REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, 2 DECEMBER 2015, 9:30 A.M.
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
RICHARD DILWORTH, PH.D., CHAIR

PRESENT
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D., chair
David Schaaf, R.A., Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Janet Klein
Bruce Laverty
Douglas Mooney
Jeffery Cohen, Ph.D.

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

ALSO PRESENT
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Hope Primas, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joseph Menkevich
John Manton
Rachel Hildebrandt, Partners for Sacred Places
Oscar Beisert
Sharon Montgomery
Helen Boggs
Anita Tymes
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Emily Cooperman, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Kathleen Abplanalp, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann
Gregory Lattanzi
Michael P. Fenerty
Margaret Peg Rzepski
Emily Miller
Michael & Marla Marko
Phillip Stoltzfus
Daniel Mulholland
Thomas Beattie
Kirk Karagelian, Esq., Carroll & Karagelian LLP
Archpriest Fr. Nerses Manoogian, St. Gregory
Jeanett Demb
Carolyn Wall
Carolyn C. Jenkins
Ann Tymes
Kathy Dowdell, AIA Philadelphia

DRAFT

Jeff King
Kate Robinson
Robert Nydick
Craig Schelter
Ed Paul
Ernest Tymes
Ken Milano
John Hering
Ori Feibush, OCF
Don Gould, Olde Richmond Civic Association
Marc Collazzo, Office of Pennsylvania Representative John Taylor
Sean McMonagle, Office of Councilman Mark Squilla
Christopher Sawyer, Olde Richmond Civic Association
Mark Zecca
Joe Williams
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Michael Clement, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine

CALL TO ORDER

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

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

Mr. Farnham announced that the Historical Commission had received requests to continue four matters on the Committee's agenda to later meetings of the Committee. He explained that neither the preservation ordinance nor the Commission's Rules & Regulations authorizes the staff or the Committee to continue or table nominations, but the Committee can recommend to the Commission that it continue the review of a nomination and remand it back to the Committee at a later meeting.

Mr. Farnham noted that the attorney making the first continuance request, for 1115-27 Frankford Avenue, had just called the Commission's offices to explain that he is stuck in traffic and would arrive at the meeting late. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to defer its consideration of the continuance request until the attorney arrived. Mr. Dilworth agreed to the suggestion.

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

Nominator: Jennifer Robinson, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Owner: 101 Gravers LLC

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 101 W. Gravers Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. 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 further argues 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, I, and J, but not Criterion H. The staff contends 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," has been overused lately, but should be reserved for truly unique locations and buildings with truly singular characteristics. The staff suggests that City Hall and the Philadelphia Museum of Art at the ends of the Ben Franklin Parkway, the New Market Headhouse at 2nd and Pine, the Fairmount Waterworks and Boathouse Row on the Schuylkill River, the Divine Lorraine, which overlooks Center City, the West Philadelphia Title & Trust at the prominent intersection of 40th and Lancaster, and the unusually sited Pennsylvania Hospital all satisfy this Criterion, but this simple house on an unremarkable street corner does not.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuation request to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Chestnut Hill Historical Society, near neighbors, and the developer of the property are working to reach an agreement about the preservation of the building, perhaps an easement agreement. He reported that Lori Salganicoff, the director of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society, submitted the continuance request on behalf of her organization and the near neighbors. Mr. Dilworth asked if anyone in the audience had comments regarding the proposed continuance. No one offered comments.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Laverty moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination for 101 W. Gravers Lane and to remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation when the discussions between the various parties are complete. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

209-25 N. 18TH STREET, PAINTINGS (OBJECTS) IN CATHEDRAL OF STS. PETER & PAUL
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: See combined discussion under the next agenda item.

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.

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: The chair of the Committee agreed to hear the continuance requests for 209-25 N. 18th Street and 900 S. 20th Street together because they are owned by the same party, the owner is represented by one attorney, and the properties were nominated by the same person. Mr. Farnham presented the continuation requests to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nominations. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission has received requests from Mr. Phillips, the attorney representing the property owner, to continue the consideration of the nominations for both the paintings at the Cathedral of Sts. Peter & Paul and St. Charles Borromeo Church. The Archdiocese of Philadelphia owns both properties. He noted that he received correspondence from Mr. Phillips yesterday that indicates that the owner and the nominator are joining in the continuance requests.

Mr. Phillips stated that he submitted the two continuance requests. He stated that the request related to the paintings is being made on two grounds. First, he and his client have significant First Amendment concerns regarding the regulation of religious, sacred works of art, which are personal, private property. They have not had sufficient time to consider the complex legal issues raised by this nomination. With regard to both the paintings and St. Charles Borromeo Church, they have not had sufficient time to consider the merits of the nominations themselves. He stated that they are requesting the continuances to allow them to consider more fully both sets of issues. He asked for at least 60 days to review the matters. He noted that the churches are functioning and active and there is no threat to either nominated resource.

Ms. Morello stated that she is agreeing to the continuance requests to give the Archdiocese sufficient time to review her work. She stated that she provided to Mr. Phillips a list of 12 churches owned by the Archdiocese that are already designated as historic. She stated that "the precedence is already set because the Archdiocese did not quibble or contest any of these properties as becoming historically certified." She stated that she is "expecting the Archdiocese to agree" to the designations based on these 12 precedents. She then read the definition of an historic object from the preservation ordinance: "A material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historic, or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment." She stated that she does not perceive any impediment to

designating the paintings. She referred to the Dream Garden designation. She stated that "she will allow the Archdiocese 60 days and really no more."

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the reviews of the nominations for 209-25 N. 18th Street and 900 S. 20th Street and to remand them back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

RECLASSIFICATION REQUEST

631 ADDISON STREET

Owner: Robert Nydick III and Katherine Mary Robinson
Applicant: Jeffery M. King

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the property at 631 Addison Street from its current classification of contributing to non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The inventory for the district dates this building to 1950, but newly discovered documents irrefutably date it to 1970 or later. Although the building shares some stylistic affinities like the windows and roofline with Redevelopment Era houses classified as contributing to the district, its stucco cladding and setback from the sidewalk differentiate it from those buildings, which are all brick and built to the sidewalk.

Section 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance stipulates that "Any designation of a building, structure, site, object, or district as historic may be amended or rescinded in the same manner as is specified for designation." Section 5.14.a.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations explains that "Amendment presupposes that the historic resource under consideration," in this case the historic district, "continues to meet the criteria for entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places." The regulation then observes that "Amendment includes … the revision of a district classification," but offers no guidance or criteria for reclassification. Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance defines a contributing building as "A building … within a historic district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Historical Commission's designation."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the reclassification of 631 Addison Street from contributing to non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, pursuant to Sections 14-203(78) and 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance, because the building does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the reclassification request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Property owners Robert Nydick and Katherine Robinson and architect Jeffery M. King represented the reclassification request.

Mr. Farnham noted that there appear to be several properties on this block of Addison that are misdated, misattributed, and/or misclassified in the inventory. He remarked that the Committee is likely to see additional requests to reclassify properties on this block.

