

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**13 DECEMBER 2017, 10:00 A.M.
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.
Janet Klein
Bruce Laverty
R. David Schaaf, RA

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Chris Nares
William Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
B. Feldman, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA
Devon Alioto, SgRA
Celeste Morello
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
George Yu
Lotus Yu
Amy Lambert, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Oscar Beisert
J.M. Duffin
K. Kelly
Fozan Ehmedi
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Mary McGettigan, WP3P

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. Ms. Klein and Messrs. Cohen, Laverty, and Schaaf joined her.

ADDRESS: 100 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Name of Resource: Rohm & Haas

Proposed Action: Designation of property, interior, and objects

Property Owner: KPG-IMW Owner, LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused from the review. Mr. Cohen temporarily chaired the meeting and presented the continuance requests for 100 S. Independence West Mall to the Committee on Historic Designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nominations for 100 S. Independence West Mall and remand them to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its 18 April 2018 meeting.

1301-25 CHESTNUT STREET

Name of Resource: Grand Court, John Wanamaker Store

Proposed Action: Designation of Interior

Property Owner: Behringer Harvard REIT

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Grand Court satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the interior, the Grand Court, of the former John Wanamaker Store at 1301-25 Chestnut Street as historic and list in on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property's exterior is already designated as historic. The nomination contends that the Grand Court is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, H, and J. The nomination claims that the Grand Court, a significant work conceived by Philadelphia merchant John Wanamaker and architect Daniel H. Burnham, stands as the unifying core of one of America's most acclaimed and influential department store designs and serves an expression of Beaux-Arts classicism. The nomination further argues that the Grand Court reflects the environment of an era shaped by the City Beautiful movement as applied to monumental commercial buildings and that the interior space includes two of Philadelphia's most recognized and established icons, the Wanamaker eagle and Wanamaker organ, which are situated in a unique and familiar architectural setting within the heart of Center City.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman returned to chair the meeting. Ms. Cooperman presented the continuance request for the review of the nomination of the interior of 1301-25 Chestnut Street. She noted that the request asked that the nomination be continued and remanded to the 18 April 2017 Committee on Historic Designation meeting.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia observed that his organization nominated the interior. He asked why he, as the nominator, had not been informed of the continuance request. He also asked why the property owner had requested a continuance. Ms. Keller explained that the property owner is working with Macy's, the tenant, to understand the implications of the designation. She added that Macy's is currently completing a building permit application for interior renovations that are unrelated to the Grand Court and wanted to proceed through the review process for that application before the designation is completed to better understand the design review process. Mr. Steinke asserted that the permit application referenced is under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, even if the designation process is not complete. Ms. Keller stated that both she and the applicant are aware of the extent of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction in this matter. It was noted that the Historical Commission routinely grants property owners' continuance requests of designation matters.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination of the interior of 1301-25 Chestnut Street and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its 18 April 2018 meeting.

6369 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: "Genteel Two-Story Stone Dwelling"

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6369 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6369 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination contends that the property holds significance to the development and heritage of Germantown and is one of several properties purchased by developer Thomas Reilly following the subdivision of the Chew estate. The nomination further argues that the building, while potentially constructed decades earlier, currently reflects the bracketed mode of the Italianate style popularized in the mid-nineteenth-century and applied extensively to other Germantown Avenue properties. The nomination also suggests that, owing to its inclusion in the National Register's Colonial Germantown Historic District, the property is part of and related to a distinctive area.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman presented the continuance request for 6369 Germantown Avenue.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 6369 Germantown Avenue and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its 14 February 2018 meeting.

6365-67 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Mill are significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination contends that the property represents the less common industrial typology that included domestic, commercial, and residential buildings located on a single parcel and that the property contributed to Germantown's industrial landscape through the manufacturing of rag carpets. The nomination further argues that the store and residence exemplify the Queen Anne style, while the rear mill building serves as an example of Second Empire architecture. The nomination also suggests that, owing to its inclusion in the National Register's Colonial Germantown Historic District, the property is part of and related to a distinctive area.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman presented the continuance request for 6365-67 Germantown Avenue.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 6365-67 Germantown Avenue and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at its 14 February 2018 meeting.

ADDRESS: 3200 BELGRADE ST

Name of Resource: Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Catholic Church at 3200 Belgrade Street in the Port Richmond neighborhood and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the church, which fronts on Allegheny Avenue and upon which construction began in 1890, is significant under Criterion for Designation E as the work of preeminent nineteenth century ecclesiastical architect Edwin Forrest Durang.

The staff notes that the architectural description describes the building's cladding as brown granite, but is, in fact, brownstone from Yardleyville, Pennsylvania.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 3200 Belgrade Street satisfies Criterion for Designation E.

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

Mr. Phillips stated that he has no comment on the technical aspects of the nomination, but will be opposing any designation on discretionary grounds before the Historical Commission. Mr. Cohen asked for clarity. Mr. Phillips responded that this Committee meeting is to provide technical advice as to whether the nomination argues that the building satisfies one or more Criteria for Designation. The building is the work of Edwin Forrest Durang, an important architect. What will be presented to the Commission is how the Archdiocese cares for this property, and what it has done to maintain this property and its other properties. This is an active, thriving parish with no risk of closing, and for that reason, the care and upkeep of the property should remain solely within the Archdiocese's discretion.

Ms. Morello opined that she observed familiarity between Mr. Phillips and some of the Commissioners during the review of one of her prior nominations. She asserted that prior relationships between the attorney and Commissioners should have no bearing on the nomination review process and whether her nominations are approved or denied. She explained that she is speaking as a practicing Roman Catholic. She again suggested that existing relationships with clergy, representatives of the Archdiocese, and Commissioners may suggest some taint and bias against the properties that she nominates.

David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that this church is one of a trio of churches along Allegheny Avenue. All three are architecturally distinctive, and likely there are additional criteria for which this church qualifies. He concluded that Save Our Sites supports the historic designation.

Oscar Beisert, representing Keeping Society, commented that he supports the nomination, and hopes that the other two churches mentioned by Mr. Traub will be nominated as well.

