REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2014, 9:30 A.M.
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
RICHARD DILWORTH, PH.D., CHAIR

PRESENT
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D., chair
Bruce Laverty
David Schaaf, R.A., Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Douglas Mooney
Penelope Giles

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT
Stacey Dowling
Stephanie Dowling
Don Simon, Central Roxborough Civic Association
Scott Moore
Dorothy Hamill, Esq., Sirlin Lesser & Benson
Davin Magerr
Prudence Humber
John DiSanto
Rev. Lewis Nash Sr.
Kay Sykora
J. Russel Peltz
John Manton
Richard Thom, R.W. Thom AIA
Laura Mark, R.W. Thom AIA
Celeste Morello
Jettie S. Newkirk, Esq., Tiagha & Associates
V. J. Michael
Carol Ray
Stephan Salisbury, Philadelphia Inquirer
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Todd Joseph
Celeste Hardester
Hal Shirmer, Esq.
Robert J. Shusterman, Esq.
Matt Monroe, Esq., Spruce Law
Tracey Gordon
Allison Weiss
Laura McGlatchley
Kathy Dowdell
Darin Gatti, Philadelphia Streets

DRAFT

Nicholas Baker, Philadelphia Streets
Robert Williams

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Dilworth called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Ms. Giles and Messrs. Laverty, Mooney, and Schaaf joined him.

312-14 N. 2ND STREET
Owner: Teresa M. Eck
Nominator: Richard Thom

OVERVIEW: The property at 312-14 N. 2nd Street is located at the southeast corner of N. 2nd and Wood Streets in the Old City Historic District. It is not individually designated. An architect working as a consultant for the property owner has proposed the reclassification of the property at 312-14 N. 2nd Street from Contributing to Non-contributing. He has also proposed the removal of the entry in the district inventory for 202 Wood Street because it is not a separate parcel, but is part of 312-14 N. 2nd Street.

Zoning and building permit records not readily accessible when the nomination for the Old City Historic District was written about 12 years ago, but now readily and publicly available online, clearly indicate that the extant building at 312-14 N. 2nd Street was constructed by Samuel Lipshutz as a "1 sty garage type storage bldg" in 1961 under zoning permit #93392F. Lipshutz demolished the two buildings that stood on the site in 1960 under zoning permit #75541F. The district inventory wrongly dates the building to c. 1920; its true date of construction is 1961. In light of the fact that the Old City Historic District period of significance ends in 1929, a building constructed in 1961 cannot, by definition, contribute to the historical significance of the district. Therefore, the proposed amendment to the district classification is justified. The inventory classifies the property at 202 Wood Street as Non-contributing and indicates that it was constructed about 1960. However, the structure at what would be 202 Wood Street is part of the building that stands on the tax parcel at 312-14 N. 2nd Street. Therefore, 202 Wood Street should not have a separate entry, classification, or construction date in the inventory. The inventory should be amended to remove the entry for 202 Wood Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission amend the Old City Historic District inventory, reclassifying 312-14 N. 2nd Street as Non-contributing and removing the entry for 202 Wood Street, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the reclassification request and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Richard Thom represented the request.

Mr. Thom reported that he was involved in the survey of the Old City Historic District in the early 2000s. He acknowledged that the survey may include some mistakes. He stated that there may be a dozen or so such mistakes in the district inventory. He asserted that the City's records show that this building was constructed after the end of the district's period of significance. He stated that the owner of a neighboring property was a young boy in the 1960s and remembers the building being built.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission amend the Old City Historic District inventory, reclassifying 312-14 N. 2nd Street as Non-contributing and removing the entry for 202 Wood Street, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ADDRESS: 321-27 WILLINGS ALY, THE ANGELIC EXALTATION OF ST. JOSEPH INTO HEAVEN
Owner: St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church
Nominator: Celeste A. Morello

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a mural known as *The Angelic Exaltation of St. Joseph into Heaven* as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The mural is located in Old St. Joseph's Church at 321-27 Willings Alley. It is attributed to artist Filippo Costaggini and was painted in 1886 in Raphael's style. The nomination contends that the mural satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the mural, *The Angelic Exaltation of St. Joseph into Heaven*, at 321-27 Willings Alley satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Celeste Morello, who nominated the painting, represented the nomination.

Ms. Morello stated that the painting is oil on canvas and is attached with screws to the ceiling of the church. She stated that it is in very good condition.

Mr. Schaaf questioned where the mural merits designation given that it is only attributed to Costaggini. He commended the evidence compiled in the nomination, but questioned why the nomination attributes the painting to Costaggini but does not conclude definitively that the painter executed the work. Ms. Morello stated that this painting is clearly in the style of Costoginni, but no signature or document connects it directly to Costaggini. She stated that artists of that period did not typically sign works such as this one. She stated that, typically, the artist designed the painting, but left the execution to his atelier. Ms. Giles asked if it was possible to have the painting authenticated. Ms. Morello stated that she did not believe that it was possible because he did not sign the work. She stated that she consulted with the Architect of the Capitol in Washington DC, which provided a list of Costaggini's works. This work is included on that list. She added that the list is provided in the appendix of the nomination. Mr. Schaaf asked if the attribution to Costaggini weakens the nomination in any way. Ms. Morello stated that the Architect of the Capitol has concluded that this is Costaggini's work even though a signature is not to be found on the painting.

Mr. Laverty asked if the Archdiocese of Philadelphia is the owner. Ms. Morello stated that the church is owned by the parish. She stated that the pastor is in support of the nomination and she included a letter from the pastor when she submitted the nomination. She stated that David Magerr is in attendance representing the parish council.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the nomination is an amazing piece of documentation. Mr. Laverty concurred. However, Mr. Schaaf disagreed with a statement on Page 9, which claims that the original St. Joseph's chapel was the only earliest Roman Catholic designed building in the English colonies. He stated that St. Mary's in Maryland was settled earlier and had an earlier Roman Catholic church building. He suggested that the nomination should read that this was

the earliest Roman Catholic designed building in Pennsylvania as opposed to the Colonies. Ms. Morello concurred.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the mural, *The Angelic Exaltation of St. Joseph into Heaven*, at 321-27 Willings Alley satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J, provided the nomination is amended as suggested.