Mr. Nydick stated that he agreed with Mr. Farnham's summary of the request. He affirmed that the inventory dates the building to 1950, but new documents show that dates to 1970 to 1975. He stated that the Society Hill Civic Association as well as the near neighbors support the reclassification.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that the Historical Commission reclassify 631 Addison Street from contributing to non-contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, pursuant to Sections 14-203(78) and 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance, because the building does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

NOMINATIONS

8330 MILLMAN STREET, VANNA VENTURI HOUSE

Nominator: Kathleen Abplanalp and Emily Cooperman, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Owner: Estate of Thomas and Agatha Hughes

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 8330 Millman Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. World-renowned architect Robert Venturi designed and built the house for his mother, Vanna Venturi, in the late 1950s and early 1960s. It is widely considered one of the world's most important architectural landmarks of the twentieth century. The subject of numerous books, articles, and essays, the house marks a pivotal shift in architectural theory and design, signifying the end of Modernism and the start of Post-Modernism. The Historical Commission designated Venturi's Guild House on Spring Garden Street, which occupies a similarly prominent position in the canon of architectural history, in 2004.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 8330 Millman Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Emily Cooperman, Lori Salganicoff, and Kathleen Abplanalp of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman argued that the Vanna Venturi House remains one of the most important modern buildings in the world. She stated that, although it is remarkable that the building has been so wonderfully cared for by its current owner, it is now up for sale. The nominators felt it was incumbent upon the Chestnut Hill Historical Society to move to protect the building from any potential adverse effects by nominating it for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Salganicoff added that the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia gave the Chestnut Hill Historical Society a small grant to protect mid-century buildings. The Chestnut Hill Historical Society is currently updating their National Register nomination for the Chestnut Hill Historic District to include ninety mid-century buildings and will submit the Vanna Venturi nomination as part of the National Register update. Ms. Salganicoff went on to state that the issue of the sale of the property coincided with their receipt of the grant from the Preservation Alliance.

Kathy Dowdell presented a written statement from the Philadelphia chapter of the American Institute of Architects, authored by the chapter's executive director, Rebecca Johnson:

> It is with great pleasure that AIA Philadelphia supports the addition of the Vanna Venturi house to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Designed by AIA Philadelphia's own Robert Venturi, the Vanna Venturi House is widely acknowledged as one of the most influential buildings of the 20th century. Its reinterpretation of traditional residential

forms made this house an early and major work of the post-modern movement in architectural design. With its oversized chimney, broken gable and arch, and non-traditional fenestration, the house exemplifies Venturi's love of "messy vitality."

From the prestige of an AIA National 25-year award, to the popularity of a postage stamp, the Vanna Venturi House has been recognized for its significance many times. It received AIA Philadelphia's Landmark Building Award in 2012, the first year for which it was eligible. It is now only fitting that this house be added to the Philadelphia Register. The Vanna Venturi House is not just a Philadelphia landmark, but a building of national and international significance; it is deserving of our city's highest level of recognition and protection.

Mr. Cohen commended the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the property at 8330 Millman Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1839-43 ELLSWORTH STREET, HARRISON DAY NURSERY
Nominator: Kim Broadbent, Staff of Philadelphia Historical Commission
Owner: Lincoln Day Nursery

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1839-43 Ellsworth Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. The nomination argues that the purpose-built daycare center, constructed in 1899 for the Harrison Day Nursery, is significant as an example of a late Furness, Evans and Co. design, commissioned by William West Frazier, a close friend of Frank Furness. The nomination further argues that the building is significant for its association with the Harrison Day Nursery and Lincoln Day Nursery, two agencies that merged to provide desegregated child care at this location in 1923.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1839-43 Ellsworth Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

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

Mr. Cohen suggested to Ms. Broadbent that she edit the nomination to clarify that Wilson Eyre was not a follower of Frank Furness.

Mr. Dilworth asked for public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that property at 1839-43 Ellsworth Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

8701 RIDGE AVENUE, "MANATAWNA"
Nominator: John Manton and Joseph Menkevich
Owner: St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church of Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 8701 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, E, and I.

The mansion was built in 1927 for Philadelphia stockbroker Reed A. Morgan, who lived in it with his wife Marian (Baird) Morgan for 27 years. The nomination contends that the building's significance is related to the Morgan and Baird families, in addition to its architect, Arthur Howell Brockie. It is situated on a large lot in Roxborough, which the nomination claims has the potential to yield archaeological information related to pre-history. The church building fronting Ridge Avenue and a garage located on the parcel are considered non-contributing in the nomination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination does not demonstrate that the property satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

The Statement of Significance in the nomination contends that the property 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," but fails to make such a demonstration. The claim of the property's satisfaction of Criterion A appears to rest on the sole significance of Marian Baird Morgan's father Matthew Baird, but the famous father had no real connection to this property.

The Statement of Significance contends that the property satisfies Criterion E, that the house is "the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation." However, the nomination makes no claim that Arthur Howell Brockie's architectural production influenced, much less significantly influenced, any development locally, regionally, or nationally. Brockie may have been influential, but the nomination does not make such a demonstration.

The Statement of Significance claims that the property satisfies Criterion I, the archaeology criterion, but offers no evidence that the property "has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history." While the site may yield archaeological artifacts, the nominator has an obligation to demonstrate that it has a likelihood of yielding such information. No evidence is presented.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Archpriest Fr. Nerses Manoogian of St. Gregory Armenian Apostolic Church of Philadelphia and attorney Kirk Karagelian represented the property owner. John Manton and Joseph Menkevich represented the nomination.

Mr. Manton defended his nomination in light of the staff's comments. Regarding Criterion A, he stated that the significance is based on Marian Baird Morgan herself, and not her father, because she came from a very prominent family whose control and influence once included the Baldwin Locomotive Works, a corporation that helped to mould the environment and business community of Philadelphia during the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century. He stated that, therefore, she is a person whose life is significant, and her family was a part of the

development, heritage, and entrepreneurial enterprise of the city. Her husband Reed A. Morgan's brokerage firm, in connection with the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, did the very same fostering of financial growth in this region until the Great Depression. Regarding Criterion E, Mr. Manton stated that the nomination presents a position that the house is the work of architect Arthur Howell Brockie, the brother-in-law of the owner Reed A. Morgan, and who is known for his work on the Sedgeley Club at the end of Boathouse Row, the Strawbridge House on Wissahickon Avenue, Germantown Hospital, Philadelphia Zoological Gardens, as well as many private residences such as the Harris Residence at 445 West Chestnut Hill Avenue, the Lippincott Residence at Wynnewood, and the Baird Residence in Villanova. Mr. Manton distributed a list of Brockie's accomplishments to the Committee members. Regarding Criterion I, Mr. Manton stated that the property may likely yield information important to pre-history or history, but the nomination cannot specifically state with any certainty that the property can yield any pre-Columbian artifacts, and the evidence lies in the fact that the land along Ridge Avenue, once a major Indian trail, and that along Old Line Road, has remained undisturbed by farming and construction since the seventeenth century. He added that a nomination has yet to be written where the actual archaeological framework has been carried out prior to its submission to the Historical Commission.

Co-nominator Joseph Menkevich suggested that Mr. Dilworth recuse himself from the review, owing to a Dilworth family connection to the Morgan family years ago. Mr. Farnham responded that, in his opinion, Mr. Dilworth does not need to recuse, because he has no financial stake in the property. Mr. Dilworth responded that he will not recuse.

Mr. Menkevich stated that his research focused on Marian Baird Morgan, a famous socialite who spent time with presidents. He opined that the nomination should have focused more on Marian Baird Morgan, because wealthy old widows' lives matter. Mr. Manton commented that Marian Baird Morgan was living at a time when women did not have many rights, but she was from a prominent Philadelphia family and the focus of the nomination should be on her and not her father.

Mr. Dilworth asked the staff to elaborate on its recommendation regarding the association with a person whose life was significant in the past. Mr. Farnham responded that the nomination has an obligation to support its claim, and while claims are made in this nomination, they are not documented or well supported, especially with regard to archaeological potential and association with a significant architect. He stated that the property may have significance, but the nominator has an obligation to the Commission and to the property owner to make the case in the nomination. The nomination fails to make the case. He noted that the list of Brockie's achievements that Mr. Manton handed out to the Committee is not included in the nomination. Mr. Dilworth asked if the nominator could withdraw the nomination and resubmit it once it is revised. Mr. Farnham confirmed this, and added that the appropriate action would be to withdraw as opposed to table, because the Historical Commission would maintain jurisdiction if it were to be tabled, which it should not if there is an agreement that the nomination does not sufficiently make the case for the claim for significance.