Ms. Klein commented that Durang was born into a theatrical family, and was named for Edwin Forrest, who was an important and famous actor. The Forrest Theatre is named for him as well. Mr. Laverty commented that Durang designed what is now the Trocadero Theatre.

Mr. Laverty commented that the nomination provides a solid argument for Criterion E and the significance associated with Edwin Forrest Durang. He suggested that the church may also satisfy Criterion H, as an established feature on Allegheny Avenue. He stated that it was designed to dominate the neighborhood, along with the other two churches mentioned, and not only in the immediate neighborhood but also from I-95. He recommended that Criterion H be added. He complimented the Archdiocese on its maintenance of the property, noting that the tower is intact. Mr. Cohen agreed. He asked why the rectory is not included as part of the nomination. Ms. Morello confirmed that only the church is proposed for designation. She stated that she is unsure if Durang is also the architect of the rectory, and the architectural styles of the church and rectory are dissimilar. She also felt that the rectory was too altered, specifically at the mansard roof, where asphalt shingles have been installed.

Mr. Cohen commented that this is one of Durang's most spirited designs, and it is incredibly eclectic. It goes from Medieval to Renaissance and is one of his most inventive designs. He asked that Ms. Morello provide citations in the future, if she includes claims such as "Often cited as one of Durang's best..." He explained that such a claim should have a citation. Ms. Morello responded that she does not remember the source of the claim, but it was likely a religious reference, and there are few references about Durang. She suggested that the claim is universal. Ms. Cooperman noted that there are citations that provide a more precise dating of the church, and are not included in the nomination. Mr. Cohen suggested that the staff or nominator add the citation. Ms. Cooperman continued that there is an 1894 citation which documents the letting of contracts for continued work, which is also not included in the nomination, and is available via the Philadelphia Architects and Buildings database. She suggested that these citations can be added to the file later.

Mr. Cohen noted that the reference to a corbel table is actually describing a cornice, as corbel tables are medieval in usage. He also noted that the term "radiating chapels" is misused, which is actually describing apse chapels. Ms. Morello responded that they are not at the apse. Mr. Cohen agreed, but noted that they have apses. Ms. Morello responded that she appreciates the comments regarding architecture, but the nomination focuses on significance related to the architect, and she desires to stay focused on Durang.

Mr. Traub commented that the church faces Campbell Square, which he refers to as the Rittenhouse Square of Port Richmond. He commented that the church is a very familiar feature of the square. Mr. Laverty agreed that it is another aspect that makes this church unique. It had the open space from the beginning, whereas many other churches are constructed very close to row houses. Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Laverty is recommended that Criterion G be included. Mr. Laverty responded that he would like to focus solely on Criteria E and H, as the work of an important architect, and as a familiar visual landmark. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that this

church is a familiar visual landmark from multiple vantage points. Mr. Cohen suggested that this church is comparable to Durang's work at Saint Charles Borromeo.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 3200 Belgrade Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and H.

ADDRESS: 2 E CHESTNUT HILL AVE

Name of Resource: 2 E Chestnut Hill Avenue

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 2 E Chestnut Hill Ave Partners LP

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2 E Chestnut Hill Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the house, constructed in 1863, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, E, and H. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the dwelling is significant as a reflection of the distinctive mid-nineteenth century form of the Gothic Revival cottage. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the building is representative of the work of James C. Sidney, one of the most important architects and surveyors of Philadelphia in the mid-nineteenth century, and his partner Frederick C. Merry. The nomination also asserts that the property is significant under Criterion H owing to its position on a prominent corner of Chestnut Hill and Germantown Avenues.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2 E Chestnut Hill Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and E, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion H.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused, owing to her association with the nominator, the Chestnut Hill Conservancy. Mr. Cohen assumed the chair. Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Lori Salganicoff and Amy Lambert represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Salganicoff explained that her organization, the Chestnut Hill Conservancy, retained Ms. Lambert to write the nomination. She opined that the property is at an important gateway location at Chestnut Hill Avenue and Germantown Avenue, and is also a location where there has been an enormous interest in tear-down redevelopment. There are certain significant properties that have risen as priorities to the Conservancy both for their cultural and historical significance, but also because they seem more likely to be in danger of demolition. She explained that the Conservancy has been nominating those properties for protection by the Historical Commission. She noted that this property is listed as Significant in the Chestnut Hill National Register Historic District and is a key location to be protected. She opined that, if the building is torn down, the property could be subdivided to four or five lots. She also acknowledged that there could also be subdivision if the building remains, which allows for a renovation/redevelopment approach, and noted that the Conservancy would be happy to support such a project. Ms. Lambert agreed with Ms. Salganicoff, noting that this is an incredibly important building whose siting is also important for Chestnut Hill and the former Germantown Township. She noted that it is also a surviving part of J.C. Sidney's portfolio. Sidney & Merry were only in business for approximately five years. It is not just along the important Germantown Avenue, but it is the starting point for a series of similar properties along E. Chestnut Hill

Avenue. From both directions, it is incredibly important, and a wonderful surviving example of the Picturesque Gothic.

Mr. Cohen asked whether the owner or a representative of the owner was present. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the owners are not present, but that she has been in contact with them. She explained that the owners do not contest the historical significance of the property, and have been working with the staff on window replacement, which was their primary concern regarding the designation of the property. Ms. Salganicoff noted that her organization has also had discussions with the property owners that she would be happy to share.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he moved to Philadelphia 35 years ago and remembers seeing this building when he first arrived and thinking that it was outstanding. He noted that it is only one large block from the Chestnut Hill East station, the Reading Railroad Station. He explained that the current station building is from 1931, but its antecedent building was built in the 1850s. He noted that the Chestnut Hill East station was established in 1854, and 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue is only nine years after the original train station was built, which really spurred development along Summit Street and Chestnut Hill Avenue. In 1884, the Chestnut Hill West station was built by Henry Houston and this building ended up mid-way between the stations. He opined that it is a fantastically sited property. Mr. Cohen agreed, noting that its siting is remarkable in that, in the suburbanizing residential mode, the building was sited to face away from Germantown Avenue. This, he noted, broke the mold of eighteenth-century buildings, which were all sited to face Germantown Avenue. He opined that this unusual aspect also makes the building more vulnerable, since there is commercial desirability along Germantown Avenue. He asked why Ms. Lambert thinks the architects sited the building that way. Ms. Lambert responded that she suspects that it was as a gateway into the more private and residential portion of Chestnut Hill. Mr. Lavery noted that the building would have turned its back on its neighbors along Chestnut Hill Avenue if it had faced Germantown Avenue. Mr. Schaaf noted that there is an incredible Italianate building directly across the street that also faces Chestnut Hill Avenue.

