron of the staff of the Historical Commission since 1994, and

that Randy is the first person he calls when he has a new project. He lauded Mr. Baron for his assistance over the years, and noted that often the new use for his properties is the historic use.

Mr. Schaaf directed the Committee's attention back to the nomination. He noted that this building is the newest of the complex, having been constructed in 1902. He opined that the building, which was the former Hydraulic and Machine Shop for both Morse and Otis Elevator companies, would have been important to the function of the companies.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1115-27 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

1416-22 FRANKFORD AVENUE, 10TH DISTRICT PATROL STABLE

Nominator: Andrew Fearon, Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC.
Owner: Stablefish, LLC.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1416-22 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the building, constructed in 1891-92 as a police patrol stable, is significant as an example of the commitment of the Bureau of Police to enlarging its services city-wide through the construction of police stations and patrol houses. The nomination contends that the building is significant for its eclectic architectural style, which was popular in the late nineteenth century, and embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Victorian Gothic and Romanesque Revival styles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1416-22 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation D; it embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style. The staff recommends the nomination fails to make cogent cases for the satisfaction of Criteria C and J. Regarding Criterion C, the nomination may successfully argue that the building is constructed in a distinctive architectural style, but it makes no attempt to explain how the building reflects an environment in an era characterized by that style. The line of reasoning regarding building typology is wholly unconvincing. The nomination makes the claim that the building typology is significant, but neither defines that typology nor explains how or why it is significant. The line of reasoning regarding Criterion J is likewise wholly unconvincing. The nomination makes the claim that the building satisfies Criterion J because it is representative of the growth of the neighborhood and city and the concomitant growth of government services and infrastructure, but explains how this particular building exemplifies the growth of the city or City services. According to this circular logic, every building built while Philadelphia is growing would be historically significant because it is evidence of growth. The staff also recommends that the nomination be edited for clarity, conciseness, and the elimination of grammatical, typographical, and other errors. For example, the Bureau of Police is routinely incorrectly referred to as the Police Bureau.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Andrew Fearon represented the nomination. Paul Horos represented the property owners.

Ken Milano, a contributor to the nomination, stated that the rest of the block has been demolished, and new buildings are being built all around. He commented that his fear was that

this building, which sits on a large lot, was also going to be demolished. He added that it is difficult to contact the property owners of many of these larger parcels that are owned by LLCs.

Mr. Fearon argued for Criterion J, opining that the building holds significant social heritage, as he cannot think of anything more iconic than a police station. Architecturally, he continued, the property has significant features and is valued as an architectural and social landmark. He praised the new owners who seem to be excellent stewards of the property.

Mr. Horos stated that one of the reasons he purchased the property was because of the architecture of the building itself, and he has every intention of preserving the building. He assuaged the nominators' concerns about demolition, noting that he plans to develop on the large lot but retain the historic building itself.

Mr. Cohen argued in favor of Criterion J as well, explicating that the property is emblematic of the sweep of city services into the areas that, until the Act of Consolidation in 1854, were not part of the city. He noted that the property has a distinctive face, and that many of the police and fire stations of the 1890s, including many designed by John T. Windrim, are of a very distinctive late-Victorian style. Mr. Fearon responded that they have reason to believe that this property may have been designed by John T. Windrim. Mr. Cohen noted that there is probably a record somewhere to that effect. Mr. Cohen stated that a critical point that is not quite made in the nomination is that the property is distinctive of the late-Victorian style; it is of a new era, as opposed to High Victorian. He reiterated that it has a distinctive face, a face that is of city government reaching into new neighborhoods for the first time. He noted that it is a strange building that defies strict characterization, but that it is representative of a very distinctive era. Mr. Schaaf added that in the last year or two the Commission certified an 1894 fire house in Chestnut Hill, which also has a grand arch with voussoirs, and is similar to the property in question.

Mr. Cohen identified some minor corrections, including the name Ballinger rather than Bellinger.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1416-22 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

81-95 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Nominators: Richelle Gewertz and Sonja Lengel, PCPC Interns; Oscar Beisert, Jim Duffin, c/o Laura Spina
Owner: VMDT Partnership

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the rowhouses at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, H, and J. The nomination states that the row is the oldest intact row of houses in Philadelphia between the Delaware River and Front Street, and represents the development of Northern Liberties, as well as Coates Street (now Fairmount Avenue). The nomination argues that the rowhouses are typical of the Federal style of architecture in Philadelphia, and owing to their age, represent a longtime familiar visual feature of Philadelphia's built environment. The nomination further argues that the rowhouses exemplify the cultural, economic, social and historic heritage of the Beach Street Mission, later known as the Friends Mission No 1, which was the first Guild House in the neighborhood started by local Quakers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the rowhouses at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation A, D, and J, but not Criterion H. The staff suggests that Criterion H, which reads "Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City," should be reserved for truly unique locations and buildings with truly singular characteristics like City Hall, Philadelphia Museum of Art, New Market Headhouse, Fairmount Waterworks, and Boathouse Row.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination. Oscar Biesert represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Sklaroff, preservation consultant George Thomas, and Rich Orlow, counsel to the ownership, represented the property owner.

Using material prepared by Mr. Thomas and provided to Committee members in advance of the meeting, Mr. Sklaroff distributed graphics to demonstrate the loss of historic fabric within the row of buildings at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue. Mr. Sklaroff then stated that the nomination, with regard to many of the details, is largely without factual basis; that it misrepresents and downplays the extensive loss of historic fabric; that it is either careless or intentionally misleading; and that it does not exhibit the intellectual rigor necessary to encumber private property restrictions. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the first page of the nomination is riddled with misrepresentations and quoted a statement from Section 6, Paragraph 2: "Within the western two bays of the first floor is a very elegant double, Federal-style doorway, which may or may not be original." Mr. Sklaroff contended that someone with a basic understanding of historic preservation could identify the doorway as later fabric, and he referenced a photograph in the nomination's appendix that shows that the end unit did not include the doorway at the time the photograph was taken. Mr. Sklaroff quoted a second statement from the first page of the nomination: "While the façade has remained largely intact, there are some signs of alteration." Mr. Sklaroff asked the Committee to judge whether the statement was true or a misrepresentation. He asserted that he found it misleading, and read another statement from the same paragraph of the nomination: "Several of the original doors have been filled in with windows and brick." Mr. Sklaroff summarized his sentiments by stating that the nomination is deceptive, and to take it seriously is to be indifferent to the requirements of the Historical Commission's code. Mr. Sklaroff then asked Mr. Thomas for his evaluation of the nomination.