Mr. Karagelian, the attorney for the church that owns the property, opined that the property does not have any historical significance, and noted that exterior alterations have been made over the years. He stated that the building is a plain house, not a mansion. Regarding archaeological potential, he stated that one could likely dig up the front yards of every property along Ridge Avenue and Old Line Road and potentially find something of archaeological interest, but that it is not enough and too circumstantial, given the burden that historic designation would impose on the non-profit church that struggles to meet its own financial commitments. He stated that the

building does not rise to the level of being historically significant, even if all of the facts are correct in the nomination. He opined that every family that has occupied a historic home has some history that they could share, and the fact that this happened to be a stockbroker's family does not elevate it to the level of being historically significant.

Mr. Manton, a co-nominator, responded that not every house along Ridge Avenue is associated with Brockie. Mr. Menkevich, a co-nominator, responded that he is not very familiar with Brockie's work, but he is pretty sure this is one of the worst examples of anything designed by Brockie; however, if this was a Picasso, no one would say that they do not like the Picasso because it is not one of his best works. This is part of his body of work, and if it does not get historically designated, all that will be left of Brockie's works will be the buildings that the Commission finds appealing. He continued that Brockie did not design this house by accident, and while it is not a great example of his body of work, it is an example nonetheless. Mr. Manton commented that Adolf Hitler was a terrible painter, but owing to his infamy, people often refer to his paintings. The co-nominators then discussed Joseph Stalin.

Mr. Mooney stated that Mr. Manton is correct in saying that an undisturbed property of this size could possess archaeological potential, but the argument in the nomination needs to be made. He suggested that Mr. Manton consider that the property sits along a known Native American trail. He also suggested that Mr. Manton look into the proximity to fresh water, if there are any spring heads on or near the property, and if there are any other known Native American sites in the immediate vicinity. Mr. Manton responded that the very name of "Manatawna" is related to Native American occupation. Mr. Mooney responded that these are the types of things that need to be included in the nomination to make the case for significance. Mr. Dilworth agreed, and noted that the information provided by Mr. Manton during this review is not included in the nomination. He suggested that Mr. Manton further consider if the connection between Marian Baird Morgan and the physical house itself is a strong enough case for significance.

Mr. Cohen stated that not every architect-designed building is automatically significant, and the nominator must build the case in the nomination. Mr. Manton responded that that is not the point. Mr. Cohen responded that it is absolutely one of the points, under Criterion E. Ms. Klein commented that the list of works by Brockie is helpful, and obtaining additional information about the points discussed would make for a more meaningful nomination.

Mr. Manton stated that he is withdrawing the nomination, and will consider editing and resubmitting at a future date. He expressed concern of his abilities to produce a nomination that will be deemed sufficient by the Commission.

1115-27 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Driscoll Construction Co.

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 does not make a cogent argument for Criteria C or H. The staff recommends that the nomination should be edited for clarity, conciseness, and typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Farnham asked the Committee to return to the continuance matter, which had been deferred earlier in the meeting, owing to the absence of the attorney representing the property owner. He presented the continuance request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Michael Clement represented the request.

Mr. Clement explained that his client was requesting additional time to review the nomination and the implications of the potential designation. He stated that his client had retained preservation architect Robert Thomas to assist with that assessment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination for 1115-27 Frankford Avenue and remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2640-42 AND 2644-58 E HUNTINGDON STREET
Nominator: Andrew Fearon, Kensington and Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC
Owner: 2640 E Huntingdon LLC

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A former church stands on the site. The church building is composed of two separate but connected structures, an 1848 chapel and an 1892 addition. The nomination proposes designating the 1848 section as historically significant, but not the 1892 section.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. The nomination argues that the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Messiah, constructed about 1848, is significant as a work of the prominent Philadelphia architect John Notman. The nomination further contends that the chapel is significant as an early example of the Gothic Revival style.

The building has been altered many times and is in very poor condition. The belfry has been lost. Most, if not all, original windows and doors have been lost and most window openings have been infilled. An addition with a roll-down gate was constructed in front of the entrance to the church. Other alterations include a fire escape and an exhaust fan. The roof is in very poor condition and the gable ends appear to be bowing significantly where water has infiltrated at the intersections of the gables and roofs. The masonry facades appear to have shifted and cracked at points. Last week, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited the building as imminently dangerous and ordered its immediate demolition. The demolition had not commenced at the time of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Prior to the submission of the nomination, a developer began to plan for the redevelopment of the site, which would include demolition of the existing structures and construction of new structures. When reviewing

building permit applications, the Historical Commission may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the review of a nomination. The plans in place may constitute substantial design development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff suggests that the Committee limit its review to the technical merits of the nomination and leave the questions of pending demolition and existing development plans to the Historical Commission. The staff observes that the building may satisfy Criteria C, D, and E, but suggests that the significant loss of integrity and poor condition of the building detract from its capacity to represent its designer or to characterize its architectural style.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had cited the building as imminently dangerous and ordered its immediate demolition last week. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Farnham if one could obtain a second structural assessment of the property in addition to that already provided by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission cannot seek an assessment that would contradict that of the Department. Mr. Cohen asked if the nominator, Andrew Fearon, could obtain a structural assessment. Ken Milano, a historian, responded that Mr. Fearon is not attending the meeting today. Mr. Milano reported that he assisted Mr. Fearon with the nomination. Mr. Cohen asked if Kensington and Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC, Mr. Fearon's organization, could pay for a second structural assessment that might reach different conclusions than those reached by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Cohen asserted that the determination by the Department should be tested to verify that it is true. He asked Mr. Farnham to explain the steps a nominator might take to challenge such a determination. Mr. Farnham stated that he was unwilling to advise the Committee how a third party might challenge a determination by another City agency. He also noted that he is not an attorney and should not be offering what can only be construed as legal advice. Mr. Farnham reported that he had spoken at length to Mr. Fearon the day before and learned that Mr. Fearon is aware of the imminently dangerous violation on the property and the impending demolition and is also aware of the community's opposition to the designation of the property. He stated that Mr. Fearon wanted to have the nomination presented to the Committee, but is aware that the building will likely not be preserved.

Attorney Sean Whalen, who represents the equitable owner of the property, Ori Feibush of OCF Realty, introduced himself to the Committee. Attorney Michael Fenerty, a member of the Olde Richmond Civic Association (ORCA), introduced himself to the Committee. Mr. Fenerty introduced his associates including Special Counsel Mark Zecca, who served as the Historical Commission's attorney in years past; current ORCA president Don Gould; ORCA representative Peg Rzepski; former ORCA president and owner of an adjacent property Phil Stoltzfus; Emily Miller, who lives next to the property; near neighbors Dan Mulholland, John Hering, Thomas Beattie, and Michael and Marla Marko; Chris Sawyer, chair of the ORCA zoning committee; Marc Collazo from State Rep. John Taylor's office; and Sean McMonagle from Councilman Mark Squilla's office. Mr. Whalen stated that the people just introduced including Ori Feibush of OCF Realty are all in opposition to the designation.