Mr. Cohen suggested some minor corrections to the nomination. He noted that in some places, the date of construction is listed as 1863-64, but in others it is listed as 1864. Ms. Lambert noted that the design and construction were begun in 1863 and completed in 1864. Mr. Cohen asked how the attribution to Sidney & Merry was determined. Ms. Salganicoff responded that there was an exhaustive study by Jefferson Moak in 1987 of every building in Chestnut Hill, where he investigated and established and based on property records, deeds, and other documents that were available who built what, where and when, and that information is available in the files of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy. Mr. Cohen opined that it would be great to have the primary source documentation as well.

Mr. Cohen commented that photographs of each elevation should be incorporated into the body of the physical description portion of the nomination so that it is not necessary to flip back and forth.

Mr. Cohen questioned the wording of "Charter for the Philadelphia Institute of Architects" at the top of page 13, and whether it should actually be the "Pennsylvania Institute of Architects." Mr. Lavery asked what year was being referenced, and Mr. Cohen responded the 1860s. Mr. Lavery replied that it would be the Pennsylvania Institute of Architects, because the Philadelphia Institute of Architects did not come into being until 1869.

Mr. Cohen asked to discuss the staff's objection to the inclusion of Criterion H. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff feels that buildings such as Nativity B.V.M or other buildings with

unique siting or features satisfy Criterion H, but that simply being a building on a corner does not elevate a property to the level of singular visual feature. Mr. Schaaf noted that the nominators see the property as a gateway, and asked Ms. Salganicoff to expand upon that point. Ms. Salganicoff explained that Chestnut Hill Avenue, like Summit Street, is a major thoroughfare upon which buildings were constructed at a pivotal time in Chestnut Hill's history, and these are properties of architectural significance. Chestnut Hill Avenue and Summit Street are spines that cross the major commercial street, Germantown Avenue, which has its own singular visual character. Ms. Salganicoff commented that, as one enters Chestnut Hill, the community opens up at this intersection, and to lose this particular property at this crucial area would diminish the strong interaction of residential and commercial. She noted that many people are introduced to Chestnut Hill from this intersection. She opined that the way the Conservancy thinks of Chestnut Hill is as a well-integrated community of commercial, residential, and institutional buildings, and all of those are important parts of what makes Chestnut Hill significant. She opined that the fact that this building sits at this location, set back in a generous way with green space and trees with the residential character right on Germantown Avenue represents a gateway to them. Mr. Lavery responded that he thinks it can be argued both ways. He opined that the gateway nature of the building is one that would be more noticed in its loss than in its existence. If one compares it to a true gateway building like the Chestnut Hill Baptist Church or the Pennsylvania Railroad Depot at the top of the hill, those are landmark buildings that people think of when they think of Chestnut Hill. He opined that people do not notice this building, not because it is not an important building, but that they would notice if it was gone. Ms. Salganicoff agreed, noting that there are overt gateways and then there are things that represent the more difficult to protect aspects of the community.

Ms. Klein noted that the architects were also involved with landscape architecture. She opined that when one looks at this property and sees the large, mature trees, it was meant to be an entrance—maybe not a gateway—but a change from the lower part of Germantown Avenue to what was then becoming much more open and verdant landscaped residential properties. Mr. Cohen mused that the property makes him think of the Italianate villa at 40th and Pine Streets that looked like a gateway to the villa district, but that he also understands the staff's point that there might be an inflation happening that every building on a corner satisfies Criterion H, which would devalue the criterion. He commented that it does not make a great deal of difference to the preservation of the property to exclude Criterion H and keep it for special circumstances. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff believes that it is a significant building, but not under Criterion H. Mr. Cohen agreed, and reiterated that most corner buildings could make the same argument.

Mr. Cohen commented that Aaron Wunsch has been compiling a definitive list of J.C. Sidney designs, and if there is a primary source document, Mr. Wunsch might know where to find it.

Mr. Cohen opened the floor to public comment.

Jim Duffin commented that it is important to think of this building in both its geographical context as well as its historical context. In looking at the development of Chestnut Hill from the eighteenth century into the nineteenth century, what one might consider more of the commercial area basically ended at the intersection of Germantown Avenue and Bethlehem Pike. He noted that that intersection, where the building that once housed the Borders Bookstore stands, used to be an eighteenth-century tavern which was converted to a boarding house in the nineteenth century and demolished in the 1920s. Then the next building up in the nineteenth century was the Chestnut Hill library. On the east side of Germantown Avenue, starting at the top of the hill and going south along Germantown Avenue, 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue is the last residential

property before entering into what can be considered the commercial area, and that follows the pattern even from the eighteenth century, as this was all farmland. He noted that the history of the property is in keeping with the historic geography as being the last vestige point on the east side of Germantown Avenue as the dividing line between residential and commercial. Mr. Cohen asked whether he supported the inclusion of Criterion H. Mr. Duffin responded that he did not read the nomination, so he does not know the exact argument that it makes, but that it could be helpful to articulate that idea of a gateway between residential and commercial in such a way. He explained that he understands the staff's concern with the use of that criterion. Ms. Klein opined that, if the building and trees and landscape are removed, that would change the entrance to Chestnut Hill. She suggested keeping Criterion H owing to the location of the building.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and H.