Mr. Thomas also expressed his dissatisfaction with the nomination. He, like Mr. Sklaroff, felt it was intentionally deceptive, grossly in error, and referred to it as an embarrassment. Mr. Thomas addressed the Committee members by stating that the writers of the nomination did the Committee a disservice by not honestly presenting the material. Mr. Thomas had visited the site prior to the meeting to carefully assess the buildings and said he became aware of the extent of alterations at that time. He stated that the buildings are so altered that they cannot be considered a row of houses, since a row of houses has, by definition, separate units that are represented by their front rooms and front steps. In this case, he argued, all of those elements have been removed. This type of house was designed with back to back chimneys to maximize efficiency, and Mr. Thomas indicated that two of the three major chimneys between units have been removed. Those changes, he claimed, should have caused the nominators to question the buildings' integrity. In his report, Mr. Thomas wrote that the entire interior of the party walls, the structure that defines the rowhouses, is gone. Only some aspects, or elements, of the main façade remain. A graphic presented to the Committee showed where Mr. Thomas placed red rectangles over all the windows of the first and second stories. He added that the dormers should be included in red. The red rectangles represented replacement, and Mr. Thomas stated every single window is a modern aluminum window with plastic snap-in muntins. He further

elaborated that the chimneys, or skyline, of the building is broken, and the main rhythmic elements of the doorways have been compromised. He noted that a close examination of the building reveals that the shutters described in the nomination are, based on the photographs also provided in the nomination, at least third generation. Mr. Thomas explained that the current shutters are plywood with applied raised molding, not the paneled or louvered shutters that would have originally been in place, which indicates that all of that fabric has been changed. In a graphic provided to the Committee, Mr. Thompson used blue shading to identify areas where the brick of the façade had been rebuilt during the twentieth century and clarified that it is not nineteenth-century brick. He stated that the alterations made it possible to remove the original windows around the doors, remove all the doors, and brick in those openings. He concluded that all of the fabric described had been removed and is clearly altered.

Mr. Sklaroff directed a question to Mr. Thomas, asking if there is any recognition in the nomination of the loss of fabric outlined by Mr. Thomas. Mr. Thomas replied that there is not, and quoted a statement from the nomination: “While the façade has remained largely intact, there are some signs of alteration.” Mr. Thomas stated that all of the original doors have been infilled. He then pointed out that while the nomination assumes alterations have occurred to the interior and although it claims the original plan remains unknown, the insurance survey at the end of the nomination clearly illustrates the original building plan. He explained that the plan of the nominated buildings followed the standard London townhouse design, which consisted of a front room, a rear room, and side passage that led to the front door; the design would then be paired rhythmically down the entire block. Mr. Thomas contended that the buildings no longer represent this design and that they have been converted to an industrial loft with the townhouse elements removed. He felt that they in no way satisfy the Criteria, because they are no longer a Federal style row, or a row at all. He further argued that the buildings are no longer residential and no longer depict the intended architectural character or style, because all the original craft elements had been removed when the buildings were gutted and transformed. Mr. Thomas provided the Committee with a photograph he had taken from the building interior that showed the length of the attic and stated that where an observer would typically only see for 12 feet, the photograph showed the entire length of the row, because all the party walls have been removed.

Mr. Thomas offered the following metaphors: “If you had an Easter bunny and somebody had bitten off the ears and head and tail, you could probably tell it was an Easter bunny;” and “If you were driving along and saw a dead animal that had been flattened road kill, and you could see that it had a striped tail, it was probably a raccoon.” Mr. Thomas elaborated that the building, though it maintains historical connections, has had each of its elements replaced and misplaced. He concluded that, point by point, the nomination fails to convince the reader that the building is worthy of designation.

Following the arguments presented by Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Thomas, Mr. Beisert clarified that he is only a contributor to the nomination, which was also authored by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Mr. Beisert stated that he and Jim Duffin had submitted a more detailed nomination but felt it was best to collaborate with the City Planning Commission. He then defended the nomination by contending that, while there have been substantial changes to the façade of the Fairmount Avenue row, equally extensive changes are evident in Society Hill. Mr. Beisert argued that photographs of Society Hill show many historic buildings that had been drastically altered, especially at the primary elevation, and that those façades were not only restored using twentieth-century brick and twentieth-century doors, but the buildings were placed on the Philadelphia Register following restoration. He explained that many of the Society Hill houses, while they now form a historic district, were individually designated before the

Commission could create historic districts. He argued that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue is an even stronger contender for designation, because the buildings survive as a row of eight units. Mr. Beisert stated that, while they may have been altered and chimneys may have been removed, the buildings maintain a very strong cohesion as a row, unlike many of the individual houses in Society Hill. In his original nomination, Mr. Beisert noted that he had argued that the purchase and restoration of the row by the Terminal Warehouse Company was an early adaptive reuse project. He stated that many people who have visited the site are surprised the buildings are not already listed on the Philadelphia Register and said, despite the claims against their integrity, the row is simply another group of undesignated buildings.

Aaron Wunsch, professor of architectural history in the University of Pennsylvania's historic preservation program, explained that he had visited the site several times and had long been impressed with it. Mr. Wunsch underscored and expanded on certain points presented by Mr. Beisert in a statement he read:

> The opponents of the designation have testified that the row in question should not be designated because it has lost large amounts of its original fabric. By the standard, however, virtually any block in Society Hill should be demolished. The point that really needs to be made at this meeting is precisely that. In the age where we are often reminded of the value of Ed Bacon's legacy, we seem prepared to ignore one of its most salient lessons. That form, massing, and block-scale fabric are keys to historic preservation. Until the mid-twentieth century, Society Hill and the neighborhood we are looking at had a fair amount in common. Much of their fabric consisted of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century rowhouses, shops, offices, warehouses, and small industries. By the time Society Hill's rowhouses were restored, they lost almost every original window. Most had storefronts that were ripped out and were replaced in the same Colonial Revival spirit that restored this row in the 1920s. Indeed, from a strictly architectural perspective, the restoration undertaken by owner Thomas D. Sullivan in the 1920s was better than a lot of what was done in Society Hill. The result was what we have got today. Impressive enough to attract the attention of the Planning Commission, whose plan for this area identified this row as something worth preserving. 81-95 Fairmount relates to surviving rowhouses just to the west. But it is taller, more impressive and more cohesive than they are. It's the most visible reminder we have that this neighborhood once had grand blocks like those that had been restored within an inch of their life elsewhere in the city. Finally, while the current nomination may seem deficient in some regards, the original that the commission received a few months ago was more thorough and was subsequently tailored at the city's suggestion. It's one thing to say also that this nomination is flawed or that it is sloppy, which it may be. It's another to testify that it was intentionally deceptive. That's not only difficult to prove. It's potentially libelous, and I would encourage you to think of it in that light.

Community member Andrew Fearon stated his interest in the Lower River Wards and voiced his support for the arguments made by Mr. Beisert and Mr. Wunsch in opposition to the claims made by Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Thomas on the row's lack of integrity.