Mr. Whalen stated that the property has been declared imminently dangerous. The walls of the structure are bowing and there is serious damage to the roof. The building is in imminent danger of collapse. He referred to the effect a collapse could have and stated that there is no way to stop the demolition. He remarked that no judge would allow this building to stand, even if the nominator posted a $100 million bond against damages that a collapse might cause. He stated

that the building will be demolished very quickly. Mr. Whalen postulated that the nominator chose not to attend the meeting because he understands that the building must be demolished. Mr. Whalen contended that the nomination should be dismissed as moot because the building will be demolished shortly. He stated that he had hoped that Mr. Fearon would withdraw the nomination. Mr. Whalen referred to the letter that he submitted to the Historical Commission this morning. He claimed that there was a lack of good faith in the filing of the nomination. He noted that Oscar Beisert submitted the nomination first, but then withdrew it. Mr. Fearon resubmitted it. He claimed that the neighbors were unaware of the nomination; they want the building demolished. He asserted that the building is a danger, a blight, and a liability. It has been vacant for 25 years. For years, the neighbors have fought developers who want to use this space as a bar and night club, which is inappropriate in this residential neighborhood. He stated that OCF Realty is not proposing to redevelop it as a bar or night club. Mr. Whalen contended that the Commission's Rule 6.9.a.10 is not limited to the review of building permit applications, as Mr. Farnham claimed, but is applicable to the reviews of nominations as well. He pointed to the words "in addition." He stated that his client had full development plans and an executed agreement of sale in place before the initial submission of the nomination by Mr. Beisert. He called the nomination an "11th-hour" submission. He stated that his client has made a material commitment to this project.

Mr. Whalen distributed an information packet to the Committee members. He stated that it includes an analysis of the alterations to the structure. He pointed out the additions of the parish house and garage entrance. He reported that the church sat on a 20,000 sf parcel, which was subdivided five years ago. He stated that the south and east walls of the church are on the property line now that the property has been reduced in size. He claimed that the windows that have been infilled could not be reopened because they are on the property line. He stated that all of the stained glass was removed many years ago. He acknowledged that John Notman was a significant architect who designed St. Mark's and Holy Trinity, both very significant churches. He claimed that this church is too degraded to warrant a historic designation. He walked the Committee members through the information packet. He showed drawings that document the evolution of the building. The additions are tied into the original structure. The church closed in 1929. The Adriatic Club opened at the site as a social club in 1930. It had bars, bocce courts, and bowling alleys. A garage entrance with rolling door was added in about 1950. All vestiges of the church were removed in 1930. The stained glass windows and belfry were removed. All interior elements of the church were removed. The Adriatic Club operated from 1930 to 1990. The building has vacant since 1990. The building is dilapidated now.

Mr. Fenerty stated that OCRA is not opposed to historic preservation and that his organization applauds the designation of St. Laurentius, a church which is only six blocks away. He asserted that the designation of the former Church of the Messiah would have an adverse effect on his neighborhood. Regarding the nomination itself, he asserted that the nomination does not make the case for the satisfaction of the Criteria for Designation, but is instead filled with superfluous details and unrelated facts about the architect John Notman. He claimed that the features that would make this property eligible for designation have been compromised. It is an example of the Gothic Revival style, but a minor one. He questioned the attribution to Notman, which had not been made until this nomination was written. Mr. Fenerty stated that he was willing to concede that it was designed by Notman, but not that the fact that Notman is the designer necessarily renders it significant. He stated that Notman's biographer reported that Notman took on many minor projects such as this one to supplement his income. He pointed to important Notman designs and claimed that this is not one of them. He claimed that this building is not important solely because it was designed by Notman. Mr. Fenerty stated that the Committee and Commission must view potentially historic resources through the prism of the purposes set

forth in the preservation ordinance and not simply look at them technically. Will the designation of this structure further the economic interests of the community, or its quality of life? Will it have educational value? The nomination does not make the case that the property satisfies the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Fenerty contended that this building is not a church, even though it is referred to as such throughout the nomination. He stated that his family has lived 357 feet from this building since 1845, at the corner of Thompson and Albert Streets. He noted that he knows the exact distance because it was measured for a Liquor Control Board hearing. The structure was last used as a church during the Hoover Administration. When the congregation left in 1929, they took the stained glass windows and other signifiers that this was a church. It became a club. From the 1980s into the 1990s, the structure housed nuisance uses. He stated that it holds many hundreds of people. This structure can only be used now as a bar or club, which will be a nuisance to the neighborhood. It would be catastrophic to the community. The effects that the community would suffer from the use of this building as a bar, which is its only feasible use, are limitless. He observed that the community has fought the owners of this building, including a mobster, for years. It has taken its toll. It has cost money, and time, and grief. The neighborhood is on the verge of a revival, but the preservation of this building will prevent that revival. Mr. Fenerty stated that ORCA has had a special committee devoted to this property for 10 years. He reported that Chris Sawyer, the ORCA zoning chair, sought out Mr. Feibush to redevelop this property as residences. Mr. Feibush liked the site and developed plans for it. Mr. Sawyer was so excited about the project that he posted the plans online, which prompted the writing and submission of the nomination to the Historical Commission. The nomination resulted from the substantial development plans for the site. The Committee should consider that timeline, which shows that the nomination was prepared and submitted to stop the project. A designation of this property would deliver a catastrophic blow to this community.

Mr. Fenerty claimed that this building is not safe and has been unsafe for a long time. During a recent windstorm, the building could be seen moving and heard making loud creaking noises. Mr. Dilworth stopped him, observing that the building has already been declared imminently dangerous. Mr. Fenerty explained that the back of the older part of the building abuts Webb Street, a dead-end street that is used as a playground by neighborhood children. He reported that the inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections was very concerned about children playing directly beneath a bowing and unstable wall. Mr. Fenerty claimed that the reuse of this building is economically infeasible. If it is designated, it will sit and continue to deteriorate. This building is hurting the neighborhood's economic prospects and retarding property values. Mr. Fenerty pointed to Representative O'Brien's letter, which the Committee has received.

Mr. Dilworth advised Mr. Fenerty and his colleagues that the points about the building's condition and feasibility of reuse have been sufficiently made. He asked those speaking to stay within the Committee's purview. He noted that the Committee is advisory only.

Mr. Collazo from State Representative John Taylor's office spoke, stating that Mr. Taylor has lived in and represents this neighborhood. He asserted that this building has always been a social club to those from the neighborhood. No one living remembers when it was a church. The building is a neighborhood blight. Mr. Taylor has been seeking solutions to that blight for years. It is a vacant, blighted eyesore. He asked the Committee to consider safety and the integrity of the neighborhood. He stated that preserving this building would do damage to the neighborhood.

Sean McMonagle for the Office of Councilman Mark Squilla addressed the Committee. He stated that the Councilman supports the position of the neighborhood and opposes the designation of the property. He observed that the Councilman is very supportive of historic

designation efforts, but contended that the preservation of this building will not serve the purposes of the preservation ordinance or the people of Philadelphia.

Mr. Zecca addressed the Committee, noting that he was counsel to the Commission at one time. He stated that the Committee should not simply consider the technical merits of the application, but should look beyond the technical merits and determine whether a designation would be good policy. Every single property in the city could be designated on its merits, but the Commission should not designate all of them; it must make policy decisions. He asked the Committee to go beyond the technical, scholarly review and look at the policy considerations. Mr. Zecca stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections speaks for the City on matters of building safety and has declared this building to be imminently dangerous. Moreover, it is about to issue a complete demolition permit for the building. The Committee would be derelict in its duty if it did not consider the safety and blight issues that make this demolition necessary in the public interest. He concluded that it is duty-bound to consider the complete picture. Mr. Zecca stated that the Committee must balance the public interest in preserving this building with the public interest in allowing it to be replaced. There is not a public interest in the designation of this property.

Mr. Stoltzfus asked the Committee to consider Mr. Zecca's comments and to bear in mind that this is not an academic exercise. He asserted that the decision will have real-world ramifications. He noted that the Commission almost always designates nominated properties. He contended that, if the Committee recommends favorably on this nomination, it will cost the community group thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours of time to fight. He observed that people have spoken about the nuisance as though it were a hypothetical, something that might happen. He stated that it is not hypothetical; it happens. Loud music has poured out of the building until dawn. He stated that his infant daughter sleeps in a room that looks out onto the building. He stated that he values historic buildings, but not at this cost. If designated, the only people that will be interested in the building will be mob-connected, night club owners who will run it illegally.