ADDRESS: 2216 WALNUT STREET

Name of Resource: 2216 Walnut Street

Proposed Action: Classification

Property Owner: 2216 Walnut Street LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to classify the property at 2216 Walnut Street as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The building in question at 2216 Walnut Street was not explicitly addressed in the district inventory, but was apparently included within the inventory entry for the adjacent building, the Roosevelt Hotel at 2218-22 Walnut Street, which is classified as significant. At the time of the designation of the historic district, the parcels at 2216 and 2218-22 Walnut Street were consolidated as one tax parcel. The inventory entry, which numbers the property as 2216-24 Walnut, describes the 10-story residential hotel at the corner, which was built in 1927, but it makes no mention whatsoever of the four-story building at 2216, which began as a rowhouse constructed about 1888 and was significantly reconstructed as an office building in 1950. The 1950 reconstruction included a new front façade, floor-level modifications, and rear additions. From the public right-of-way, the building appears as a mid twentieth-century, four-story office building. The classification application argues that the statement of significance does not mention any historic buildings in the district that post-date 1935, that the statement of significance does not claim that office buildings played a role in the district's significance, and that the most analogous building in the district, 1606 Locust Street, which began as a four-story rowhouse but was refaced in the twentieth century as an office building, is classified as non-contributing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the classification of 2216 Walnut Street as non-contributing, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, for the following reasons:

1. the inventory for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District does not describe the history or appearance of the building at 2216 Walnut, but merely subsumes it into 2218-22 Walnut, a building with an entirely different history and appearance;
2. the underlying 1880s rowhouse was so altered in 1950 that it lost all attributes of a residential building discernible to the public; and,

3. the commercial use as a sales office for business machines is not a use that would qualify the building for a classification of contributing under the statement of significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused, owing to her association with the property owner. Mr. Cohen assumed the chair. Mr. Farnham presented the classification request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Devon Alioto, and property owner Michael Alhadad represented the application.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that the proposed classification of non-contributing is appropriate and deserves the Committee's support. Mr. Cohen responded that the lack of description and classification of this building in the historic district's inventory sounds like a mistake.

Mr. Schaaf asked why the front façade of 2216 Walnut Street is so similar to the façade of the adjacent Roosevelt Hotel. Both have ochre brick facades with limestone bases. Mr. Lavery asked whether the building in question and the Roosevelt Hotel were owned by the same entity in 1950. Mr. Farnham responded that the buildings at 2216 and 2218-22 Walnut Street were owned by the same person in 1950, when 2216 Walnut was reconstructed. He added that the new building at 2216 Walnut was not constructed as an annex to 2218-22 Walnut Street, the Roosevelt Hotel, but as a stand-alone office building. Mr. Farnham noted a newspaper article from 1950 that referred to 2216 as a "rebuilt, air-conditioned building" that was being leased to an office machine company. He concluded that the building at 2216 was not an annex of the hotel but was a separate office building constructed by the owner of the hotel. Mr. Cohen commented that the office building was "good, contextual design." He noted that the fenestration of the building at 2216 "is not that of a hotel." Mr. Cohen posited that the historic district surveyors were likely confused by the similar buildings. He noted that the building that stood on the site prior to the reconstruction was designed by Frank Furness, but that building is gone. Mr. Cohen again stated that the lack of a classification for the property at 2216 Walnut was a "mistake" and the request should be approved.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization does not oppose the classification request. He noted that the Alliance holds easements on both 2216 and 2218-22 Walnut Street. He stated that the Alliance has granted conceptual approval under the easement agreement for the retention of the 1950 façade and the construction of a new building behind it. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance explained that the buildings at 2216 and 2218-22 Walnut Street were combined as one property until 2016.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that his organization is not opposed to the classification.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission classify the property at 2216 Walnut Street as non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, for the following reasons:

1. the underlying 1880s rowhouse was so altered in 1950 that it lost all attributes of a residential building discernible to the public; and,
2. the commercial use as a sales office for business machines is not a use that would qualify the building for a classification of contributing under the statement of significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

ADDRESS: 4058 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: 4058 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Apostolos and Elizabeth Nares

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4058 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the “restrained interpretation of the Italianate” twin satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G and J. The nomination argues that the twin, constructed between 1872-76 as part of the Thomas H. Powers development consisting of 4046-60 Chestnut Street, is one of a group of houses that has significant value as part of the development of the twin housing type and the formation of West Philadelphia as a suburb aimed to accommodate white-collar commuters whose influx into West Philadelphia was fueling this suburban development. The nomination further contends that the twin is part of and related to a distinctive area, owing to its listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing resource within the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4058 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, but not Criterion G. The staff suggests that Criterion G, which reads “Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif,” should be reserved for squares, parks or truly unique and distinctive areas.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman returned to the chair. Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Elizabeth Stegner, president of the University City Historical Society, represented the nomination. Chris Nares, the son of the property owners, represented his parents.

Ms. Stegner stated that the nomination is correct and complete, and the building is a significant part of the development of the West Philadelphia streetcar suburb. She reminded the Committee that it had reviewed nominations for other buildings in the same row and had recommended that those nominations demonstrated that the properties satisfied the cited Criteria for Designation.

Oscar Beisert, representing Keeping Society, disagreed with the staff’s recommendation regarding Criterion G. He commented that the reason that the area was designated a National Register Historic District was because of its architectural and other historic qualities, and this is part of that distinctive area that should be preserved. He noted that the storefront window is intact. Ms. Stegner agreed that it is one of the more complete houses on the block. Ms. Stegner introduced Mr. Nares, the son of the property owner. She stated that he is not contesting the nomination. Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Nares wished to comment. He declined. Mr. Beisert commented that there was always a pharmacy at the corner building. Mr. Cohen suggested that he consult atlases to determine commercial uses. Mr. Laverty asked if 4058 and 4060 Chestnut Street are the same width. Mr. Nares responded that 4060 Chestnut Street is wider than 4058 Chestnut Street by approximately 10 feet.