Mr. Schaaf discussed Mr. Wunsch's comments which referenced the block scale of the row. He stated that it is a very significant observation and that the street wall that stands now was in place in 1828. He also noted that the roofscape remains and that the east and west end curtain gables are essentially the same as when the buildings were constructed. He called those features "character-identifying motifs of this block, very handsome." Mr. Schaaf recounted his first experience in Philadelphia, stating that he encountered the "urban mess of the waterfront

Las Vegas," but when he saw the buildings at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue, he thought it was a wonder they still stood and was stunned they held on as long as they had. Mr. Schaaf continued with his own observations of the row's alterations. He stated that all the dormers, features typically lost on buildings of similar age, remain. He indicated that shutters are often lost and are generally irrelevant, since they can be replicated from eighteenth- or nineteenth-century designs. Similarly, he stated that windows are commonly lost. However, he argued against the earlier comments that emphasized the alteration of the first-story windows by indicating that the row's second-story openings remain essentially unchanged from 1828. He again mentioned the extant curtain gables, and stated that three of the original five chimney stacks exist, noting that the placement of the two missing stacks is known. He contended that the features that remain are character-defining. Mr. Schaaf further commented that the buildings are no longer residential, but that buildings are often changed and adapted through time, and a building on the waterfront would be even more likely to be adapted to a new use. He concluded by stating that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue is a block of buildings and that changes to the block have been superficial compared to what remains.

Mr. Sklaroff cautioned Mr. Wunsch not to make accusations of libel and slander, stating that that itself has ramifications. Mr. Thomas asked the nominators to clarify who wrote the nomination. Mr. Beisert responded that it is the City Planning Commission's nomination. Mr. Sklaroff inquired who at the Planning Commission headed the nomination effort. Mr. Beisert stated it was written by several individuals. Mr. Sklaroff again asked who headed the effort. Mr. Schaaf replied that it was written under the direction of Laura Spina. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it gives him great concern, because this property was presented to the Planning Commission in good faith as a property owned by a certain developer for a major project. He added that Laura Spina was aware of those plans. Mr. Sklaroff argued that the Planning Commission's involvement is a reaction to a presentation he and others made of a major development project at 700 N. Delaware Ave. Mr. Schaaf stated that the presentation called for the retention of the nominated buildings. Mr. Sklaroff replied that their retention was open for discussion. Mr. Sklaroff then elaborated that two or three years ago, when the project was presented, his team faced a complex zoning change. He contended that designation of the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue would be an obstacle and asserted that he was not aware that the designation of the property was contemplated by the Planning Commission. He commented that he did not have knowledge of involvement in the nomination beyond that of Mr. Beisert and that the Planning Commission's involvement is new information.

Mr. Schaaf responded that he does not know the extent of Mr. Beisert's involvement in the current nomination. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that he is "trying to get to the point where we can love the nominator, Mr. Beisert, but hate the nomination." Mr. Cohen interjected that he would like to keep the conversation to a level of civility and not accuse anyone of malfeasance. Mr. Cohen asked to discuss the merits of the case rather than continuing to argue about the identities and motivations of the nominators.

Mr. Thomas redirected attention to the screen, which projected a photograph of the row's context. He stated that the setting had not been discussed, although it is important to understand. He claimed that the row had been cut off by I-95 and that the highway destroyed the community located east of I-95. He elaborated that various historic maps, particularly the 1932 and 1962 zoning maps, depict the buildings and blocks disappearing. He pointed to an area that became Philadelphia Transportation Corporation (PTC) parking lots, and stated that the area is now comprised entirely of parking lots, with the exception of a couple of older houses at the edge of Delaware Avenue. Mr. Thomas highlighted an area of an aerial image and identified new housing, parking, and a large structure along the Delaware River. He then stated

that the nominated building would be more fitting in the urban context of Society Hill. Mr. Thomas felt the building has no context in its current setting, because that setting has been so altered.

Mr. Schaaf argued that I-95's construction exposed the edge of some eighteenth-century houses along Front Street immediately adjacent to the highway. He stated that Old Swedes' Church, situated within three hundred feet of I-95, is arguably one of the ornaments of Philadelphia's waterscape. Mr. Thomas commented that Old Swedes' Church remains within the context of residential buildings. Mr. Schaaf replied that his intention was to reference the urban landscape of Philadelphia itself, not specifically Old Swedes' Church.

Mr. Thomas resumed his arguments about the nominated property's context by stating that, since the 1940s, the surrounding area has been a neighborhood of bus parking lots. Mr. Sklaroff pointed to an area above the nominated property and noted that the area is approximately three acres and serves as the Greyhound service facility. He explained that, through collaboration with the Planning Commission, his team seeks to transform the larger area into a vital, mixed-use development with commercial and residential units, with special attention to the public realm. He again noted his lack of awareness of the Planning Commission's involvement in preparing the nomination of the Fairmount Avenue property and argued that the row fails to contribute to the neighborhood. He further explained that the property would be an individual designation that would need to stand on its own merits and stated that the row is not Old Swedes' Church and is not on hallowed ground. He concluded that the property is not properly portrayed in the nomination.

Community member Dana Fedeli asked Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Thomas if they live near the nominated building. Mr. Sklaroff answered that he lives in Spring Garden and has lived in the City of Philadelphia for most of his life. Ms. Fedeli noted that several residential homes exist on Fairmount Avenue and stated that she helped restore one of them. She claimed the area has a residential component and that the first-floor commercial properties along Front Street contain residential units on the upper floors. On the projected aerial image, Ms. Fedeli identified several recently constructed houses near the nominated property. She asserted that the neighbors support the preservation of the building.

Mr. Beisert explained that the reason he initially withdrew the nomination was to remove the wagon house, constructed in the 1850s and located behind the rowhouses, from consideration for designation, because he was unaware of the extent of the plans for development. He elaborated that, for much of the building's history, the area has been industrial and much of that industrial fabric survives. Mr. Beisert identified clusters of historic fabric extant on Spring Garden Street and Fairmount Avenue and noted that, while the residences may be decontextualized now, they were constructed for workers employed along the waterfront. He noted that many of the buildings that housed workers of the waterfront have been lost, and he argued against losing the rowhouses along Fairmount Avenue.

Mr. Orlow spoke on behalf of the property owner and noted that he disagrees with the nomination for the reasons stated to the extent that the property would be nominated and be deemed historic. He explained that, if designation is used to affect the rest of the development, the practical reality would be that the Greyhound facility would likely remain for quite some time. He felt designation would impede the ability to properly reuse the entire block.