Mr. Laverty asked how long it had been since illegal nightclub activities had occurred in the building. Mr. Fenerty stated that they occurred throughout the 1990s and most recently occurred three or four years ago. There were gang fights and loud music. Any use for the existing building will be a nuisance. The building is not a candidate for repurposing; it has six bars in it.

Mr. Farnham observed that the discussion had moved off track. He stated that he wanted to offer some clarifications and to try to return the discussion to matters within the Committee's purview. He stated that the Historical Commission and Department of Licenses & Inspections are both agency of the City of Philadelphia. The Department is responsible for public safety. The Historical Commission defers to the Department on matters of public safety. The Historical Commission is not contesting the imminently dangerous citation on this property. Moreover, a demolition permit will be issued shortly; the Historical Commission affixed its stamp on the demolition permit application, acknowledging the imminently dangerous citation and acceding to the demolition. He stated that the developer, Mr. Feibush, may execute on that permit as soon as it is issued regardless of the actions of the Committee on Historic Designation and Commission on the nomination. Mr. Farnham stated that the discussion of the significance of the building at this point in time is essentially an academic exercise that will have no effect unless the developer chooses not to demolish the building. Mr. Feibush stated that the Historical Commission's staff conditioned the demolition permit with the requirement that the historic building must be rebuilt within one year. He stated that he cannot demolish the building with the risk that he might have to rebuild it. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission's Rules &

Regulations require the staff to condition permits to demolish owing to dangerousness in such a manner, but noted that the condition is merely a technicality that should be discussed with the Commission itself. He stated that he does not believe that the Commission would require the reconstruction in a case such as this. Mr. Farnham then turned to the role of the Committee. Disagreeing with Mr. Zecca, he asserted that the Committee is charged with evaluating the technical aspects of the nomination. For example, is the architect someone who has significantly influenced historical developments? He acknowledged that the Committee is free to make a recommendation to the Commission regarding the appropriateness of designation, whether it is good policy to designate, but the Committee's primary role is to determine whether the nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee's recommendation is advisory; it is non-binding. He stated that the Committee's recommendation will not decide the fate of the building or the neighborhood. It will be a recommendation about the success or failure of the nomination to document that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria. He remarked that the Historical Commission, which has a broad purview, will consider the claims about safety, blight, and nuisance and make a determination about whether a designation is good for the neighborhood and good for the city, whether a designation is good policy. He concluded that today's discussion relates to the technical merits of the nomination. The broader issues will be considered by the Commission.

Mr. Sawyer, the ORCA zoning chair, stated that the Commission is not required to consider neighborhood input when reviewing nominations. He suggested that immediately after this meeting he would write a nomination for Councilwoman Blackwell's house and then force the Commission to review it. Mr. Sawyer stated that, as the zoning chair, he will be compelled to confront the problems created by any designation, not the Historical Commission and not the nominator. He stated that the zoning code requires local input from the Register Community Organization (RCO), but the historic preservation ordinance does not. Mr. Sawyer claimed that most designations occur in areas where the historic value is recognized. He claimed that most nominations do not confront opposition. He claimed that zoning reviews are rife with controversy; historic nomination reviews are not. He claimed that nomination reviews are "more of an academic exercise." He contended that there is no possible adaptive reuse for this building. If the building is designated, then the Commission will be confronted with demolition by neglect because there is nothing that can be done with this building. Mr. Sawyer stated that, as the Historical Commission begins to consider designations outside neighborhoods traditionally considered historical, City Council should amend the historic preservation ordinance to give the RCOs the authority to review and support or reject nominations before they are presented to the Historical Commission. He then suggested that, perhaps, RCOs should simply be informed of nominations before they are presented to the Historical Commission. He asserted that the Historical Commission should formally notify RCOs before and soon after receiving nominations. Mr. Dilworth reminded Mr. Sawyer that the City has ordered the demolition of the building, making demolition by neglect unlikely. Mr. Sawyer responded that a designation might prevent the sale of the building and its subsequent redevelopment. He asserted that any commercial use for the building is infeasible because the property cannot support off-street parking. He stated that some of the property is zoned CMX-2. He claimed that it was rezoned as such "back in the day" when one could simply place a call to the district councilperson's office and have the zoning changed.

Oscar Beisert, who first submitted the nomination and then withdrew it, observed that some cities have preservation agencies that are organized by neighborhood and neighborhood preservation boards review nominations at the local level, allowing for local input. He asserted that it is a good practice.

Mr. Fenerty stated that he had concluded the neighborhood's presentation. He asked the Committee to review the nomination through the prism of the overarching purposes of the preservation ordinance and not solely on the merits documented in the nomination. He asked them not to consider it as an academic exercise, because it is not academic to the neighborhood. Mr. Dilworth stated that Mr. Fenerty misunderstood the process. He explained that, regardless of the Committee's recommendation, the Commission would take up the matter at its next meeting. Mr. Fenerty responded that the Commission would follow the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Fenerty thanked Mr. Beisert for withdrawing the nomination after he learned of the neighborhood opposition. Mr. Fenerty called Mr. Sawyer "the greatest zoning chairman in the world," but stated that, unlike Mr. Sawyer, his organization understands and accepts the Historical Commission's processes. Concluding, he stated that the Historical Commission preserves great treasures, but this is not one of them.

Mr. Whalen noted that the Commission does value the Committee's recommendations and asked the Committee to take that into account as it deliberated. He stated that the community was witnessing two decades of frustration with this property and, although some of the comments may be outside the Committee's purview, the testimony is relevant. Mr. Whalen stated that, even if one considers only the proposed Criteria for Designation, Criteria C, D, and E, this building does not merit designation. It is too altered and deteriorated to represent its architectural style. And, while no one would dispute that the architect Notman is important, this building is not a significant Notman project. He asserted that, as with the Manatawna nomination, which was heard earlier, simply because a prominent architect's name is associated with a building, does not mean that Criterion E is automatically satisfied. One must consider the value of the building within the architect's production. The name alone does not carry enough weight for a designation.

Ms. Klein stated that she appreciates the feelings of the neighborhood and will take them into consideration. She noted that Mr. Farnham had shared his impressions of the condition of the building and had reviewed the documents provided by the Department of Licenses & Inspections regarding the imminently dangerous (ID) declaration. She asked him to summarize his impressions of the structural condition of the building. Mr. Farnham responded that he is not a structural engineer and is also bound to accept the Department of Licenses & Inspections' conclusions about the building. In the eyes of the Commission and the City, the building is imminently dangerous. Mr. Farnham stated that he had not been in the building, but had seen some of the defects noted by the Department when he recently visited the site and looked at the exterior of the building. Mr. Farnham stated that he wanted to focus the Committee's discussion. He asked the Committee to consider whether the building retained sufficient integrity to characterize a distinctive architectural style, the Gothic Revival, as required by Criteria C and D. Mr. Farnham stated that he does not agree that the building retains sufficient integrity to satisfy Criteria C and D. Mr. Farnham then acknowledged that John Notman was one of the most important Philadelphia architects of the nineteenth century, but asked whether every work by Notman, regardless of condition, can represent Notman and his greatness. Mr. Farnham stated that this building represented Notman in 1848 and 1892, but not today, in its current condition. He concluded that, in his personal opinion, this building fails to satisfy the three Criteria cited. He acknowledged that not everyone on the staff agrees with him. He concluded that, regardless of the opinions of experts, the ID declaration and impending demolition likely renders the recommendation and the nomination moot.