ADDRESS: 113-29 BERKLEY ST, KEYSTONE DRY PLATE & FILM WORKS; MOORE PUSH-PIN
Owner: Berkley Property LLC
Nominator: Kim Broadbent, Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works; Moore Push-Pin at 113-29 Berkley Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J. The building has significant interest or value as part of the city's development and is associated with important individuals; John Carbutt and Edwin Moore. John Carbutt, founder of the Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works, was a pioneer of mass-market dry plates for photography, and produced the first commercial x-ray plates in the world in his Wayne Junction factory. Edwin Moore, who operated out of the factory beginning in 1912, was the inventor of push-pins, which he referred to as "a pin with a handle." He then went on to patent picture hangers and map tacks, also manufactured out of the Wayne Junction factory. The building is part of a distinctive industrial area, known as Wayne Junction, which should be preserved for its ties to Philadelphia's manufacturing history, and the building exemplifies the economic and historical industrial heritage of the community. Wayne Junction Station was the locus of mills and factories that capitalized on rail transportation to move in raw goods and send out finished products. Carbutt's choice of location for his factory was likely influenced by the close proximity to the railroad, availability of worker's housing and open space. Other industries soon followed the lead of Carbutt, and Berkley Street between Greene Street and Wayne Avenue became an industrial headquarters. 113-29 Berkley Street is a contributing building in the Wayne Junction Historic District, designated in 2012 to the National Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 113-29 Berkley Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Broadbent explained that she authored this nomination as part of a larger effort related to the industrial history of Wayne Junction while an intern at the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, prior to joining the Historical Commission's staff.

Ms. Giles asked if the owner or a representative of the owner was present in the audience. No one responded.

Ms. Giles asked Ms. Broadbent about the current use of the building. Ms. Broadbent responded that the building is currently occupied by Recovery King, which is a treatment and rehabilitation facility for individuals struggling with substance abuse, based on her understanding of its services. Ms. Giles asked if the current owner is aware of the nomination. Ms. Broadbent responded that the owner is aware of the nomination. Ms. Giles asked if the owner is supportive of the potential designation of the property. Ms. Broadbent responded that the owner is not at

the meeting, but that the staff of the Historical Commission did receive a phone call recently from a lawyer calling on behalf of the owner. Ms. Giles asked about the nature of the call. Ms. Broadbent responded that the lawyer had telephoned for information on the designation process and the means of objecting to a nomination. Ms. Giles asked if the owner objected owing to financial concerns. Ms. Broadbent explained that she had not taken the telephone call, but knew that the staff member who spoke to the lawyer outlined the designation process as well as the subsequent review process. The staff member explained that a designation would not result in a requirement to immediately restore the building, but would authorize the Commission to review building permit applications to ensure the building retains its historic integrity. Ms. Giles asked about the outcome of the telephone conversation. Ms. Broadbent responded that information was relayed to the property owner's attorney. Ms. Giles asked if the nomination should be tabled for review at a later date. Mr. Dilworth responded that the owner is aware of the proceedings and has apparently not elected to participate in them.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the building represents layers of fascinating manufacturing history, not only the push-pin history, but also that of the Keystone Dry Plate & Film Works.

Mr. Laverty asked whether the Historical Commission would have jurisdiction over the painted "Moore Push-Pin Co." sign on the side of the building. Mr. Farnham responded that, if the building is designated, then the Commission will review proposals for all alterations to the exterior, including painting of the brick. Ms. Giles asked how the owner will know this information. Mr. Farnham responded that Commission sent the owner notice of this and the Commission meetings as well as a copy of the nomination. If the Historical Commission chooses to designate the property, the staff will provide the owner with additional information about the review process and the extents of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. The owner will be provided with complete information about working with the Historical Commission.

Mr. Dilworth asked if the staff has an opinion on the significance of the later additions to the main factory building. Ms. Broadbent responded that the later additions were used by Moore Push-Pin into the 1970s; they should be considered historically significant.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 113-29 Berkley Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J.

ADDRESS: 1501-05 FAIRMOUNT AVE
Owner: J. Mark Kreider
Nominator: Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate as historic the property at 1501-05 Fairmount Avenue. It is an Art Deco commercial building designed by architect Samuel Brian Baylinson and completed in 1930. The building is listed as a contributing resource in the National Register-listed Fairmount Avenue Historic District. The nomination contends that the property at 1501-05 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D because it is an architecturally distinctive example of the Art Deco style as applied to low-rise commercial construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 1501-05 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Benjamin Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Robert J. Shusterman, attorney for J. Mark Kreider, the property owner, stated that the owner opposes the designation. Mr. Shusterman claimed that the designation process as defined in the historic preservation ordinance and in the Commission's Rules & Regulations is flawed because it does not comport with due process. He stated that the scheduling of consideration is also deficient from a due process perspective. He stated that he understands that these legals questions are within the purview of the Historical Commission, not the Committee on Historic Designation, but he needed to make the statements on the record.

Mr. Shusterman claimed that the photographs provided in the nomination do not clearly show the condition of the building. He stated that they show the "rhythm and character" of the building, but, since they were taken from a great distance, they do not show the physical condition. He stated that his close-up photographs of the architectural details show evidence of movement of this cast-stone façade. Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Shusterman to better explain the movement. Mr. Shusterman stated that the cast-stone panels have shifted out of position. Ms. Giles asked if a structural engineer had inspected the building. Mr. Shusterman stated that they have not had chance to obtain the services of a structural engineer. Ms. Giles asked if the building is occupied and being used to operate a business. Mr. Shusterman affirmed that it is occupied. Ms. Giles opined that, if it is occupied, then the building owner has not concluded that the building is unsafe. Mr. Shusterman claimed that the façade and its elements are inherently unstable. He distributed copies of photographs taken on 8 November 2014 during a meeting at the property with George E. Thomas, a historic preservation consultant with CivicVisions. He pointed to a photograph and claimed that it indicated that a block of the facade is about to fall. Ms. Giles suggested that the facade should be repaired. Mr. Shusterman agreed and noted that they have had a masonry specialist dispatched to the site. He restated that photographs in the nomination do not reflect that the skin of the building is seriously failing. Ms. Giles asked what this had to do with his client's opposition to the nomination. She stated that it is not surprising that an old building needs some repair. Mr. Shusterman distributed another set of photographs, contending that they too show flaws in the cast-stone panels.