Mr. Mooney indicated that the nomination lacks an argument for Criterion I, the site's archaeological potential, and suggested that this criterion be included. He stated that although

there has been discussion about the site's lack of context, lack of setting, and lack of integrity, those issues have no bearing on the archaeological resources that are likely buried beneath the site. Given its unique setting east of Front Street, Mr. Mooney noted that the row of houses was likely constructed on "made ground." He commented that he would like to learn what the buildings are supported on, and that information could contribute to the understanding of Philadelphia's waterfront. The nomination identifies the area from Coates Street (now Fairmount Avenue) and Front Street as once being part of Budd's Wharfed Yard, part of the eighteenth- or possibly seventeenth-century waterfront of Philadelphia. Because of this association, Mr. Mooney believes evidence of that early waterfront is preserved beneath the ground at the nominated site. He continued by stating that archaeological investigations at the West Ship Yard, located several blocks from the nominated property, have demonstrated the continuing preservation of those significant waterfront features that remain below the ground. He elaborated that the Fairmount Avenue properties may also contain artifact deposits associated with the individuals who occupied these homes over the years. These people, he argued, were among the earliest workers on the waterfront, and artifact deposits contained in these properties could have invaluable information in helping scholars understand the lives of the people who lived and worked along the waterfront. Mr. Mooney concluded by strenuously urging that Criterion I be added to the nomination and asked whether it would be possible to do so by tabling and resubmitting the document.

Mr. Farnham replied that the safest course of action would be to amend the nomination and give the property owner the opportunity to review the amended nomination before the Commission acted on it. Mr. Mooney asked if while that occurred, the property would remain under the protection of the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham replied that if the Historical Commission were to table this review, then the property would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction until the Commission reached a decision on its designation.

Mr. Thomas countered that the basements of the buildings were excavated five or six feet below grade. Mr. Mooney replied that the basement excavations would have no bearing on potential artifacts preserved below grade. Mr. Beisert addressed the argument for including Criterion I by stating that he is not an archaeologist and asked for recommendations for an archaeologist who would donate time to help in amending the nomination to include the archaeological component. Mr. Mooney suggested that Mr. Beisert reach out to the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, an organization that could assist with the work.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that Mr. Beisert has contended that the nomination is not his and is the effort of the Planning Commission. Mr. Schaaf disputed the claim. Mr. Sklaroff replied that Mr. Beisert has presented the Planning Commission as the nominator and then asked that the Planning Commission withdraw its nomination under the circumstances. Mr. Cohen stated that anyone can nominate a building. Mr. Sklaroff replied that he understands the nomination process but feels the nomination should be withdrawn under the circumstances presented. Mr. Cohen responded that, to a significant degree, the nominator does not matter, because the Committee is judging the merits of the case. He elaborated that the Committee is judging the case even beyond the merits of the nomination, given the new information presented at the meeting and noted that he is pleased by the discovery of the new information. Mr. Cohen stated his appreciation of Mr. Thomas's reading of the original fabric, especially in recognizing the later installation of the Federal doorways. Mr. Thomas interjected that, when looking holistically at the new masonry and steel lintels of the basement windows, the building dates to the twentieth century.

Mr. Cohen continued to discuss the building's integrity, stating that he has a better read on the original fabric, and while many critical features have been lost, the building retains a great deal of character in its overall form. He indicated that the main question before the Committee is whether, despite the noted losses, the building's overall character, as conveyed through its shape, scale, envelope, and relationship to the street, remains. Mr. Thomas argued that the removal of the party walls has compromised the building's integrity. Mr. Cohen replied that the interior is not under consideration and then opined about Mr. Schaaf's experience of discovering early-nineteenth-century fabric that remained east of I-95 and its significance in anchoring the neighborhood's former identity, which has largely disappeared. Mr. Cohen mentioned a digital collection held by the University of Pennsylvania Archives that contains photographs by Anthony Garvin and John Cotter taken in 1968 that show the area impacted by the construction of I-95. Mr. Cohen noted that the photographs depict a number of individual structures from the residential and mixed-use neighborhood that were left standing after the highway's construction. He contended that the Fairmount Avenue row stands as one of the few and striking vestiges of that fabric. Mr. Cohen reiterated the point made earlier that much of the integrity claimed to be lost was often lacking in many Society Hill buildings in the 1950s. He explained that numerous buildings contained ground-level shops, old fabric had been removed, and new fabric used to create shops had been installed. He used the 400 block of Walnut Street as one example of this type and scale of alteration and stated that the change in appearance of these structures is known. Mr. Cohen then stated that the question before the Committee is whether the remaining fabric, albeit altered tremendously, is still evocative and historically significant. Mr. Farnham commented that, while that is the question before the Committee, the other question that needs to be addressed is whether the nomination demonstrates that the remaining fabric is significant. He stated that the nomination is the document that makes the argument for significance and cautioned the Committee not to look solely at the building itself, but to look at the building through the document.

Mr. Laverty reiterated that the nominated property is significant to Philadelphia's waterfront. However, he stated that, owing to the additional work presented and the amount of material that may still be available, the nomination could be quite a bit stronger and fuller. He advocated for the nomination's revision. He then stated his astonishment that, in the early twentieth century, a fairly large waterfront company would save the historic block and make such improvements as the elaborate Federal-style doors. Mr. Laverty continued that the neighborhood worsened by 1920 and was similar in character to Society Hill in 1960. Mr. Schaaf added that the row represents a century-old adaptive reuse of the building that proved to be a sensitive conversion of residential units into an office building.

Mr. Cohen directed a question to Mr. Farnham and asked how to proceed if the Committee felt the nomination had to be amended in order for it to be considered for designation. Mr. Farnham replied that the Committee could recommend that the Commission table this nomination and return it to the nominator for revision. Mr. Cohen asked if that would open a window of vulnerability to the building. Mr. Farnham answered that it would not and stated that the property would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction until the nomination was withdrawn or until the Historical Commission voted to reject it. He explained that, should the property owner submit a building permit application, the Commission would review it under its authority, and that, if it were going to reject that application, it would have 90 days to act on the nomination. He clarified that the amount of time the Historical Commission can hold control over the property while the nomination remained under consideration is limited.

Mr. Cohen stated that the issues were clear, and that he would recommend waiting for an amended nomination. He asked Mr. Farnham if that would be the proper course of action. Mr.

Farnham replied that, if the Committee believed the property to be of such significance that it warrants designation, but that the nomination itself does not make an effective case for that, he would recommend the Committee not send it to the Commission with the recommendation that it satisfies one or more of the criteria. Mr. Farnham stated that it was his opinion that, if a designation resulted from the Committee's recommendation and that designation was appealed, it would be fairly difficult to defend the designation under the current nomination. Mr. Cohen summarized Mr. Farnham's suggestion by indicating that the existing nomination would be vulnerable to appeal, so the Committee should ask for a revised nomination. He noted that the property would not be more vulnerable during the revision process. Mr. Farnham clarified that the building would not be more vulnerable if the changes were made promptly. Mr. Cohen then commented that Mr. Thomas's report contains very good information, and the nominator needs to clarify arguments in the nomination.