Ms. Cooperman asked if Criterion G was included in the designation of the other buildings on this block. Ms. Chantry responded that she was unsure, but that the staff recommendation for

this property is the same as it was previously for the other properties on the block, meaning that the staff consistently recommended the omission of Criterion G.

Mr. Cohen asked if Mr. Beisert is aware of other Powers & Weightman developments. Mr. Beisert responded that he is, and that there was clearly a turning point in Weightman's developments where the style changed to be more eclectic. Mr. Cohen commented that this building is pre-Willis Hale. He asked if Mr. Beisert is aware of what Thomas Powers' own house looked like, and if this row is designed by an architect that worked for Powers. He referred to the building as "remarkable" and described it as conservative with subtle signs of the Italianate. He remarked that the row is unique for being flush on the street with no setback. Mr. Beisert commented that this house type was much more prevalent in Center City and now much of it is gone. He opined that this building is carrying on the Federal style tradition. Mr. Cohen reiterated that the building is unique as a semi-detached house with no setback, whereas many older houses in West Philadelphia have porches or setbacks and are more suburban in design. Mr. Beisert noted that there is another similar house behind 4060 Chestnut Street which may have been part of this development. Mr. Cohen commented that it is interesting that the row was constructed as grand rental properties. He expressed pleasure that the building is nominated for historic designation. Mr. Beisert added that there are similar properties nearby on Pine Street.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he wished the entire block of buildings had been nominated simultaneously, rather than piecemeal, as the real power of the development comes through as an urban streetscape. He commented that the entire street is much more powerful than any individual unit. He stated that this is true of other developments such as Portico Row, on the 900 block of Spruce Street, where the entire block is uniform and magnificent. He opined that the 4000 block of Chestnut Street has the same qualities, although there are interruptions. He considered those interruptions to be meaningless in the entire collection of facades.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4058 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, but not Criterion G.

ADDRESS: 1821-27 RANSTEAD ST

Name of Resource: The Musical Art Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Bian and Lia Yu

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Musical Art Club building, constructed in 1917, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion J because it represents Philadelphia's musical community at an important point in its history. Under Criterion E, the building is significant as the work of Price & McLanahan, a local architectural firm whose experimental work influenced the development of Greater Philadelphia, Atlantic City, and the Midwest. The building's unusual style embodies the culmination of Price & McLanahan's evolution of a "protomodernist" architecture, while still featuring Arts and Crafts elements utilized in their early work, satisfying Criteria C and D.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society represented the nomination. George and Lotus Yu represented the property owners.

Mr. Beisert agreed with the staff overview and recommendation.

Mr. Yu commented that he and his wife live in Swarthmore and purchased the building 28 years ago, and that they like the building. He explained that Price lived and worked in this building. He stated that they take issue with the nomination process. He opined that someone entered the building without talking to them and took photographs of the interior, but that he would let his attorney handle that at the Commission meeting. He noted that their attorney submitted a letter to the Committee and Commission members. He also took issue with the assessment of the building as being in “good” condition. He explained that he and his wife are both retired architects, and practiced in this building on the top floor. The building is not in good condition. He explained that the rear parapet was bulging and in 2012 they had to rebuild the parapet to the cost of \$135,000. Ms. Cooperman interjected that the Committee on Historic Designation does not address issues of condition, only the technical merits of the nomination. Mr. Yu responded that he believed that the condition was the technical part of the nomination. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission can designate ruins, but thanked Mr. Yu for his comments. She noted that the Committee’s task is to determine whether the nomination makes a convincing argument that the building is historic. Ms. Cooperman noted that the property owners could make additional arguments at the Commission meeting. She clarified that, if designated, the Historical Commission would only exert jurisdiction over the exterior of the building, not the interior.

Mr. Yu asked to comment on the surroundings of the building. Ms. Cooperman responded that he could, but noted that the surrounding area has no bearing on the technical merits of the nomination. Mr. Yu commented that the creators of the Rittenhouse Square Historic District were so embarrassed of the 1800 block of Ranstead Street that it was excluded from the district. He stated that Ranstead Street has about 15 dumpsters from the rears of five restaurants, and that their next door neighbor is a 24-hour massage parlor that was recently raided, and the street is full of rats larger than cats. He noted that the top floor of their building has been vacant since 2014, and no one wants to rent it. The bottom floor has been vacant 21 years out of 28 years. He bemoaned the building’s life after designation, noting that the street has taken the oxygen out of the building. He noted that he and his wife want to take care of it, but argued that it should be conserved rather than preserved because conservation deals with the sustainability of the life of the building. He noted that, right now, he and his wife subsidize the building with their fixed income. He reiterated that the street is a horrible street, and wished that the City would do something to help this building survive, because otherwise it is a tombstone. He noted that there is a recording studio in the basement and that he loves the idea of having artists stay in the building, but that they cannot keep the building alive. He stated that he considers architecture as part of the arts as well. He expressed his hope that, since the Historical Commission includes representatives of the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the City Planning Commission, it might be able to do something to help keep the building alive. He explained that there are many repairs to be made, including to the front parapet, which is about to fail. He noted that he thought that that was part of the technical aspects of the building. He noted that the building has been leaking for 11 years, and they built a gutter inside the building to collect water to allow it to drain, but that the front parapet will be even more

expensive to repair that the rear parapet because there are Mercer tiles and other wonderful artifacts. He concluded by asking what is the sense of preserving the building with no life.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment.