Ms. Giles asked Mr. Shusterman if a hardship would be imposed on the owner should the property be historically designated. Mr. Shusterman replied that a designation would prevent the owner from adequately maintaining the property. He returned to the photographs, pointing out cracks and other flaws to the Committee members. He stated that the cracks may look insignificant, but they allow water to infiltrate. Ms. Giles suggested that could and should be repaired. Mr. Shusterman opined that they cannot be repaired without a massive expenditure. Mr. Dilworth asked if they had obtained any quotes for the repair of the façade. Mr. Shusterman responded that they do not have quotes because they were just informed of the nomination and did not have enough time to obtain the services of an engineer or masonry company. Ms. Giles asked if the owner intends to repair or demolish the building. Mr. Shusterman stated that his client has no plan to repair or replace the building; presently, he is collecting information about the cost to repair. Mr. Shusterman stated that he has a report authored by George Thomas about the condition of the building. Mr. Dilworth stated that the cost to repair falls beyond the purview of the Committee, which is charged with evaluating the property's historical significance as documented in the nomination. He asked Mr. Shusterman to address the nomination specifically. Mr. Shusterman replied that the nomination form lists the condition of the building as good. He stated that he and his client disagree and would classify its condition as poor. He supplied another set of photographs, stating they also show the problems with the façade. Mr.

Dilworth stated that the cost of repairs is not within the purview of this Committee. Mr. Shusterman disagreed. He reported that many years ago he incorporated the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Corporation, which was transformed into the Preservation Alliance. He stated that he was involved with the Philadelphia Historic Preservation Corporation's easement committee. He noted that, as a matter of policy, the committee would consult an engineer before taking an easement. He stated that it would not take an easement if the engineer advised if the building was in poor condition. He opined that this Committee should be guided by such a policy; it should recommend against designating buildings in poor condition. Ms. Giles stated that the owner has not offered any real evidence that the building is in poor condition. Mr. Dilworth stated that not only have they not offered real evidence, but evaluating such evidence would fall beyond the charge of the Committee. He stated that he finds it hard to understand how the decisions of the predecessor to the Alliance should affect this Committee, which makes recommendations about historic significance. Mr. Shusterman observed that this Committee makes recommendations about whether or not to list buildings on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He stated that, as a matter of law, the Committee must consider whether the building is capable of being maintained. Mr. Dilworth countered that the Commission with the advice of the Committee on Financial Hardship makes determinations about feasibility of reuse. Mr. Shusterman disagreed. Ms. Giles stated that, even if Mr. Shusterman's argument is accepted, the owner has submitted no real evidence about the building's condition to consider. Mr. Schaaf observed that the photographs that have been submitted show normal wear for an 85-year-old, cast-stone building. Mr. Shusterman stated that the steel fasteners securing the panels to the walls are "exploding." Ms. Giles asked if he had retained an expert to support his claims. Mr. Shusterman stated that they have not had enough time to retain a structural engineer between the time his client received the notice of the consideration and this meeting. He complained that the staff had refused to continue this review. Mr. Dilworth noted that the staff and Committee do not have the authority to continue such matters, but the Commission does; he explained that they can request a continuance at the Historical Commission meeting to allow for more time to retain a structural engineer and obtain a structural report. Mr. Dilworth suggested that they move on from questions of condition and cost of repairs to questions of architectural and historical significance. Mr. Shusterman indicated that he would appeal a designation if the Committee did not base its recommendation on condition and cost to repair.

Mr. Shusterman distributed a report authored by George Thomas. Mr. Shusterman stated that Mr. Thomas concludes that it is inappropriate to designate this building as historic. Mr. Dilworth pointed out that Section Two of the report is pertinent to the Committee's deliberations because it addresses the question of historical significance. He asked Mr. Leech, who authored the nomination, if he had any comments regarding that section of the report. Mr. Leech stated that he identified a broad spectrum of Art Deco buildings in Philadelphia in the nomination and then determined which were underrepresented on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He stated that this building is one of the best examples of this type of Art Deco commercial architecture that is underrepresented on the Philadelphia Register. He stated that he identified a group of important Art Deco buildings that warrant designation and this is the first of that group to be nominated. He observed that the architect Samuel Baylinson might be very promeint, but then noted that the architect is not cited in the nomination as the reason for this building's significance. He asserted that the style and type of building make this building notable. Mr. Dilworth stated the Mr. Thomas's assertion that the building has no context is irrelevant because its context is not cited as a reason for designation. Mr. Leech concurred that the assertion is irrelevant, but noted that there is context: the building was built for the automotive industry and the area on and around North Broad Street was an automotive hub.

Mr. Dilworth stated that he understands that designation places obligations and, potentially, burdens on property owners. He contended, however, that the Committee's task is to determine whether the nomination successfully documents that a property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation. He noted that the Committee is advisory. The Commission, not the Committee, determines whether it is prudent to designate a property. He stated that he would like to keep the discussion focused on historic significance. Mr. Shusterman opined that this building is not the best Art Deco building on Fairmount Avenue, or even on the block. Mr. Schaaf stated that the Historical Commission is not limited to designating only the best. Mr. Shusterman replied that this property is underutilized. He opined that the other Art Deco buildings cited in the nomination take full advantage of their current zoning; this building does not. He stated that this is building was designed for short-term, commercial use; it was not meant to last forever. Ms. Giles stated that she suspects that this is the crux of the issue. The property on Fairmount Avenue is very valuable because the current zoning would allow for a much larger building on the site. Mr. Shusterman stated that, when the site was appraised for a potential buyer, six townhouses was identified the highest and best use. Ms. Giles stated that the zoning for the site would likely also allow a five-story commercial building. Mr. Shusterman stated that the historic context has been lost because the automobile industry left the area long ago. Ms. Giles suggested that the owner is likely concerned because a historic designation would prevent razing the building and constructing something more lucrative. Mr. Shusterman stated that designation would also hinder the owner in razing part of the building and building something more lucrative. Ms. Giles stated that Mr. Shusterman should have been more forthright with the Committee and not basing his objections on photographs of cracks in an 85-year-old building. Mr. Shusterman stated that he showed the photographs of the cracks to point out that the building is in poor condition and getting worse. Ms. Giles stated any building will deteriorate if it is not maintained. She asserted that this building should be maintained. Ms. Giles concluded that she is convinced that this property satisfies the Criteria for Designation.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Shusterman to summarize the property owner's objections to a historic designation. Mr. Shusterman stated that he has two concerns. First, the cost for repairs will increase with a designation owing to the Commission's requirements. Second, the property will not be able to be redeveloped in the future. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Shusterman if historic designation would exclude any possibility for further development. Mr. Shusterman replied that a designation would preclude any redevelopment. He claimed that the driveway at the rear of the building would need to be preserved, making it impossible to develop the open part of the lot at the rear. Ms. Giles stated that a partial demolition at the rear might allow for a significant redevelopment. Mr. Mooney noted that the site might have archeological potential. Mr. Shusterman stated that they have not had a chance to look into the archeological potential. Ms. Giles suggested that, if they need for time, they can ask for a continuance at the Commission meeting.