Mr. Beisert stated that he submitted all information to the Historical Commission staff and was told the nomination had to be substantially shortened and revised. He claimed much of the information requested had been included in the nomination he previously submitted and withdrew, although some of that information pertained to the wagon house. Mr. Cohen commented that the wagon house is a separate building and should not be included. Mr. Beisert added that there was also a section on Sullivan and his reuse of the row. Mr. Cohen stated that Sullivan is very pertinent to the nomination for his conception and reuse of the row. Mr. Cohen reiterated his preferred course of action, which is to revise the nomination. He clarified that the revisions should focus specifically on 81-95 Fairmount Avenue, not the wagon house, and that the nominator should strengthen the arguments for Criterion J rather than focusing on the property's architectural style.

Mr. Cohen inquired whether a motion is needed. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee needs to offer a recommendation to the Commission, so the Commission has some guidance once presented with this nomination. He stated that, while the Committee can reject the nomination as incorrect and incomplete, it does not have the authority to table it; only the Historical Commission has that authority.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Commission table the nomination to allow the nominator to revise it and remand the revised nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation for review.

1736 MEADOW STREET, WILMOT SCHOOL
Nominator: Joseph J. Menkevich
Owner: Second Baptist Church of Frankford

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Wilmot Public School at 1736 Meadow Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, I, and J. The nomination argues that the Italianate school building, attributed to architect James C. Sidney working under the supervision of Superintendent of School Buildings Lewis H. Esler, is a rare survivor of a "Philadelphia Plan" interior, popularized by Samuel Sloan beginning in the 1850s. The Wilmot Public School was intended for the education of African-American children, and was staffed by an African-American principal, teachers, and janitor. The building and its surrounding yard are the site of the 1811 Frankford Public Burial Ground, which is said to contain the bodies of African American civilians and Civil War veterans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1736 Meadow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, I, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Joseph Menkevich and Leon Brantley represented the nomination. Pastor Darrell R. Bradsbery of Second Baptist Church of Frankford represented the property.

Ms. Broadbent noted that a letter of support for the nomination was received from Jason Dawkins, State Representative of the 179th Legislative District. Mr. Brantley mentioned a letter of support for the nomination from Councilwoman Maria Quinones-Sanchez.

Mr. Menkevich explained that, as his research progressed, he became interested in the people involved with this building throughout history. He stated that he will likely prepare another nomination that includes the burial ground that is associated with this property, which dates from 1811. He expressed his concern that the City may decide to build on top of the burial ground, not knowing that it is a historic burial ground. He opined that Pastor Bradsbery had plans to use this building as an educational center, but that it takes a lot of money to bring a building up to code.

Pastor Bradsbery stated that he supports the nomination. He explained that the building was previously used by Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops and for summer bible school, and the City leased the building for the Head Start program until 2013. He stated that the future goal for the building is to continue its history, with proposed uses to include a computer center, after-school tutoring, resume building and interviewing techniques, and other education-related uses.

Mr. Brantley, co-nominator and Vietnam veteran, stated that his interest in this site relates to the veterans that may be interred there. He explained that he was involved in surveying this property while employed by the City's surveying division back in the 1970s. He stated that there used to be an annual march that went from Campbell AME Church down to this site to lay a wreath at the gravesites of Civil War veterans. Mr. Menkevich and Mr. Brantley discussed tribes of black Indians who have lived in the neighborhood for generations.

Mr. Menkevich explained that his nomination includes an extensive amount of research because he hopes that it will be used as a research tool in the future. He stated that a project known as Meadow Gardens changed this area of Frankford in 1974 and 1975. The project redeveloped the area, removing existing shacks. Mr. Menkevich expressed his frustrations with the City not allowing researchers to have access to survey records.

Mr. Cohen commended Mr. Menkevich on the thoroughness of the nomination. He suggested that the nomination could be restructured to have a more concise statement of significance, with an appendix that contains all of the remaining information. He also suggested that a plan showing Samuel Sloan's open interior plan be included with the nomination as an illustration.

Mr. Mooney stated that the building was an obviously candidate for historic designation. He commended Mr. Menkevich on the nomination.

Mr. Cohen asked about the establishment of the African American community in Frankford. Mr. Brantley responded that Swedes came further up the Delaware River and settled in what is now East Frankford, and the black community is descended from the Delaware Moors. Mr. Menkevich stated that the King's Highway played a large role in the community, and that every

person had to travel the same highway, no matter his or her color or place of residence. He stated that the area was originally a Quaker community.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1736 Meadow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, I, and J.

6128-32 RIDGE AVENUE, ROXBOROUGH TRUST COMPANY
Nominator: John Manton
Owner: Roxborough Real Estate Group

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6128-32 Ridge Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the former Roxborough Trust Company building is significant as part of the development of the Roxborough neighborhood, for whose inhabitants it was built in 1924. The nomination further contends that the building, designed by architects Heacock & Hokanson, embodies defining characteristics of the late Beaux Arts style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6128-32 Ridge Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, but not A and J. The staff suggests that one might be able to make cogent cases for the satisfaction of Criteria A and J, but such cases are not made in this nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. John Manton represented the nomination.

Mr. Manton stated that the building does qualify for designation under Criterion A, because it is a landmark building along a major thoroughfare in Roxborough. He argued that the structure is familiar to many people, holding significant character as a landmark to people passing it on the street. Mr. Manton also contended that the building satisfies Criterion J, since it holds political and economic significance to the community. He explained that the bank failed during the Great Depression, because its depositors made an unnecessary rush on the bank. The managers then willingly turned the bank over to the State Banking Commission to save its remaining assets, which were fought over until 1943. Before closing, the bank had held accounts for churches, mills, operational expenses of businesses, individuals, and stockholders. Mr. Manton also indicated that the bank had existed since 1918, when it was located in the old Patriotic Order of the Sons of America hall.

Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination was well researched, and he was glad to see the architectural firm of Heakcock & Hokanson receive recognition. Correcting the noomination, Mr. Cohen then clarified that not every round arch is a Romanesque arch, explaining that Romanesque is a medieval style. Mr. Manton replied that he thought Romanesque was based on ancient Roman forms. Mr. Cohen responded that Romanesque is not a variant of Roman architecture.