David Traub of Save Our Sites commented that his organization could not be more pleased that this building is being nominated for designation. He noted that, in 2010, Save Our Sites included the building in its annual list of endangered sites. He lamented the fact that neither they nor anyone else nominated it at the time, but that they are pleased to see it nominated now. The list was then published in *Center City Weekly Press*. Mr. Traub quoted from the article, explaining that the building was described as having been designed by architect Will Price of Price & McLanahan for the Musical Arts Club. This clubhouse for the defunct Musical Art Club is a treasure tucked away on the alley-like 1800 block of Ranstead Street. Adorned with Mercer tiles, it begs for restoration. He noted that he is unsure whether Mr. Yu read the article, but opined that Mr. Yu is saying two opposing things. Mr. Traub opined that, on one hand, Mr. Yu is saying that he loves the building and wants to see it preserved, but on the other hand, it seems he has taken no action to preserve the building as it could be. Mr. Traub noted that the front elevation of the building is very distinguished, and could be incrementally restored over the years.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that the Alliance also supports the designation of the building, and is pleased to hear that the owners appreciate the building and understand what they have. He opined that, should the building be designated, the owners would find that working with the staff of the Historical Commission will actually be an asset to the owners as they seek to conserve and restore the building. He acknowledged that the owners are architects and likely know what they are doing, but that the Historical Commission staff has great experience with buildings of this style and the materials on the building, including the Mercer tile and high-quality brick, and can help the owners improve the building over time. Mr. Steinke reiterated the Alliance's support for the designation of the building, noting that it is a hidden gem by an important architect, with an important architectural and social history.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance commented that the building is currently surrounded by underutilized surface parking lots, so to Mr. Yu's point, one way to breathe life back into the building is to think about what is possible on the block, and having the Musical Art Club serve as the core of a new development. Mr. Beisert noted that there was recently a new building constructed on the street. Ms. Cooperman noted that other nearby sites are not within the purview of the Committee, but that she appreciated the comments. Mr. Yu asked to respond to Mr. Traub's comments that the owners do not maintain the building. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Yu to save his comments for a later time. Mr. Yu responded that he wants it on record that the owners spent a lot of money inside restoring the lobby and in reconstructing the rear parapet. He opined that designation of the building only puts a burden on the owner, but no one wants to support the street. He noted that they just talked to the next door neighbor where a parking garage used to be, and they are going to construct a 13-story hotel. He explained that he saw the architectural plans for the hotel and the loading dock will be right next to the Musical Art Club building, and there will be more dumpsters.

Mr. Cohen addressed Mr. Yu, noting that he is pleased to hear that he is a Will Price fan and that that attracted him to the building. He opined that the building is a real gem, and is an excellent example of who Will Price was as an architect. He commented that all references to the Art Nouveau should be removed, but that the building is a wonderful representation of

Price's continuation of the Arts and Crafts into the nineteen-teens. Mr. Yu commented that it is Arts and Crafts with a touch of Modernism. Mr. Cohen agreed, noting that it is a very special Modernism. He reiterated his admiration for Mr. Yu's appreciation of the building and care for it over the years. He argued that the building should be designated and preserved. He opined that as people start to see the building in a different light, not amid dumpsters, but as a great representation as a late Arts and Crafts landmark, this place could become a gem. He suggested that the building could house a café for the proposed neighboring hotel, and noted that he can imagine wonderful things for the building. He observed that the Committee's task is to determine whether the building is historic, and that the answer is clearly yes.

Mr. Schaaf noted that, right or wrong, one of the first times he saw a photograph of the front of the building, he thought, "Wow, Philadelphia has a Prairie style building!" Mr. Cohen responded that Prairie style is associated with Frank Lloyd Wright in such an exclusive way. Mr. Schaaf directed the Committee members' attention to the photograph in the nomination of the Steubenville train station, which was constructed in 1910. He noted that the Robie house was constructed in 1911, and remarked that it is unmistakably Midwestern. He opined that the Musical Art Club building has overtones of the Prairie style. Mr. Cohen agreed, and argued that it is a fantastic articulation of who Will Price was. He noted that, in the 1920s, people referred to Price and Wright as pioneers of a modernity that had not quite happened yet. He noted that this building is a great and articulate landmark of that moment in history. Addressing Mr. Yu's earlier assertion that someone had entered the building and photographed the interior, he noted that the captions say that the photographs are from Pinterest. Mr. Yu responded that he would refer that question to someone else. Mr. Cohen noted that the Committee's task is not to consider the interior, but to determine whether the exterior is historic, which it clearly is. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that regardless of what is or was in the interior, it is clear to the Committee that the exterior is emblematic of the type of Modernism they are discussing.

Ms. Klein noted that the current use section of the nomination form says "unknown," and asked the owner what the current use is. Mr. Yu responded that two floors are vacant, but that the building has always been occupied for business use. He noted that formerly it was used as the offices for architects and engineers, and as a print shop.

Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Steinke's previous comment that the building is of equal architectural and social merit.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

ADDRESS: 2041-55 CORAL ST

Name of Resource: Harbisons' Dairies

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Fozan Ehmedi

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2041-55 Coral Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the four buildings and iconic milk bottle water tower formerly owned by Harbisons' Dairy satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, F, H, and J. The nomination argues that Harbisons' Dairy

developed into a leading dairy company that served many Philadelphians through what began as a home milk delivery service and later expanded into a large-scale production facility. The nomination asserts that owners Robert and Thomas Bartley Harbison were significant Philadelphians, owing not only to their role in establishing and growing the prominent dairy business, but also for their involvement in educating and promoting the safe storage and transport of milk products. The nomination further contends that the milk bottle water tower is significant for its innovative use as an advertisement and as a familiar visual feature of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2041-55 Coral Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, F, H, and J. The staff contends that the nomination, not the building itself, does not make a cogent argument for Criterion C.

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

Mr. Cohen inquired why the staff recommended against the satisfaction of Criterion C. Ms. Keller explained that Criterion C is checked on the nomination form, but no argument for its satisfaction is presented in the Statement of Significance.

Mr. Beisert commented that, if no argument for Criterion C exists, the criterion may have been checked on the form by mistake. He asserted that there may be some merit to an argument that the property does satisfy the criterion.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Ehmedi several questions. Mr. Ehmedi responded that he purchased the property in 1985 and explained that he owns a grocery store and has used the property for grocery storage, though he has ceased using the property for storage due to problems caused by the loading and unloading of trucks. Mr. Martin clarified that the property is currently empty and asked Mr. Ehmedi to describe the building interior. Ms. Cooperman responded that the interior is not under consideration.