Mr. Shusterman stated that there are several other buildings in the city that better satisfy the Criteria for Designation than this one. Mr. Laverty replied that that was irrelevant. He stated that the Committee must make a recommendation of the nomination before it.

Mr. Dilworth commented that historic designation does not preclude alternate uses and redevelopment. He stated that the Historical Commission often approves redevelopments that take into account the historical nature and significance of the building while allowing for higher and better uses of the property. Mr. Shusterman stated that it does not make sense to incorporate this failing building into a new development. Mr. Schaaf offered the National Products building as an example. The Historical Commission approved the restoration of the façade and the construction of a new six-story residential building behind it. Mr. Laverty stated

that the addition at Western Union Building is another good example of the redevelopment of a historic building. Mr. Dilworth cited the tower approved for the Lit Brothers Building as yet another example. Mr. Leech cited the Historical Commission's recent approval of the conversion of the Warner Brothers Film Storage Building into a hotel as another example. Ms. Giles stated that there funding is available for the redevelopment of historic buildings. Mr. Shusterman stated that he is aware of all these projects because he has been involved in historic preservation since 1979. He claimed that the burden on the owner of a building this small would be too large.

Mr. Kreider asked why he received so little notice about this meeting. He claimed that he received the notice letter about 15 October 2015, less than one month before the meeting. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historic Preservation Ordinance requires the Historical Commission to send notice letter to the owner and the property at least 30 days in advance of the first public meeting. He stated that the Historical Commission satisfied that requirement. Mr. Leech stated that the Preservation Alliance has been discussing the nomination with Mr. Shusterman, and would support a request for 60-day continuance at the Historical Commission meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 1501-05 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

ADDRESS: 365 GREEN LA, BENJAMIN KENWORTHY HOUSE
Owner: 1801 CBM A TO H LLC
Nominator: Celeste Hardester

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Benjamin Kenworthy House at 365 Green Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Benjamin Kenworthy House sits prominently on the southeast corner at the intersection of Green Lane and Manayunk Avenue. It was built in 1871 by William F. Raynor, an English stonemason, for Benjamin Kenworthy and his family. Kenworthy was an affluent and a prominent member of the Roxborough and Manayunk community, who owned textile businesses. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, H, and J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 365 Green Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, H, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Celeste Hardester represented the nomination.

Sean Whalen, attorney for the property owner, stated that they are in significant negotiations with the community about the nomination and the development of this property. He stated that their main position is that the nomination is null, moot, or must be denied. Mr. Whalen provided a background, stating that the property was purchased by the current owner in November 2013 and he applied for zoning for complete demolition of the house and the construction of eight residential units in January 2014. He stated that while that was pending the owner applied for a building permit to completely demolish the house in March 2014. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued the demolition permit, which remains valid and is not subject to the Historical Commission's review. Mr. Whalen stated that they have agreed to postpone demolition of the building owing to the negotiations ongoing with the community. He stated that the nomination was submitted in August 2014, post-dating the application for the demolition permit by five months. He contended that, upon its submission, the nomination was null as there was already

a demolition permit in place. He stated that, if the Committee concludes that the nomination is not null, then he would argue that, under the code, the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction because of the pending conservation district. He added that he would argue that the nomination is moot because of the valid demolition permit and would be moot until such time that the Department of Licenses & Inspections determines that the demolition permit is no longer valid. He stated that the permit was issued in October and is valid for six months, until April 2015. He stated that his client is in complete opposition of the designation of this property.

Mr. Farnham stated that it is his understanding that the property owner holds a valid demolition permit and could act on that permit legally without the intervention of the Historical Commission; the Historical Commission does not have the authority to review or revoke the permit. He stated that the owner could go forward and demolish the building and at that point there would be little or no reason for the Historical Commission to designate the property. He stated that, while the building still stands, the Committee may discuss the historical significance of the property and make a recommendation to the Historical Commission as to whether or not it satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation in its current form. Mr. Laverty asked when the demolition permit expires. Todd Joseph, the property owner, responded that the permit will expire in six months. Mr. Farnham stated that the permit will remain valid as long as work is underway; the permit would lapse after six months of inactivity.

Ms. Giles asked if the nomination is moot owing to the open demolition permit. Mr. Farnham replied that it is not, but the Commission's designation of this property would have no impact on the property owner's right to act on the demolition permit. He stated that the Commission may designate the property with the valid demolition permit. Mr. Laverty asked if these circumstances had ever arisen in the past. Mr. Farnham stated that he is aware of a couple of past cases in which nominations have been submitted for properties despite outstanding demolition permits. In the case of the Stephen Girard building on South 12th Street, the nomination was withdrawn to avoid compelling the owner to act on the demolition permit. That permit later lapsed, the nomination was resubmitted, and the Commission designated the property. Ms. Giles asked if anything in the Historic Preservation Ordinance precluded the Commission from acting on a nomination of a building with a valid demolition permit. Mr. Farnham stated that nothing in the ordinance precludes the Committee from offering a recommendation or the Commission from designating.

Mr. Mooney observed the protections of the Philadelphia Register are extended to the property once the property owner is notified of the consideration of a nomination. Mr. Farnham agreed, but noted that the owner had a valid permit in hand at the time of notice. Mr. Mooney stated that the property owner was notified and obtained the permit in October. Mr. Whalen clarified that the Department of Licenses & Inspections takes into account the regulatory restrictions on the property at the date of permit application, not the date of issuance. Hal Shirmer, an attorney representing a group of neighbors, disagreed with Mr. Whalen's assertion and contended that the date of issuance, not the date of application, is the relevant date.

Mr. Joseph stated that he did not have the permit sooner because of the four-to-six-month process to obtain a demolition permit, owing to all of the new requirements. He stated that he is not using the demolition permit as a bargaining chip. He stated that, by right, he can demolish the building and build two houses.