Mr. Cohen commented that Criterion J should be included in the nomination, and Mr. Schaaf agreed. Mr. Cohen remarked that the building is a neighborhood and community landmark located in a prominent position. Mr. Schaaf elaborated that the structure is the most significant

building on Ridge Avenue in Roxborough. Mr. Cohen agreed and added that the building claims significance on a larger scale, City, Commonwealth, and Nation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

246-60 N 4TH STREET, PAINTINGS

Nominator: Celeste Morello
Owner: St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate two oil-on-canvas paintings over west-wall side altars in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at 246-60 N 4th Street as historic objects and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the paintings, executed by decorative artist Filippo Costaggini, satisfy Criteria for Designation A and E. The nomination argues that the paintings are significant works of art by an important designer, Filippo Costaggini, whose artistic production has significantly influenced the cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, and that the paintings have significant value as altarpieces that exemplify the demand for this type of decoration for Roman Catholic churches, representing a firm cultural trait adapted to the American Art tradition, as a transference from Western Europe.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the west-wall side altars in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at 246-60 N 04th Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A and E.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.

Ms. Morello referred to an earlier news release from the Archdiocese that she considered an endorsement of the designation of the painting at Old Saint Joseph's Church. She also referred to an article published in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, written by John Nivala of Widener University Law School, who cited Article I, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, stating that Pennsylvanians "have a right . . . to the preservation of the . . . historic and esthetic values of the environment." Ms. Morello stated that she is deriving "esthetic values" from that quote.

Mr. Phillips stated that it is the Archdiocese's position that designation by a municipality of a sacred religious work of art is a clear violation of the First Amendment of separation of church and state. He stated that these works of art are personal property, of a deeply religious non-secular nature, and the government should not have any place regulating or exercising jurisdiction or authority over these works of art within churches. He continued that they communicate the Catholic faith and they contribute to the work of God, to which Ms. Morello admits as much in her nomination. He stated that her nomination focuses on the religious nature and the importance and significance of these works to the Catholic faith, and the Archdiocese does take care of its religious works of art. He stated that they are the embodiment of the faith, and they are treated as such, but it is a slippery slope when a municipal government exercises some control over religious works of art. He put forward a hypothetical situation, where if there is some change in Catholic doctrine, and as a result, the Catholic Church wishes to alter these works of art or remove them, the church would have to ask the City of Philadelphia's permission

to change a work of art reflective of its own internal doctrine. He stated that that is not a place that the Historical Commission should be in. He continued that, in terms of the criteria cited in the nomination, and in the definition of "object," the word "religion" or "religious" is never used. He opined that the religious value is not mentioned because of the separation of church and state, and is not an unintentional omission. Mr. Phillips concluded that these paintings in particular are deeply religious paintings that should not be designated as historic by the City of Philadelphia.

Ms. Morello stated that she was born and raised as a Roman Catholic, and she knows that the Catholic Church does not alter its doctrine. She stated that it will add to or clarify doctrine, but it will never change it. She stated that there could be no change in these paintings that would be permissible because they stand as remnants of 1878 and 1879, and that is the way art was depicted at that time. She stated that these paintings were custom-made for this church, are elements in the Augustinian community, and there is no way that their content would be retracted. Regarding Filippo Costaggini, Ms. Morello stated that these paintings were part of his portfolio, as he was not yet hired to do the painting in the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C. She concluded that these paintings represent his portfolio and showed that he was competent to take on the work of Constantino Brumidi in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Phillips responded that there is no disputing that these paintings are integral to the Catholic Church and the Catholic faith, but they are not integral to nor should they be imposed upon by the City of Philadelphia. He stated that this is a fundamental First Amendment issue, and that church and religion stays out of government, and government stays out of religion.

Ms. Morello asked Mr. Phillips why the Archdiocese made no comment about the nomination of the Costaggini painting at Old Saint Joseph's Church, and of the ceiling at Saint Augustine's Church. Mr. Phillips responded that they were not aware, and learned of St. Augustine's Church ceiling the day he was at the Commission meeting to speak about the nomination of St. Laurentius. Ms. Morello responded that it received national publicity.

Mr. Cohen stated that these are complicated issues to consider. He questioned what the ramifications of designation would be upon movable objects such as these paintings. Mr. Laverty stated that the Committee on Historic Designation has a track record of recommending for the designation of works of art as objects inside Catholic churches, including movable objects. He suggested that the Commission can make the final determination of designation. Mr. Mooney commented that it is a fascinating argument in many ways, but the Committee is not an arbiter of First Amendment rights, but rather the Committee exists to evaluate the merits of the nomination and to make a recommendation based on those merits. Mr. Laverty reiterated that there is a precedent for the Committee to recommend for designation.

Mr. Phillips clarified that there was no opposition for previous nominations because there was no awareness of the nominations. He suggested that it is important and significant to look at the words related to the Criteria for Designation, and the lack of the word "religion" in the Criteria. He stated that Criterion A speaks to the character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation. Mr. Phillips argued that neither of the paintings is reflective of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, but what they do have is significant value to the Catholic Church. He opined that Costaggini is not a designer, architect, landscape architect, or designer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation. He stated that Costaggini's work might be significant to the Catholic Church, and these paintings are significant to the Catholic Church, but to say that the

paintings are significant to the City, Commonwealth, or Nation is thereby admitting that there is no separation of church and state. He questioned where it could go from there, and questioned whether the Commission would start designating sacred works of art in synagogues and mosques.

Mr. Laverty asked if Ms. Morello's previous nominations for church paintings and frescoes were approved by the Commission. Mr. Farnham responded affirmatively.

Ms. Morello commented that, back in 1796, when the cornerstone for this Augustinian Roman Catholic Church was laid, George Washington donated money for it, and that casts a new national light on this, because the Founding Father gave money to such an institution for the Augustinian priests to establish the church. Mr. Phillips responded that this information has nothing to do with the paintings in question.

Mr. Cohen stated that the argument for Criterion E is made sufficiently in the nomination, but he questioned Criterion A. He suggested that one might talk about the emergence of the Roman Catholic community and that these paintings are a monument to that community, and the connection to George Washington could be significant. He stated that those might be the best arguments one could apply to Criterion A.

Mr. Schaaf stated that he sees validity in both sides of the argument. He referenced Rogier van der Weyden's *The Crucifixion, with the Virgin and Saint John the Evangelist Mourning*, an undesignated painting of religious content located in a prominent location in the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Mr. Phillips expressed his concern that if the Archdiocese wanted to loan one of the altar paintings to go on display at the Vatican for a period of time, a designation would prohibit that, absent approval from the City of Philadelphia. Mr. Schaaf responded that he was not sure that that is true. Mr. Phillips responded that a removal of the object is prohibited, absent approval from the Historical Commission. Mr. Schaaf asked where this information came from. Ms. Morello commented that the paintings are works of Costaggini, not Raphael. Mr. Phillips responded that her point is a separate argument, but that the Archdiocese would be prohibited from destroying or altering the paintings, and the definition of "destroy" includes the removal of an object from a property. He concluded that the Archdiocese could only loan the altar pieces to the Vatican after obtaining the approval of the City of Philadelphia. The Archdiocese would be required to ask permission to take its sacred works of art and the embodiment of its faith and send them to the Vatican. He stated that the Historical Commission should not be in that position.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the west-wall side altars in St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at 246-60 N 04th satisfy Criteria for Designation A and E. Mr. Cohen dissented.