Ken Milano stated that he is not the nominator, but did undertake some of the research for the nomination and would speak on behalf of the nomination in light of the nominator's absence. He

explained that he is a historian who concentrates on and has published several books on this area known as the River Wards. He acknowledged that this is not one of Notman best known works and was not built for the folks of Rittenhouse Square like St. Mark's and Holy Trinity, but it is nonetheless important. Port Richmond became a district in 1846 and this church was built about one year later for working class people. It was a country parish church for people working in the shipbuilding industry. Mr. Milano acknowledged that it was a problem property, noting that he drank there and occasionally got into fights there. He noted that Joseph Menkevich, who worked on the Manatawna nomination, also drank at the building. Mr. Milano pointed out that he never publicly urinated around the building because he is "not that kind of person." He reported that he also drank around the corner at the Oaks Club, which was worse, an even ended up once at the hospital after a visit to the infamous bar. Mr. Milano stated that he appreciated the neighbors' position and might even agree with it if he lived in the area. He noted, however, that the complaints are with the previous owner, not the current owner. He asserted that the building can be reused for something other than a bar. It could be a home or an artists' space. Mr. Milano reported that he requested permission to enter the building, but was refused. He stated that he cannot refute the ID declaration. He stated that he and the others involved with the nomination have acted in good faith. He observed that they did not notify the community group because they wanted to get the property under the Commission's jurisdiction quickly before permits for the demolition and redevelopment were issued. He stated that they tried to meet with ORCA, but were invited and disinvited and "other stuff which I won't go into and is not part of what you need to know."

Mr. Menkevich stated that he is familiar with the building because he has "drank there." He stated that he is in support of the designation process. He stated that the Committee's decision should be based on history as documented in the nomination and not on the other issues related to the property. He referenced the Greenwood Cemetery case, which lasted 10 years. The zoning permit went to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. He stated that he did not want a crematorium constructed at the site because the smoke from it would "spoil" his barbeque chicken. He stated that he became involved with historic preservation because of chicken. He now writes nominations. The owners of Greenwood Cemetery neglected the building. Eventually, it was rehabilitated. He said that "if you throw enough money at something" even a dilapidated building can be rehabilitated. The Historical Commission rightly did not get involved in the zoning case and that is the way it should be. "If L&I says knock it down, then knock it down." Mr. Menkevich asked the Committee to concentrate on the question of historical significance and not look beyond its purview and try to guess what might happen in other arenas.

MOTION: Mr. Laverty moved to recommend that the Historical Commission table the nomination for 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street to the next meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Klein seconded the motion.

Mr. Laverty explained that he is hesitant to agree with the community's or staff's arguments that this is not a historic structure. He suggested that, if the Committee defers a decision, the issue will be solved for it by external forces.

Ms. Klein noted that the property line running through a building and the nomination's grading of the two halves of the building differently may cause regulatory difficulties in the future. She stated that the nomination should be tabled to address those matters. For example, can the two parts of the building be structurally separated?

Mr. Laverty stated that, if the building is ID, it should be demolished. However, that does not mean that the Committee should conclude that the building is not historically significant. He asserted that both halves are significant. Mr. Schaaf stated that Hazelhurst & Huckle, the architectural firm that designed the 1892 section, is very prominent. Mr. Dilworth reminded his fellow Committee members that the nomination proposes that the Hazelhurst & Huckle side of the building has no historical significance. If the Committee believes that it has significance, then it should recommend against the nomination. Mr. Farnham explained that the nomination as submitted only proposed the designation of the older half of the building. The staff revised the nomination to include the newer half because the Commission cannot successfully regulate half a building. The revised nomination labels the newer half non-historic, not because it has no historical significance, but because the original nomination made no claims about the historical significance of the newer half.

Mr. Dilworth asked the architectural historians on the Committee to explain how the older half of the structure in its current condition represents Notman. Mr. Laverty stated that the walls, roof, and cruciform shape all represent Notman. Mr. Dilworth noted that the cruciform shape has been lost with the addition.

Mr. Cohen stated that he is very angry. He asserted that Messrs. Whalen and Fenerty have no basis for their claims about the significance of this building. They are not experts. He objected to the “apocalyptic rhetoric” of the neighbors. He asserted that Notman is the architect of this building and is very important. He stated that no one is advocating reinstituting a nuisance bar. He asserted that the building satisfies Criteria C, D, and E. It is a very early example of the Ecclesiological Gothic. It was built explicitly for a working class neighborhood. He stated that this is a monument for this neighborhood. Someone in the audience yelled out: “You’re kidding me.” Mr. Cohen stated that this is an example of Gothic trying to be modest. The best example in the city is St. James the Less in Nicetown. It was meant to be a small, rustic church, not a cathedral. He stated that he respectfully disagrees with Mr. Farnham. He stated that this chapter of architectural history began in the mid 1840s in the United States. The discovery that this is a Notman church is a major discovery. It satisfies Criteria C, D, and E. Taking a very broad view, he asserted that this is a landmark building, one of the oldest non-residential buildings in this area. A clever architect could integrate parts of this building into a new residential development. The best outcome for this neighborhood would be to retain aspects of the building and incorporate them into a new development. Mr. Cohen stated that he has more to say, but wants to regain his composure.

Mr. Sawyer, the ORCA zoning chair, disagreed with Mr. Cohen and stated that there are other old churches in the neighborhood. He stated that this church is in the shadow of I-95 and will never be on an architectural tour. Mr. Schaaf disagreed. Mr. Sawyer claimed that none of the Committee members have ever been in the neighborhood.

Mr. Schaaf disagreed with Mr. Cohen about the start date of the Gothic Revival and pointed to Latrobe’s cathedral in Baltimore, which dates to 1806. Mr. Cohen responded that he is aware of Latrobe and has written extensively on this period of architectural history. He stated that this church is a monument in the Ecclesiological Gothic Revival, which is a subset of the larger Gothic Revival movement. He stated that the Ecclesiological Gothic Revival was an attempt to be true to the medieval forms. It was not simply a pastiche of Gothic forms like pointed arches. Pugin said: “Decorate construction. Never construct decoration.” In this style, the structure is exposed and decorated, not hidden.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Cohen to opine on whether enough of the physical elements of the building remain to represent the building's significance. Mr. Cohen stated that he disagreed with Mr. Farnham that the integrity has been lost such that the building can no longer betray its significance. Mr. Dilworth asked him to list the elements that together comprise the historical significance of the building. Mr. Cohen stated that the shape of the building and the stonework survive. He added that movable elements from the interior that have been lost are not relevant to the conversation. He stated that the surviving piece should be integrated into new residential development. Mr. Dilworth suggested that the distinctive cruciform shape has been lost with the additions. Mr. Schaaf disagreed and asserted that the Hazelhurst & Huckle addition is significant as well. Mr. Cohen stated that the building has sufficient integrity to disclose its historic character. Mr. Laverty agreed that "enough of it still stands." The walls and the roof are largely unchanged.

Mr. Whalen objected to the motion to table. Mr. Farnham explained to Mr. Whalen that neither the staff nor the Committee on Historic Designation can table or continue a nomination review. Only the Commission has that authority. Moreover, the Committee recommendation is advisory; it is non-binding. Again, the Commission has the authority to make the decision.

Mr. Feibush stated that he will not demolish the building with the condition regarding reconstruction in place. He stated that he cannot afford to take the risk. Mr. Laverty disagreed, suggesting that Mr. Feibush has the approval he needs to move forward with the demolition. Mr. Zecca noted that Mr. Farnham has already stated that the staff conditioned the demolition permit with the requirement that the building is reconstructed within one year. Mr. Dilworth stated that the Commission would not compel Mr. Feibush to reconstruct the building. He explained that, in his experience, the Commission has never required such a reconstruction. Mr. Dilworth offered as an example the case of a designated, neglected house on Ridge Avenue in Roxborough, which was demolished without any permits or approvals. The Historical Commission retained jurisdiction over the site and approved the construction of a bank building with the requirement that it include some Wissahickon Schist accents to recall the lost house. It did not require the reconstruction of the house, even though it might have been warranted in that case.