Mr. Whalen noted that the building has a significantly later one-story rear addition that is not original to the house. Mr. Schaaf stated that that is not an uncommon condition, but is typical. Mr. Joseph stated that, owing to the type of construction, one can discern that the addition was

constructed later. Ms. Giles asked if the property is occupied. Mr. Joseph responded that the property is unoccupied. Ms. Giles asked how long it has been occupied. Mr. Joseph responded that the previous owner died in April 2013 and he purchased the property from the estate.

Celeste Hardester, the nominator, provided a timeline for the writing and submission of the nomination. She stated that, prior to Mr. Joseph's purchase of the property, the community became concerned about its future as well as that of the block and neighborhood. She and others worked with the Planning Commission to rezone the area. The community sought to prevent this property and others from being subdivided into six or eight lots. She stated that the rezoning process was successful and this lot was rezoned. She stated that members of the community warned Mr. Joseph prior to purchasing the property that that he would not be able to do as he intended with the property, and they discouraged him from purchasing the property. Ms. Hardester, stated that this property is the arrival point at the top of the hill, where on enters Roxborough. She stated that this area is well known for being the area where the owners of mills in Manayunk lived. She stated that the property in question belonged to a mill owner and his family. She stated that the house is visually significant, owing to its location at the top of the hill. She stated that it is the introduction to a block that is architecturally consistent. She stated that this building is an integral part of the history of the neighborhood. She stated that the community wants this house to be preserved. Mr. Dilworth observed that those points were made clearly in the nomination.

Mr. Whalen pointed out that the owner is in significant negotiations with the community with regard to revisions to the development plans. He stated that they have had many meetings with the community at which they have sought ways in which to preserve the building. He stated they are in agreement that the non-historic, one-story rear addition can be demolished and the rear of the lot redeveloped.

Kay Sykora, a community member, provided updated photographs of the property, which show the house more clearly after the removal of the mature vegetation. She stated that one can see that this property is an important gateway to the area. She reported that she was involved with the designation of Main Street Manayunk early 1980s. She observed that this area is the bookend to the commercial and mill area in Manayunk. The mills were located along the water in Manayunk. The workers lived up the hill from the mills and the mill owners lived at the top of the hill. She stated that this intersection is the center of the mill owners' area. Mr. Schaaf asked Ms. Sykora if this block is included in the potential Roxborough Neighborhood Conservation District. Ms. Sykora replied that it is. She stated that she ran the Manayunk Development Corporation for 16 years and is not opposed to development. She acknowledged that Mr. Joseph is working with the community to find a solution that works for everyone.

Don Simon, the president of the Central Roxborough Civic Association, informed the Committee that Roxborough has been under considerable development pressure in recent years; new construction is rapidly swallowing up most of the available open land. He stated that some developers have been eyeing the characteristic nineteenth-century single homes on large lots with the intention of demolishing the original structures and constructing densely-packed homes. He stated that this is having a destructive effect on the character that makes the Roxborough neighborhood unique. He stated that, in an effort to protect this character, the community has been working with the Planning Commission to complete a zoning remapping and create a neighborhood conservation district that will impose design restrictions to maintain the unique qualities of the area. He stated that many of the characteristic nineteenth-century homes stand on Green Lane. He asserted that the Kenworthy House sits in a prominent location at the crest

of the hill. He stated that the property is significant to the history of Roxborough and voiced his support for the nomination.

Prudence Humber stated that she first came to the Historical Commission's office in mid-February 2013 and met with Ms. Coté to discuss nominating properties. She stated that the community has been considering historic designation since that time. She mentioned that she rode the 27 Bus today, which still follows the route of the Wissahickon Electric Railway line established by Benjamin Kenworthy. In addition to being a wool merchant, he was involved in streetcars and was a director of the Manayunk Trust Company. She stated that Kenworthy's wife was also from a textile family, which still operates a dye business on Main Street. She added that this building is special to the Roxborough community.

John Charles Manton proclaimed that he is the foremost historian in the Roxborough-Manayunk area. He stated that he was commissioned by Ms. Hardester one month after the death of the former property owner to compile the research on this property. He stated that the property was not sold until the following December. He began the research on this house and twelve other houses that form a cluster in that area with the hope of creating an historic district. He reported that, owing to the time required for district designation, the community decided to nominate each house separately. Through his research, he found that these twelve housed are share interrelated histories involving two families, the Keeleys and Kenworthys. The related houses form a little village of mansions tied to the mills of Manayunk. He stated that demolishing this house would degrade the entire group of houses.

Mr. Laverty noted that the nomination form specifies "architectural pattern book" as the architect of the house. He asked if the nomination refers to a specific book. Mr. Manton stated the particular pattern book upon which this house is based is unknown. Mr. Laverty asked how they came to know that Raynor was the builder. Mr. Manton stated that his name appears in the original purchase of the property.

Scott Moore, a neighbor, stated that he supports the nomination.

Mr. Shirmer, the attorney for the neighbors, provided a copy of letter that was sent to the property owner informing him that the property had been rezoned. He provided photographs of a development undertaken by the current owner at 18th Street and Cecil B. Moore Avenue. He stated that the current owner purchased the property for $200,000 and it is currently marketing it for $289,000. He stated that this building is a classic example of a mill owner's home at the top of the hill. He stated that the owner's initial zoning application proposed demolishing the house and building eight houses; the Zoning Board of Adjustment denied the application. The owner can subdivide the parcel into two residential lots by right. He stated that it appears that the property can be subdivided with one new house on one lot while maintaining the current house on the other. He stated that the neighbors want the three- and two-story sections of house preserved, but would not object to the demolition of the one-story section. He stated that, with the large trees now removed from the property, one really has the feeling that one is entering the gateway to Roxborough when coming up the hill.

Ms. Giles stated that the Committee's recommendation is not going to stop the community and the property owner from continuing to work together and, regardless of the designation decision, everyone should continue to work together. She stated that it appears to be a significant corner.