900 S 20TH STREET, ST. CHARLES BORROMEO CHURCH
Nominator: Celeste Morello
Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate St. Charles Borromeo Church and rectory at 900 S 20th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The

nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. The nomination argues that hybrid Romanesque/Baroque St. Charles Borromeo Roman Catholic Church is architecturally significant as part of the national culture of the post-Civil War era when combinations of "revival" styles emerged in American architecture. Its rectory is a fine example of the Second Empire architectural style. The nomination further contends that the church is significant owing to its architect, Edwin Forrest Durang, one of the foremost American ecclesiastical architects of the late nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 900 S 20th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.

Mr. Phillips stated that, on behalf of the parish, the Archdiocese is not opposing the designation.

Mr. Cohen stated that this is an extraordinary building which absolutely merits designation. Mr. Laverty opined that Criterion H could be applied. Mr. Cohen stated this nomination will be the permanent record for the building, and therefore it should be more fully researched. He suggested that that the nomination needs additional information, and makes too many generalities. He suggested that Ms. Morello use online databases to find accounts in old newspapers of when the building first opened. He also suggested that she consult with an architectural historian. Mr. Schaaf commented that Ms. Morello should be more careful in pointing out the details of the building. Mr. Cohen stated that this building defies a simple catagorization of architectural style.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 900 S. 20th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

209-25 N 18TH STREET, PAINTINGS

Nominator: Celeste Morello
Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate five oil-on-canvas paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street as historic objects and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the paintings, executed by artist/decorator Constantino Brumidi, satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. The nomination argues that the paintings are significant works of art by an important designer, Constantino Brumidi, whose artistic production has significantly influenced the cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, and that the oil paintings exemplify the heritage of Philadelphia's Catholic community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.

Mr. Phillips indicated that many of his previous statements from the review of the Costaggini paintings were applicable to this review as well. Related to these specific paintings, Mr. Phillips reminded the Committee that the word "religious" is not listed in the Criteria. He stated that the nomination simply takes the word "cultural" and inserts it instead of "religious," but the religious undertones cannot be denied, and they are the fundamental driving force behind the nomination. He quoted several sentences contained in the nomination: "The subjects of the paintings are integral parts of the services and important in Roman Catholic doctrine"; "Brumidi fulfilled Church doctrine by the instant oils 'to instruct and edify those who may visit and pray in this Cathedral'"; and "Use sacred art to enhance Church doctrine, and to distinguish Protestantism that claimed the 'denial that the Virgin played any significant part in God's plan for man's salvation.'" He stated the nomination itself is rooted in religious arguments, and opined that it is neither the role of the Historical Commission, nor the Committee, nor any municipal, state or federal government to passively approve of the religious doctrine of the Catholic Church. He reiterated that it raises a fundamental First Amendment issue, and the Committee needs to recognize that and not recommend for historic designation.

Mr. Cohen asked if it is not possible for an object to have both religious significance and cultural significance. Mr. Phillips responded that it would be possible theoretically, but in these instances, the paintings are purely non-secular. Mr. Cohen responded that these paintings may have cultural significance if they were painted by Leonardo, and opined that, even if an object was made for religious reasons, it can still have cultural significance that could be protected. Mr. Phillips agreed, but stated that the paintings in question only have religious significance. He continued that it depends how one defines the Roman Catholic faith. He questioned if it is a culture or a religion, and if any faith is a culture or a religion. He stated that he believes the paintings are entirely non-secular, and that atheists and agnostics could take issue with it.

Mr. Cohen responded that these are objects, and in some cases, objects get moved to other places including museums and civic buildings, and they have cultural significance. He stated that the mission would be to preserve their cultural historical significance. Mr. Phillips responded that cultural historical significance is not set forth in the nomination; rather, the religious significance is. He stated that, if they meant the same thing, they would not be defined differently, and since they are religious objects, they are cared for by the Catholic faith. Ms. Morello stated that the paintings are representations. She stated that the paintings are not blessed like some statues are, and they are secularized at this point until they are considered "religious" objects.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports Ms. Morello's efforts with religious property nominations. He stated that the following points apply to all three of her religious property nominations: First, there is a clear track record of the Committee and Commission approving nominations like this one. Second, there are any number of case studies that show that historic designation does not represent a violation of religious freedom or a violation of separation of church and state. He stated that he does not agree that something can only be religious or only be cultural. Lastly, he stated that these buildings are anchors of a Catholic community, and represent demographic changes in the city. He summarized that the Alliance supports the nominations.

Mr. Phillips stated that he would like to emphasize the distinction between the aesthetic value of the exterior of a building and the interior personal objects belonging to the Catholic faith. He continued that, simply because there was a previous designation of a fresco inside a church, it does not mandate that the Committee must agree with historic designation every time a religious object is proposed for designation that is integral to a religious faith.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. Mr. Cohen dissented.

934 SNYDER AVENUE, ANGELO BRUNO HOUSE
Nominator: Celeste Morello
Owner: Jean Bruno

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 934 Snyder Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation A. The nomination argues that the circa 1915 rowhouse is significant as the residence of Angelo Bruno, the head of the Philadelphia-South Jersey Family, a branch of the American Mafia, from 1959 until his murder in 1980. The nomination argues that the FBI's investigations of Bruno played a significant role in the development of important law enforcement techniques and statutes used to prosecute members of organized crime syndicates.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the house at 934 Snyder Avenue satisfies Criterion 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." The staff contends that the house does not have significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation. The nomination attempts but fails to demonstrate that Bruno was in any way the catalyst for important law enforcement techniques and statutes that were developed to prosecute members of organized crime syndicates in the 1960s and 1970s. The staff also contends that, although Bruno may be notorious and infamous, he is not a person significant in the past and therefore the house is not associated with the life of a person significant in the past.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Jean Bruno represented the property.

Ms. Bruno stated that she does not like the use of the word "infamous" when her father, Angelo Bruno, is being discussed. She stated that her father was against murder and drugs, and loved America.