Mr. Whalen asked the Committee to clarify the motion on the floor. He asked if the Committee was considering tabling the nomination because it believed that the nomination would be moot when the building is demolished. Mr. Laverty, who made the motion, stated that he would consider the nomination moot if the building were demolished. Mr. Whalen stated that it is telling that Mr. Fearon had not bothered to take the day off work to attend the meeting. Several Committee members asked him not to jump to conclusions based on Mr. Fearon's absence. Mr. Whalen asserted that Mr. Fearon would not consider the nomination moot if the building were demolished. He asserted that the only way Mr. Fearon can indicate that is to withdraw the nomination. Mr. Whalen claimed that, if the Committee recommends tabling the nomination, it is putting Mr. Feibush in a difficult situation because he cannot demolish the building with the condition in place, but he is carrying the liability of an imminently dangerous building. He asked the Committee to vote the nomination up or down and not simply "punt" the matter.

Mr. Fenerty asked the Committee if the reconstruction condition on the demolition permit application could be removed in light of the fact that Mr. Dilworth contended that the Commission would never require such a reconstruction. Mr. Mooney stated that, if the building is demolished, then there is no reason to designate it because all of the proposed Criteria relate to the building and not other aspects of the site. He added that a reconstructed building would not satisfy the Criteria; it would not be a historic building. Mr. Fenerty advised Mr. Whalen not to

object to the motion to table. Mr. Laverty noted that the Commission has routinely removed properties from the Register after historic buildings have been lost. Mr. Dilworth stated that the likely outcome is that the building will be demolished and the material will lose its historical significance. He asked why his fellow Committee members were not factoring that into their calculations of integrity. Mr. Laverty stated that he and Mr. Cohen cannot be put into a position where they will agree that the building does not have historical significance. He stated that he can agree that the building suffers from structural defects and must be demolished, but he cannot agree that it does not have historical significance. He stated that the building does have significance, even if it needs to be demolished. Mr. Cohen stated that he does not want to recommend tabling the matter because he has a very strong opinion on its historical significance. Mr. Dilworth asked if the historical significance of a building is diminished if the building is destroyed. Mr. Laverty conceded that it does diminish. Mr. Dilworth then observed that Messrs. Cohen and Laverty were asserting that the historical significance of the building diminishes once it is demolished. Mr. Cohen disagreed, stating the building's significance remains whether it is standing or not, but noted that it stands today. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Cohen to agree that the building's significance is related to its materiality. Mr. Cohen stated that this will be a historically significant building even after it is demolished. Mr. Dilworth asked about the relationship of the physical existence of a building and its historical significance.

Several in the audience asked that the matter be allowed to move forward to the Historical Commission at its meeting next Friday. Mr. Farnham explained that nothing that the Committee can recommend would prevent the Commission from hearing the matter at its next meeting. He stated that the Commission may table, adopt, or reject the nomination regardless of the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Whalen suggested that the Committee vote up or down on the nomination, but add a statement in the recommendation that the nomination is moot if the building is demolished. Mr. Schaaf stated that that was not possible. The Committee cannot simultaneously affirm the satisfaction of the Criteria and allow for a rescission. Others disagreed. Mr. Whalen stated that it would not be a rescission; instead, it would be a conditional designation. Mr. Dilworth observed that they agree that the building is likely to be demolished in the near future. He asked the Committee members if they agree that the historical significance declines if it is demolished. Mr. Schaaf stated that the building has no historical significance if it demolished because the resource is gone. Mr. Laverty stated that the demolition does not mean that the building was never historically significant. Mr. Cohen stated that the building's historical significance lives on beyond the material building. It will always be significant. The need for protection will no longer exist, but the building will always be historically significant. Mr. Dilworth stated that, in light of the condition of the building, its historical significance is tenuous. He stated that he would make a motion to recommend that the Commission reject the nomination. Mr. Schaaf cautioned that the Committee already has a motion on the floor. Mr. Whalen again suggested that the Committee vote up or down on the nomination, but add a statement in the recommendation that the nomination is moot if the building is demolished. Mr. Fenerty stated that the community supports the motion to table. Mr. Milano stated that the area is a preservation desert. There are no designated properties in "ORCA Land."

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Laverty and Ms. Klein withdrew their motion to recommend that the Historical Commission table the nomination for 2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street to the next meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at

2640-42 and 2644-58 E. Huntingdon Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Mr. Laverty seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 1. Mr. Dilworth dissented.

Ms. Klein and Mr. Laverty excused themselves from the meeting.

5710 WISSAHICKON AVENUE, FRANCIS R. STRAWBRIDGE HOUSE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Eastview Realty Association

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5710 Wissahickon Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. The nomination argues that the house, constructed in 1905-06 for Francis R. Strawbridge, is significant as an intact example of a Brockie & Hastings interpretation of the Colonial Revival style, as well as for being a fine example of the Georgian tradition of architecture in Philadelphia, and in Germantown specifically. The nomination further contends that the house is significant for its association with its first owner, Francis R. Strawbridge, the son of Justus C. Strawbridge, co-founder of the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, as well as his son G. Stockton Strawbridge.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5710 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert noted that the nomination was a particularly fun to write, as he was able to meet with descendants of the Strawbridge family, who were excited about the possibility of the designation and protection of the building. John Manton commended the craftsmanship of the building as designed by Brockie & Hastings. Mr. Cohen noted that the Strawbridge house is a relatively early example of the architects' work. Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination is sound.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5710 Wissahickon Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1003 FRANKFORD AVENUE, FREDERICK RAPP HOUSE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Fulwider II Corp A PA Corp

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1003 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, and J.

The nomination argues that the house, constructed between 1785 and 1787, is significant as an example of "an average to slightly above-average house type of the late eighteenth century in the Fishtown section of the larger Kensington neighborhood, within the larger post-Revolution context of Philadelphia." The nomination claims that the Rapp House is the oldest known

dwelling in Fishtown and the larger Kensington neighborhood. The nomination further contends that the house is significant for its association with its first owner, Frederick Rapp, a doctor and German soldier.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1003 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but suggests that the nomination be edited to provide clarity and correct numerous typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Farnham noted that the staff had been working on nominations for this and nearby houses, and is pleased to support the nomination. Mr. Beisert commented that it is surprising that a house of this age has survived. Historian Ken Milano noted that the neighborhood of Kensington, with Fishtown as its oldest section, was established in the 1730s, and very few buildings of that age survive and are designated. He noted that Colonial Kensington was along Richmond Street, where this property is located. He noted that gentrification in the area has increased dramatically and that properties such as this one have become so valuable that people will buy perfectly good old houses and tear them down to construct larger, modern buildings.

Mr. Mooney asked whether the rear ell of the house has a basement. He stated that, if it does not, he would argue strongly for the addition of Criterion I to the nomination; though, if it does, he continued, there would be no archaeological potential. He noted that, as his day job, he directs the archaeological investigation for the I-95 project, and that the archaeological resources being discovered in this part of Philadelphia are incredible. Mr. Mooney noted that, if there is no basement below the rear ell, there could still be a great potential for archaeological resources. Mr. Beisert responded that there is an insurance survey for the property, but he is not sure if it mentioned a basement. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there is a bulkhead door to the basement of the main block. Mr. Mooney responded that he is not concerned about the basement of the main block because anything of archaeological value would be located at the rear of the property in the back yard. He noted that, if this was downtown Philadelphia, there could be deep-shaft features that go down 20 or 30 feet; if there is a basement, it does not really matter, because the shaft features will extend below the basement. He noted that what they have found in the Fishtown/Kensington section of the City is that the watertable is much higher and the deepest shaft features they have found are only about 10 feet deep. If there is a basement in this part of town, he continued, it eliminates any archaeological potential, but if there is any backyard space, archaeological potential is huge. He noted that one block away from this property is another German ancestry home, the Remer site, which backs up to Shackamaxon Street with Sarah Street on the other side. The only part of the property that remains from the construction of I-95, he noted, is a four-foot strip of the backyard, in which a total of 62 features were found, including about eight shaft features (privies), and unbelievable artifacts. One of these artifacts, dubbed the Shackamaxon Spectacles, are believed to be the oldest pair of eyeglasses ever found anywhere in the United States, and may date as early as 1550.