Mr. Whalen objected specifically objected to Criteria for Designation G and H. Mr. Schaaf stated that Criterion for Designation G covers that fact that the Keelys and the Kenworthys had a

compound of buildings built over several decades and that the compound is the "distinctive area." Mr. Whalen stated that the Keeley-Kenworthy compound of buildings satisfies Criterion H, but Criterion G is intended to refer to an already recognized area like Rittenhouse Square or Fitler Square, a specific park or designated area that has already been recognized by the Historical Commission. Ms. Giles stated that this area is attached to the mills of Manayunk. Mr. Dilworth stated that a cluster of buildings is the "distinctive area" referred to in Criterion G. Mr. Laverty stated that, based on what he has heard from the community, this is a distinctive area for the residents of Roxborough. Mr. Dilworth stated that it is a "unique location with singular familiar characteristics" and "represents a familiar visual feature of the neighborhood." Mr. Schaaf stated that Criterion H refers to a physical perception like coming up the hill to encounter a visual feature. Criterion G is not appropriate because one would not actually know that the compound of buildings was part of the social history. Mr. Dilworth offered that it makes it a unique location. Mr. Laverty countered that it makes it a distinctive area of the homes of the mill owners. Mr. Schaaf stated that both Criteria G and H apply. Mr. Laverty concurred.

Mr. Whalen stated that the area may be distinctive to the neighbors, but the area ceases to exist even one block away. The Committee members agreed that it is arguably a distinctive area. Mr. Whalen stated that, under Criterion A, it is part of a development, the compound of 12 buildings, and it is not a unique geographical area. Mr. Schaaf clarified the Criterion A applies to the historic development of the City and does not mean a development in the physical sense. Mr. Dilworth stated that the strength of the nomination does not depend on the number of Criteria it claims to satisfy. Mr. Schaaf agreed, stating that property need only meet one Criterion to be designated.

Mr. Whalen asked what exactly would be designated. Mr. Farnahm stated that the area proposed for designation is defined in the nomination under the boundary description. He stated that in this case the nomination proposes to designate the entire tax parcel.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 365 Green Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, H, and J.

ADDRESS: 1314-16 N BROAD ST, BLUE HORIZON
Owner: Ray-Whitaker Inc.
Nominator: Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Blue Horizon at 1314-16 N. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Blue Horizon is a culturally and architecturally significant building and that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. Originally constructed as three contiguous brownstone rowhouses around 1878, the properties were combined and converted into a fraternal hall by the Loyal Order of Moose in 1914, with a large auditorium addition designed by architect Carl Berger completed in 1916. In 1961, the property was renamed the Blue Horizon and hosted its first professional boxing match. Before its eventual closure in 2010, "The Blue" was the last-surviving and longest-operating of the many neighborhood boxing clubs which characterized the sport in twentieth-century Philadelphia.

A second nomination proposes to designate the Blue Horizon Auditorium as an historic interior and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the interior satisfies the definition of a public interior portion in the preservation ordinance and is

historically significant. A “public interior portion” is defined as an interior space in a building or structure that is, or was designed to be, customarily open or accessible to the public, including by invitation” and has in no way “been significantly altered physically such that a substantial portion of the features reflecting design for public use no longer remain.” The auditorium served as Moose Lodge’s primary public interior space, served not only the organizational needs of the Moose organization, but was also regularly rented out for public gatherings such as sporting events, lectures, and conventions. Then in 1961, the auditorium was converted with minimal physical changes into the Blue Horizon boxing auditorium.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 1314-16 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Blue Horizon Auditorium at 1314-16 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that there is a permit application that has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and could be obtained by the owner or developer without the intervention of the Historical Commission, permit number 492852, for the partial demolition of the building including the auditorium and the erection of a five-story addition. He stated that he has had extensive discussions with the Law Department and the Department of Licenses & Inspections and it is the City’s position that the owner could obtain that permit today and act legally under that permit without the intervention of the Historical Commission.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that he is here to represent the nomination and would be happy to answer any questions that the Committee has in regards to the merits of the nomination. He stated that he was unaware of the open permit application as that information is not available to the public. He stated that the legalities of the Commission’s jurisdiction over the open permit application are not under the purview of this Committee. He urged the Committee to review the nominations before them regardless of this open permit application.

Dorothy Hamill, an attorney for an equitable owner, stated that the permit application was submitted well before the nomination. She stated that obtaining a demolition permit is a cumbersome process. She stated that, although not yet issued, they can obtain the demolition and new construction permit legally because the permit application was submitted before the date of notice of the consideration of the nomination. She stated the permit application was submitted in September 2013 and the nomination was submitted in June 2014. She stated that they spoke with Mr. Leech before the meeting and he is amenable to a continuance to allow for the owner and the developer to share their plans with the Alliance. She contended that some information in the nomination is factually inaccurate. She stated that the nomination does not reflect the building as it is today because the fixtures and finishes that are identified as being significant were removed many years ago. The light fixtures, for example, are gone. She stated that ESPN removed the old lighting years ago. She stated that they would like the opportunity to discuss the redevelopment plans with the Preservation Alliance and work with the organization on preservation matters related to the development. She stated that they have been working with the Commonwealth and have agreed to restore the façade of the building as well as the

mural on the side of the building. She stated that the auditorium has suffered a significant amount of damage and must be demolished. She stated that they would like an opportunity to work an agreement with the Preservation Alliance.

Mr. Dilworth stated that there are photographs in the nomination dating from 2011 and 2014. Ms. Hamill gestured to one of the photographs and stated that the plaques depicted in it have been removed.

Matthew Monroe, an attorney for an equitable owner, stated that his client learned about the nomination late. Jettie Newkirk, an attorney for the property owners, stated that they came to this meeting to ask for a continuance. She stated that they have not received notice of the meeting and had asked Mr. Leech for a continuance. She stated that they received a telephone call two weeks ago about this meeting. She stated that her client's due process had been violated because this meeting was being held without proper notice.

Mr. Monroe stated that they are in discussions with an architectural historian, who they would commission to review the nomination, but they have not had enough time to formally address the merits of nomination. He stated that they need more time to prepare. Mr. Monroe asked for a continuance to allow for more time. Mr. Dilworth stated that the Committee is an advisory body and does not have the authority to grant a continuance. Ms. Hamill stated that the Committee is advisory does not have all of the information it needs to make an informed recommendation. If the Committee moves forward today, it would, in essence, only have one side of the story.