Ms. Morello stated that, if Angelo Bruno was not the head of the Mafia in Philadelphia, there would not have been an organized crime strike force established in the city. She noted that the strike force just recently closed, which means that the city no longer has a problem with organized crime. She stated that, if Bruno was removed from the equation, and there was no boss of any Mafia in Philadelphia during the 1960s when the Kennedy brothers started their campaign to establish specific law targeting organized crime and corruption, the law would have overlooked Philadelphia, because there would have never been a reason to start an organized

crime strike force in Philadelphia. She continued that organized strike force offices were set up by the United States Attorney's office, because of the corruption resulting from gangsters and other underworld figures paying off local and state law enforcement to get rid of various criminal charges; federal law became necessary. She stated that in 1959 and 1960, when Bruno became boss, he already had a track record, and it was already established at that point that there was cause for law enforcement to continue to look at his activities but on a more sophisticated level. She stated that this is when the federal government became involved in Philadelphia, and that Philadelphia's Mafia was also a catalyst that brought more attention to organized crime activities that were transpiring in southern New Jersey and New York and in other offices. She opined that this was made clear in the nomination, and that organized crime strike forces were only selectively established in cities where there was organized crime of this level. She stated that, regarding Philadelphia's history after Bruno, one can see that there is a succession from Bruno to the 1980s, when the organized crime control act was fully in place and applied in the federal courts. Specifically with the Nicodemo Scarfo family, one can see the devastating effects of what Bruno had started in the 1960s while he was boss. She disagreed with Ms. Bruno's comments about Angelo Bruno not getting involved in drugs, stating that Angelo Bruno was not only financing very high importations of drugs from foreign countries and overseeing the distribution of drugs, but he also collected money from the proceeds of drug sales. She stated that Angelo Bruno's murder in 1980, which happened at 934 Snyder Avenue, brought on another stage in the development of law enforcement, with more surveillance, and ultimately with more witnesses who were members of this family, and who agreed to turn against the family and be witnesses for the federal government. She stated that this had never happened before, and if Angelo Bruno was not the boss during that long period of time, there probably would not have been a Nicodemo Scarfo family. She asked the Committee to reconsider the merits of the nomination.

Ms. Bruno commented that she never considered getting the house historically certified, but she does not oppose the nomination, and she considers it an honor. She stated that policemen in South Philadelphia wish her father was still around, and that he was killed because he kept drugs out, although the government could not prove it.

Mr. Schaaf stated that he contacted the Chicago History Museum in order to determine if there was precedent for this type of historic designation. He was informed that Al Capone's house in Chicago is not historically designated, although there have been several attempts to certify the house, with the earliest attempt dating back to 1989. Ms. Morello responded that his house is not designated because Capone was a really temporal figure, whereas Angelo Bruno's FBI file is part of the John F. Kennedy assassination record. She stated that she is unaware of anyone else in Philadelphia who has had their FBI file become part of such a critical moment in twentieth-century history or in United States history. She stated that Angelo Bruno was caught on tape, and that is how the FBI knew that he wanted Kennedy to be killed during his presidency, which moved Bruno's file from the organized crime category to the John F. Kennedy assassination record. She stated that Al Capone was not a boss, whereas Angelo Bruno was not only a boss of the Philadelphia region, but he was also part of the national commission of Mafia bosses from all over the United States. She commented that the nomination also includes references to Bruno's overseas investments.

Ms. Bruno commented that she once heard her father talking to someone from Florida, who suggested that they "get rid of" John F. Kennedy. She recollected that her father said to the man: "Once there was a king, and everybody said how bad the king was. So they assassinated the king. Then what happened? The king's successor was even a worse person!" Ms. Bruno

summarized that her father opposed the Kennedys, but he was against violence and assassination.

Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination is based on the association with a person. Ms. Morello interjected and stated that she was looking at it from the angle of development of the organized crime strike force, and why one was established in Philadelphia.

Ms. Bruno stated that the house is her house, and she has no criminal record. She does not think the house was ever in her father's name. She stated that she used to teach second grade. She reiterated that she would consider it an honor to have the house historically certified.

Mr. Cohen stated that the argument, at least as it has been written, is that the building is significant because it is associated with the life of a person significant in the past. He stated that, without judging Angelo Bruno, the building could be a sort of counter-monument. Ms. Morello clarified that she was focusing on the first clause of Criterion A, not the latter clause, which reads: "Has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation." Mr. Cohen responded that if that is the case, then is she saying that this building is an articulate monument to the responses to the procedures of criminal justice? Ms. Morello responded that she is saying that the person who lived at 934 Snyder Avenue justified an organized crime strike force to be founded in Philadelphia. Mr. Cohen responded that she is basing the significance on the connection of the building to the creation of the strike force. He reiterated that the Committee is not gathered to judge Angelo Bruno, but rather to judge whether the building at 934 Snyder Avenue warrants protection as historically significant. He stated that Ms. Morello's argument is that the law enforcement response to Angelo Bruno is the significant factor of this building, and questioned if the building is an articulate representation of the response of law enforcement to organized crime. Mr. Laverty stated that the Committee looked at precedent with the previous three nominations, but in this case, there is no precedent, locally or nationally. He mentioned that Stanfa and Testa's houses in Girard Estate are designated, but only because those houses are within the historic district boundaries. He opined that there is not a strong enough connection between what happened with the government's response in terms of criminal justice and this site. Mr. Cohen opined that if a different argument had been made, he could see the house being a kind of informational monument. He suggested that an angle could be that Angelo Bruno was living relatively modestly in an average South Philadelphia streetscape rowhouse, instead of in a boastful mansion. He opined that that argument could be interesting, but that is not the argument being made in the nomination, and instead the argument is that this is a site that is connected with law enforcement response. Ms. Morello asked the Committee if she should revise the nomination. Mr. Schaaf suggested that another potentially interesting observation is that Angelo Bruno chose to stay in South Philadelphia so that he could monitor the actions of those nearby.

Ms. Bruno asked if she could receive tax breaks for having a historically designated house. Mr. Cohen responded that she would not receive tax breaks.

Ms. Morello again asked the Committee if she should revise and resubmit the nomination. Mr. Cohen responded that the Committee is still evaluating the nomination. He then suggested that the Committee recommend that the Commission not designate the property at 934 Snyder Avenue, for the reasons outlined in the discussion. Mr. Mooney stated that he agrees with Mr. Cohen, in that the case for designation was not made.

Ms. Morello again asked the Committee if she should revise and resubmit the nomination. Mr. Cohen responded that a resubmission is always possible. Mr. Farnham reminded Ms. Morello that the Committee on Historic Designation is advisory, and suggested that she wait until the Commission meeting to see how the Commission votes. Mr. Cohen summarized that the Committee has not provided much encouragement for this nomination. He stated that it is not the subject matter, because even things that can be construed as negative places of significance, such as prisons or concentration camps, are often places that society considers significant and wants to keep, so it is not the negativity that is the issue, but rather it is the way the connection is made, and the depth of the connection, as presented in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 934 Snyder Avenue satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

DRAFT