Mr. Martin noted that the city values the building at \$556,000, which he argued is less than many rowhouses around the city. Mr. Martin called Mr. Beisert's nomination "sloppy" and "grossly deficient." He remarked that Criterion C is identified in one part of the nomination and not substantiated. Therefore, he continued, the Commission does not have the authority to designate under Criterion C, because the Rules & Regulations require the nomination to provide a narrative for each criterion proposed in the nomination. The property owner, he added, should have a right to respond to an argument for that criterion. Mr. Martin suggested that the nomination contains a significant deficiency, because it alludes to but does not include the adjoining property, which he contended was integral to the Harbisons' complex. He noted that the adjoining parcel is not owned by Mr. Ehmedi.

Mr. Martin distributed several documents to the Committee members. Ms. Cooperman commented that the Committee does not have time to review materials that are submitted at the meeting. Mr. Martin stated that the materials include information available online pertaining to the Milk Depot condominium building, which is the property immediately adjacent to Mr. Ehmedi's property. He asserted that the owner markets the property as being at the old Harbisons' Dairy complex. Mr. Cohen asked whether the condominium building is to the southeast of the complex. Mr. Ehmedi affirmed. Mr. Martin commented that deed information

pertaining to 2046 Amber Street, the adjacent property, is available from the Philadelphia Architects and Buildings website, as well as a photograph of the building that appears to date to the 1890s. That photograph, he added, is identified as Harbisons' Dairies. Mr. Martin contended that the nominator was familiar with the materials and directed the Committee to page 37 of the nomination, which shows the same photograph. He argued that the nominator included pages upon pages of the dairy's history, which began in a still-extant building attached to this complex, but which is not nominated. He questioned the nomination's accuracy and reliability.

Regarding the photograph Mr. Martin provided and which is represented in the nomination, Mr. Cohen inquired how the photograph relates to the insurance survey shown on page 31 of the nomination. Mr. Martin answered that he has studied the insurance survey and has not been able to reconcile it, but added that he understands what Mr. Cohen is suggesting. He then distributed a series of aerial photographs from Google Maps that show the relationships of the structures. Mr. Cohen asked for clarification on the relationship of the condominium building to the nominated property. Mr. Martin explained that the structures are attached and were built as part of the same complex that functioned as the Harbisons' business. The only distinction, he continued, is that one property is owned by Mr. Ehmedi and the other is not. He questioned the reason for the Commission to designate a portion of an essentially unified historic property.

Mr. Schaaf asked whether the condominium building is located on Amber Street. Mr. Martin affirmed. Mr. Schaaf stated that the boundary description provided in the nomination shows the nominated property bounded by Abigail, Dreer, and Coral Streets, with the condominium building abutting the nominated property from Amber Street. The Committee members discussed the boundary of the nominated property.

Mr. Martin suggested that the Committee recommend that the Commission return the nomination to the nominator as being deficient or that it recommend against designation. He added that his previous arguments have already proven that the nomination is deficient, though he has additional concerns.

Ms. Cooperman observed that the Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company Industrial Site Map does not include the condominium property Mr. Martin is referencing as being part of the Harbisons' facility. Mr. Martin responded that, at that time, it may no longer have been part of the Harbisons' facility.

Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Martin whether his point is that the seminal building that actually begins the dairy is not included in the nomination. Mr. Martin affirmed. Ms. Cooperman observed that the building is situated on a separate tax parcel and was subdivided from the rest of the property prior to 1918.

Mr. Cohen agreed that the building was part of the Harbisons' story, but asked Mr. Martin for clarification on his argument that the narrative does not include all such properties. The interest of the city, Mr. Martin responded, is in protecting this building, because of its significance to that story. To nominate one property and not the other is questionable, he added. Mr. Cohen responded that one part of a property can be nominated without the nomination of another part. Mr. Martin replied that the practice has been done in the past but argued that nominating one part of the complex will burden one property owner and not the other. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee considers whether the property merits designation and not whether a property owner will be burdened.

Mr. Martin directed the Committee to pages 39 to 45 of the nomination and noted that the narrative addresses Criteria for Designation A and J. He argued that it comprises a narrative and photographs regarding the Harbison family and the dairy business and that it only informs the reader that the Harbison family was rich. He contended that there is no other substance and questioned the Harbison family's accomplishments by noting that one member was listed as being a member of the Chamber of Commerce, though Mr. Martin argued that it was not a major accomplishment. That family member, he continued, was a businessman, who in 1966, produced a calendar. In 2014, he continued, a descendant produced a biography. The calendar and biography, Mr. Martin asserted, accounts for 40% of the footnotes in the nomination. The basis for designation should not be a property owned by a rich person, he claimed. He observed that the nomination describes the dairy as "one of the largest and most important businesses in the city." Mr. Martin argued that the nominator provided no citation and drew the conclusion on his own. He stated that it was a dairy, and asked whether a dairy is unique or important in Philadelphia's history, contending that there are dairies throughout the country. He further asserted that there is nothing extraordinary about the business or individuals that would warrant designation under Criteria A or J. He then directed the Committee to pages 50 to 54 to comment on Criteria E and F. On page 51, he continued, the nomination describes the building as a "typical Philadelphia masonry building." Mr. Martin argued that the nomination is accurate in that regard and that the building is no more than typical, with nothing that warrants designation. The milk bottle water tower, he continued, is removable and simply an object. He stated that it would be appropriate for the Committee to distinguish between the designation of the milk bottle water tower and the building. He then argued against designation under Criterion E, noting that the criterion is not addressed in the Statement of Significance and is only discussed in Appendix C. That discussion, he continued, consists of a "cut and paste" from the Philadelphia Architects and Buildings website's description of the firm Stearns & Castor. That description, he continued, references 40 buildings, projects, or component buildings by the architect and fails to include Harbisons' Dairies.

Mr. Cohen asked whether the Committee has Appendix C. Mr. Martin responded that it is at the end of the nomination. Ms. Keller stated that the nomination form did not include Criterion E as one of the Criteria for Designation and the staff did not consider it to be part of the nomination. Mr. Martin asked for clarity and asked the staff to repeat the extent to whether Criterion E is included in the nomination and Criterion C is not. Ms. Keller clarified that the nominator checked Criterion C on the nomination form, but failed to provide an argument in the Statement of Significance, and, therefore, the staff recommended that the nomination does not satisfy Criterion C. She further explained that the nominator did not check Criterion E on the nomination form, but did provide information that pertained to the criterion; however, without the criterion checked on the form, the staff did not consider it part of the nomination.