Mr. Farnham stated that neither the staff nor the Committee have the authority to grant a continuance or table the nomination. He stated that the Historical Commission, which will consider the matter on 12 December 2014, has that authority to table or continue the matter. He informed the various parties that the Commission routinely tables designation matters when property owners request continuances. Ms. Newkirk stated that the staff has the responsibility, according to the Commission's Rules & Regulations, to notify the property owner 30 days in advance of the review of the nomination. She stated that no notice went to the building and no notice went to the owners. Mr. Farnham strenuously disagreed and asked Ms. Cote to display the various items documenting the Commission's attempts at notice. He asserted that the staff complied completely with the Historic Preservation Ordinance's notice requirements regarding the consideration of nominations. He stated that the Commission is required to send notice at least 30 days in advance of the meeting to the property itself and to the property owner using the City of Philadelphia's tax records to obtain the owner's address. He stated that those letters were sent and they were returned as undeliverable by the US postal service. He stated that the staff also, as a courtesy, notified Mosaic Development using the address on its website. However, that notice was also returned. He stated that because the staff was unable to contact the property owner, which has an obligation to maintain a valid address with the City for tax purposes, or the development partner, the staff asked for the assistance of the Preservation Alliance, which provided an email address for Vernoca Michael, one of the property owners. Mr. Farnham stated that, more than 30 days in advance of today's meeting, he sent an email with all the pertinent documents to vernoca706@gmail.com, but received no response. He stated that he knows that that is a valid email address because he received an email from that address from Ms. Michael this morning. He stated that he also emailed the notice to Leslie Smallwood at Mosaic as well. He asserted that the staff went well beyond the notice requirement to try to reach the owner and equitable owner. He concluded, that despite the efforts to notify, the staff would support a continuance request when the matter comes before the Historical Commission to allow the owner and development partner to have a full opportunity to assess the accuracy of the nomination and explore the implications of designation.

Ms. Hamill observed they could obtain the demolition permit today, but they would rather participate in the process. Mr. Dilworth suggested that the owners and development partners voice their concerns about the nomination now so as to get on the record. Mr. Monroe stated that is sounds like the staff has followed the letter of the law. He stated that, unfortunately, they learned of the consideration of the nomination through a third party and have not had time to assess the two very dense nominations. He stated that they would like time to hire a qualified individual to review the nominations. He stated that today's review would be a one-sided narrative that favors designation without an opportunity to respond in any meaningful way.

Mr. Farnham advised that the Committee has an obligation to allow anyone in attendance to speak on the matter, but suggested that the Committee is not required to reach a conclusion today. He suggested that the Committee could recommend to the Commission that it continue this review and remand the nomination back to this Committee. Then, everyone wanting an opportunity to participate can participate fully. Ms. Giles asked if the Alliance could withdraw the nominations. Mr. Farnham answered that the Alliance can withdraw the nominations. Mr. Leech stated that he is not authorized to withdraw the nominations at this time, but the Alliance would support a continuance request at the Historical Commission meeting.

Zenobia Harris, a representative of City Council President Darrell Clarke, stated that the Council President supports a continuance.

Russell Peltz, a boxing promoter, stated that he began working at the Blue Horizon in 1969 and he had his last fight there in 2009. He stated that merely keeping the façade of the building is a "joke." He stated that this is probably the most famous sports arena in the history of the city and no one venue in this city has received as much worldwide publicity as the Blue Horizon. He stated that it was voted the top boxing arena in the country by major publications. He opined that retaining the façade and calling it preservation is a "disgrace." He stated that this auditorium cannot be replicated anywhere; there is no auditorium like it. He stated that all fights sold out for many years because of the atmosphere in the auditorium. He stated that the only other venue in this city that comes close to the significance of the Blue Horizon is Franklin Field. He stated that it is the best boxing venue in the world.

Vernoca Michaels, one of the property owners, stated that she understands that Mr. Peltz wants the building to persist as a boxing arena, but they do not have the support of the boxing community to maintain it. She stated that it is a blighted building today. Ms. Giles stated that perhaps, because it has become an emotionally charged subject, some help to preserve the building will come forward. She stated that everyone agrees that this building is important; she suggested that it is possible to work together with the community to preserve it. Ms. Michaels stated that all potential buyers wanted to demolish the building. She stated that the current plans involve preserving the façade. Ms. Giles concluded that condition of the interior is in question but the façade itself is worth saving.

Rev. Lewis C. Nash, Sr., pastor of Faith and Deliverance Outreach Ministry and committee representative for the 47th Ward, stated that there was a community meeting about the plans for the building. He stated that the building has been sitting empty for several years, is blighted, falling down in the back, and the brick is decaying. He asserted that the developers, who want to secure and invest in the building and the community, should not be prohibited even with if they only want to retain the front façade. He would like to see this project move forward immediately and not be held up. He stated that the façade should be preserved, but the project should be able to move forward. He stated that the building is falling down and it will only get

worse if it continues to sit. He stated that investment at the Blue Horizon will mean that more business will move to the community.

Carol Ray, one of the property owners, stated that when they left the building in 2009 she notified the state of a change of address as well as put in for mailing forwarding with the US Postal Service twice. She stated that she does not know why they did not receive the notice. She stated that when the boxing business started to fail the boxing community was unhelpful. She stated that they have a legitimate operation that wants to invest in the property and preserve the building to some extent. She hopes that the Commission will look at the economic value of the proposed project.

Mr. Leech stated that the Alliance does not consider retention of the façade as preservation. He stated that the Blue Horizon is a world-famous site that merits real preservation. He stated that it is unfortunate that this property was not designated earlier, but there is still an opportunity to designate it. He stated that it is the Alliance's responsibility and mission to advance such nominations. He stated that he sympathetic regarding the owners' situation, but is hopeful that there is a better solution and better future for this building.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the consideration of the nomination for one month.

VARIOUS BLOCKS OF THE HISTORIC STREET PAVING THEMATIC DISTRICT
Owner: City of Philadelphia
Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: In 1998, the Historical Commission designated the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, a collection of several hundred blocks of streets in the city that retain their historic street paving materials. In 1999, the Commission amended the district, adding a few streets that had been initially overlooked. The designation covers the cartway itself, but not the curbs or sidewalks. The historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to review building permit applications issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, but not streets permits for work within the right-of-way, which are issued by the Streets Department of the City of Philadelphia. Therefore, with regard to historic streets, the Historical Commission acts in an advisory capacity, providing advice to the Streets Department about the appropriateness of alterations to historic cartways. Per an informal agreement, the Streets Department consults with the Historical Commission whenever it undertakes work to historic streets or reviews applications from third parties for work to historic streets. The Streets Department should be commended for its stewardship of historic streets, which it undertakes voluntarily at great expense.