Mr. Mooney further noted that there are a number of Native American sites, including on the Remer site property. They found that, if there is any kind of open backyard space, a Native American site is very likely. The area is reported to have been the Native American village of Shackamaxon. He noted that the village probably did not sit directly on the river, but back off the river, around the current location of Frankford Avenue.

Mr. Mooney noted that he does not know whether there is unexcavated space at the rear of 1003 Frankford Avenue, and thus is unsure whether to recommend the inclusion of the additional Criterion. Mr. Beisert responded that it is difficult to tell for this property, which although originally a fully detached structure, has become the most landlocked by neighboring structures. He noted that he knows the property originally had a frame ell, as it is called out in the insurance survey, but is unsure whether that frame structure survives, as the whole rear of the building has been stuccoed.

Mr. Manton asked if Frederick Rapp, the original owner, was the Hessian colonel at Trenton during the Revolutionary War. Mr. Beisert responded that Frederick Rapp was in the military, but was a surgeon. Mr. Beisert noted that there were many people named Rapp in Philadelphia during that period.

Mr. Mooney reiterated that the archaeological potential in this area is incredible, but that, if the rear ell of the property has a basement, there is no point in the inclusion of the additional Criterion. Mr. Farnham suggested that the staff undertake additional research and provide it to Mr. Mooney. If it proves there is archaeological potential, the nomination could be amended at a later date.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1003 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. Mr. Mooney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1101-03 FRANKFORD AVENUE
Nominator: Oscar Beisert
Owner: Shifco Holdings LLC

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1101-03 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 building, constructed in two phases, the first in 1851 and the second in 1856, is significant in the development of Kensington as part of several industrial enterprises: the Martin Landenberger Hosiery Mill Complex (1851-1920), 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 a “distinctive industrial pile of a mid-nineteenth century urban mill and/or industrial building,” and claims that it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style. 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 1101-03 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but does not make a cogent argument for Criterion H. The staff recommends that the nomination should be edited for clarity, conciseness, and typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert opined that Criterion H is a weak Criterion to begin with, but that the property is a visual feature in that in wraps up Frankford Avenue with the mill at the corner and the Italianate style sheds that append it. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff contends that Criterion H should be used for buildings that are an established visual feature; for example, is it referenced in guides or tour maps and not just has it been there for a while? Mr. Milano opined that when Landenberger was a hosiery mill it was well known. Ms. DiPasquale asked whether there are documents that discuss it as a landmark, and whether that is documented in the nomination. Mr. Beisert responded that he wants the property to be designated, whether it is a visual feature or not. He opined that the group of buildings gives the area a strong sense of place. He noted that there are other buildings that were part of the complex that he has not yet had time to nominate.

Mr. Dilworth commented that, as a factory building, it does not seem to have singular visual characteristics, but rather is just more representative of an era. Mr. Beisert responded that the way the sheds are lined up next to it have a very distinctive feel.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1101-03 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for A, C, and J, but not Criterion H. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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 does not make a cogent argument for Criteria C or H. The staff recommends that the nomination should be edited for clarity, conciseness, and typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff recommendation that the nomination does not satisfy Criterion C was based on the fact that the staff did not consider the industrial buildings to be of the Italianate style, and that there might be a better stylistic classification for the buildings.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he wished there could have been a way for this series of nominations to be collapsed into one narrative, as there is so much repetition across the four nominations. He asked if that was because there are multiple parcels. Mr. Beisert responded that he believes the whole area should be a historic district.

Edward Paul, one of the owners of 1105-09 and 1111-13 Frankford Avenue, commented that the proposed designation presents some issues, as there may be some development happening next door at 1115-27 Frankford Avenue, and that they would like to piggyback on that development. He noted that the Committee had recommended that the Commission grant a continuance to that nomination, but that he did not realize that was an option. He noted that they purchased the property in 1987 and have persevered with it, despite the City condemning the property next door at 1101-03 Frankford, which is finally being redeveloped. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the property at 1101-03 Frankford Avenue is being redeveloped on permits secured nearly a year prior to the submission of the nomination, and as such, those permits are not subject to the Historical Commission's review.

Mr. Paul noted that in his 48 years of business, he had owned properties already designated as historic, but never gone through the process of designation. He requested that the Committee recommend that the Commission continue the nominations for both his properties to the next Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Ms. DiPasquale noted that, during the period of the continuance, the properties would remain under the Commission's jurisdiction and any permits or work to the exterior of the properties would need to be reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission.

Mr. Paul noted that Transport Cycles has already installed a new entrance behind the roll-down gate shown in the photographs.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the two buildings composing the 1105-09 parcel are just one large space inside. Mr. Paul responded that he does not believe that the industrial building has any historical significance on the interior, although there may be some on the exterior. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Historical Commission only regulates work to the exteriors of buildings, and does not regulate use.

Mr. Dilworth asked if anyone objected to the request for a continuance. Joseph Menkevich asked whether someone requesting a continuance should have a good reason for doing so, noting that the owner might be leaving town, but the building is not. Mr. Cohen responded that the building would still be protected during the period of the continuance. Mr. Beisert remarked that he was pleased that the owner was not immediately opposed to the possibility of designation. Mr. Paul noted that he would like to see how the Committee rules on the property next door at 1115-27 Frankford, as plans for and regulation of that property will influence his properties.

Mr. Farnham reiterated that the Committee has already made a recommendation that the Commission grant the continuance for 1115-27 Frankford Avenue, which has some linkages to the properties at 1105-09 and 1111-13 Frankford Avenue. Mr. Farnham opined that, when a request is made to obtain additional time to investigate the implications of designation and to review the nomination, the reasonable decision is to grant that continuance request.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination for 1105-09 Frankford Avenue and remand it back to the Committee on Historic

Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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 does not make a cogent argument for Criteria C or H. The staff recommends that the nomination should be edited for clarity, conciseness, and typographical errors.

DISCUSSION: See above discussion for 1105-09 Frankford Avenue.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved that the Committee on Historic Designation recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination for 1111-13 Frankford Avenue and remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation at its next meeting in March 2016. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

709, 711-15, AND 717-19 S 12TH STREET, UNION BAPTIST CHURCH
Nominator: Oscar Beisert and Rachel Hildebrandt
Owner: 12th Street Development LLC

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 709, 711-15, and 717-19 S. 12th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. The nomination argues that the Romanesque Union Baptist Church building is significant as an architect-designed, purpose-built African American church. The nomination further contends that the building is significant for its association with vocalist and civil rights activist Marian Andersen, who first sang in the church choir at the building in 1902.

The nomination for this property was submitted on 14 August 2015. Prior to the submission of the nomination, on 31 July 2015, the property owner submitted an application for complete demolition to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Owing to the fact that the demolition application was submitted two weeks in advance of the nomination, the Historical Commission

had no authority to review the demolition permit, which was issued. The property owner has since acted upon that permit, demolishing the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that, owing to the demolition, the property at 709, 711-15, and 717-19 S. 12th Street fails to satisfy any of the Criteria for Designation cited in the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

The staff displayed photographs of the building in various states of demolition over the last few weeks. In light of the permitted demolition of the building, Oscar Beisert and Rachel Hildebrandt withdrew their nomination for the property at 709, 711-15, and 717-19 S. 12th Street.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dilworth moved to adjourn at 12:40 p.m. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

(a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
(b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
(c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
(d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
(e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
(f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
(g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
(h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
(i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
(j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.

DRAFT