Mr. Cohen addressed Mr. Martin's statement about the building complex not being included on the Stearns & Castor project list by arguing that the lack of recognition is not conclusive about the property's importance. He further contended that the project list is an accumulation of knowledge in process, but it is difficult to have complete knowledge of an architect's entire work. He reiterated that the absence of a project from a project list is not a determination of a building's significance.

Mr. Martin directed the Committee to Criterion H, arguing that the milk bottle water tower is referenced in the narrative and shown in Appendix A through pop culture images. Listing of photographs of this type, he continued, cannot be deemed sufficient by the Committee or Commission to justify designation. He argued that the property owner recognizes a distinction between the water tower and building and believes the water tower is subject to removal and is

not part of the building, but rather is an object that may warrant independent review by the Committee and Commission. He advocated that the Committee recommend to the Commission that it return the nomination to the nominator for revision, as the document is currently deficient.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the nomination as submitted does establish the prominence of Harbisons' as a dairy and Harbison as an individual. As a dairy, he continued, Harbisons' was one of the leading brands of dairy and milk products in the city. He commented that, as described in the nomination, Mr. Thomas Bartley Harbison was prominent enough that the city elected to rename part of Aramingo Avenue after him, to Harbison Avenue, as Northeast Philadelphia was being developed between the wars. He contended that the building exemplifies Philadelphia's famous historical status as the Workshop of the World through its muscular, robust, industrial design. He asserted that the adaptability of the property to another use has already been proven through the reuse of the adjacent building, which also functioned as part of the Harbisons' complex and which now has a separate owner and separate tax parcel. In a neighborhood that is increasingly attractive for residential development, he continued, buildings of this type about a mile south in Old City were redeveloped for residential use successfully 30 years ago and are significant ornaments to the city. He claimed that Old City and the city as a whole is greatly enhanced with the adaptation of similar buildings for residential use. He argued that the interest in preserving this building is good for the city's image, economy, and historical context. Mr. Steinke suggested that the milk bottle water tower's significance is tied to its position on top of the dairy complex and that it represents and establishes a familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, one that can be seen far and wide, including from I-95. He contended that Philadelphia does not contain many iconic building elements like the Harbisons' water tower that punctuate the cityscape, and to separate this object from the complex of which it was designed to be a part would greatly diminish it. For all those reasons, he concluded, the nomination does establish the worthiness of the complex, including the milk bottle water tower, on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that Mr. Steinke "stole his thunder" and that he was prepared to offer similar statements. He noted that Save Our Sites, the preeminent preservation advocacy organization in Philadelphia, wholeheartedly supports the designation of the property.

Mr. Lavery commented that, less than one year ago, the Committee on Historic Designation was accused of discriminating against rich white women, because there was a property that had not been designated in Roxborough. He argued that the Committee does not discriminate against rich people or poor people, but that it considers the merits of each nomination in terms of a property's historical contexts. He suggested that Mr. Martin's argument that Harbisons' Dairies was not an important and vital part of Philadelphia's history because there were dairies and milk everywhere misses the point. He acknowledged that Mr. Harbison would have been a wealthy man, but noted that his product ended up on the doorsteps of approximately half of the residents of the city. Just as the owner of the Pennsylvania Railroad was a rich man, Mr. Lavery continued, the Pennsylvania Railroad impacted the lives of every Philadelphian. He asserted that the Committee needs to consider such an impact when it looks at a property's historical context. He further contended that the images of current iconography provided by Mr. Beisert only strengthens the case that an entire new generation has developed an appreciation for the site and this particular object. He stated that he would like to see the adjacent property nominated, but argued that not including it in the current nomination in no way diminishes the strength of the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf directed the Committee to the 1910 Bromley atlas on page 32 of the nomination and commented that the original Harbisons' Dairies was founded at Abigail and Amber Streets. That building, he continued, had already transitioned by 1910 to another use by becoming the Weimar Tape Company. He agreed with Mr. Lavery that the building should be designated, but its lack of inclusion in the current nomination does not lessen its strengths.

Mr. Beisert stated that the photograph of the building where Harbisons' Dairies may have started is a two-story building and observed that the corner building is now a three-story building. While it may have been enlarged, he added, the building is significantly larger than shown in the historic photograph.

Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee is not considering the designation of that building.

Mr. Cohen opined that it would be possible to detach the milk bottle water tower from the structure, but it would remove some of the complex's authenticity. The preservation of this place, he continued, lends meaning to the landscape, especially when connected to the milk bottle water tower, which is visible from a distance and contributes to the actual fabric and the Harbisons' name. He suggested that no matter what its future redevelopment, the milk bottle water tower will anchor this place more than its history, which is one of the reasons the nominator proposed that the complex be designated. He noted that the Committee will treat the milk bottle water tower as part of the structure, adding that he is hopeful that many would agree that a recognition of that value is important.

Ms. Cooperman responded that, putting aside its shape, the milk bottle is a water tank that is part of the building and that just happened to have this particular form that advertised the business. She added that the water tower is as much a part of the building as a chimney stack would be.

Mr. Lavery commented that at least three milk bottle water towers existed, including one in Hunting Park and another around Kensington and Erie Avenues. He stated that the water tower at the Coral Street property is the only surviving milk bottle water tower. Fifty or sixty years ago, he continued, there were thousands of water towers above the city's industrial buildings, and they tended to be the first to go. However, he argued that the milk bottle water tower is an integral part of the building and serves as a very visual and prominent reminder of the city's industrial history.

Mr. Cohen applauded the nominator for obtaining family photographs. He then agreed with the staff recommendation that, because no case is made for Criterion C, it should be eliminated.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 2041-55 Coral Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, F, H, and J.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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