The Streets Department recently commissioned Gilmore & Associates Inc. to study the conditions of streets that retain their historic paving materials and generate a report that would allow the Streets Department to plan strategically for the maintenance of the historic streets. The Streets Department has limited funds for restoration work to historic streets and is seeking to spend those funds as effectively as possible. The consultant surveyed every block currently listed in the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District as well as several that are not included in the district and generated a lengthy report. The report includes photographs of all blocks as well as information about paving materials, condition, and need for repair. The staff of the Historical Commission integrated the data collected by the consultant with data related to

context including local and National Register districts, rarity of material, and other factors and then ranked all blocks. Based on these rankings, the staff proposes a series of additions and removals from the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The blocks proposed for addition were overlooked in the late 1990s, when the nomination was prepared. The blocks proposed for removal include cartways where the historic paving material has been removed since the designation, usually by regional and state agencies beyond the control of the City, as well as blocks where the cartways are in very poor condition, do not merit restoration, and will provide stockpiles of rare paving materials for restorations elsewhere. If adopted, the amendments to the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District will allow the Streets Department to be more efficient with its management of historic streets, focusing its scant resources on cartways meriting preservation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission amend the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District as proposed in the following documents, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented an overview of the amendments and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Darin Gatti, Chief Engineer and Surveyor for the Philadelphia Streets Department, and Nicholas Baker, Transportation Planner for the Philadelphia Streets Department, represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he agrees with most of the proposed amendments; however, he does not agree with the removal of Wistar Alley, as the Planning Commission believes there is granite block beneath the asphalt paving. He explained that the Planning Commission has been trying since the 1960s to develop a thematic path from the Visitor's Center that would include this section of the street. He has no doubt that Ben Franklin walked on Wistar Alley, and noted that the Wistar House on the northwest corner of North 3rd Street and Market Street is looking better than it ever has, and the naming of Wistar Alley must have a connection to that house. Mr. Schaaf stated that the Streets Department should be applauded for finding and proposing the addition of the streets that are not yet part of the thematic district.

Mr. Mooney commented that there are several examples of streets that are proposed for removal where the historic paving material remains, but asphalt has been placed on top. He suggested that this is a means of historic material being preserved in place, and agreed that these streets should remain on the inventory of designated historic streets. He stressed that many of these streets are smaller interior streets where archaeological resources are preserved. Unlike larger streets that have multiple utilities running under them, the smaller interior streets and alleyways have nothing but small water lines. He explained that an example of this is Moravian Street, which is proposed for removal and should be removed because it no longer exists. However, around 2005, the Historical Commission suggested to the developer that they hire an archaeologist, owing to the historically significant location of Moravian Street. This resulted in the discovery of an intact Native American site just inches below the paving. Mr. Mooney then gave a brief history of Native Americans associated with the site of the former Moravian Street, stating that as late as 1928, the City of Philadelphia was receiving Native Americans on this site and acknowledging their claim to this particular property.

Mr. Gatti explained that this project started as an engineering evaluation of the historic streets, but they came across many streets that have been paved over and they are unsure of what material is beneath the asphalt or concrete. He stated that he is not opposed to keeping these streets on the list of designated streets. He asked if the best action going forward is to continue to pave over these streets if they are already paved over, or if there is an alternative action to

take. He explained that the information from the Historical Commission will be incorporated into the engineering evaluation so that the Streets Department can properly prioritize maintenance of the streets. This will also be used as a tool to ask City Council for more funding for historic streets. The Streets Department currently receives about $250,000 a year for maintenance to historic streets, but it costs about $500,000 to complete work to one block.

Ms. Giles asked whether historic streets should be treated differently than asphalt streets when being treated for snow and ice removal. Mr. Gatti responded that the Streets Department uses smaller equipment to plow smaller streets. Ms. Giles asked if salt is destructive to the historic paving material. Mr. Gatti responded that the historically designated streets can be removed from the salting route, if that is what the Historical Commission wants. Many Committee members voiced their disagreement with that idea. Mr. Gatti responded that the granite block streets are actually much more resistant to salt than concrete and asphalt, and brick streets have about the same resistance or just slightly less. For that reason, the Streets Department does not see a reason to stop salting the historic streets.

Mr. Laverty asked if the Historical Commission staff could prioritize the list of designated streets. Mr. Farnham responded that this suggestion is precisely what this study has led to, and the Streets Department now has a list that incorporates the data from their consultants as well as data from the Historical Commission staff. This means that the Streets Department now has a list that can be used when looking to spend their maintenance dollars strategically. Mr. Farnham elaborated that the reason for proposing the removal of some streets is that there are many in poor condition, that do not rank as high as others, and it may be decades before the Streets Department can address their maintenance needs. While these streets remain in poor condition, the Historical Commission staff and the Streets Department has property owners and business owners routinely complaining that they would like to see their streets repaired. Therefore, this entire project is geared toward spending the maintenance dollars as effectively as possible. Mr. Farnham added that the Historical Commission is advisory to the Streets Department and cannot legally compel the Streets Department to act according to its recommendations. He also noted that the Streets Department is doing an incredible job with their attention to historic streets.

Ms. Giles asked if the Streets Department can remove a section of asphalt paving for each street proposed for removal to see if there is historic paving material below. Mr. Gatti responded that they could potentially do that, but he knows that typically streets that are next to new developments have lost their historic paving material. Mr. Baker commented that the majority of the streets that have been paved over since the designation were between trolley tracks on state roads, with no city involvement.

Kathy Dowdell asked about public notification when work will take place on historically designated streets, and asked specifically about Chester Avenue. She opined that the public may be able to pressure Councilpersons for support to restore historic streets, if they had notice of the upcoming work. Mr. Gatti responded that notification is given to the appropriate City Councilperson when paving is to occur, and they generally notify property owners in the immediate vicinity. He added that the Streets Department is working to produce the paving program for the year that will be available ahead of time on the Department's website. Mr. Farnham noted that Chester Avenue was paved as part of a Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) project and, although designated, outside the Commission's authority.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved to recommend that the Commission amend the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District as proposed in the following documents, provided that streets with historic paving material surviving under asphalt or concrete remain on the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Rules & Regulations. Ms. Giles seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dilworth moved to adjourn at 12:42 p.m. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DRAFT