

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

**18 APRIL 2018, 9:30 A.M.
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Janet Klein
Douglas Mooney
R. David Schaaf, RA

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

ALSO PRESENT

David Massado
Donna Rilling
Laurel Racza, Painted Bride
H. Rubenstein, Painted Bride
Steven Peitzman, East Falls Historical Society
Bob Lane, Painted Bride Attorney
Kevin Golden, Cozen O'Connor
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Owen Flannery, Etting Street Holdings
Ben Leech
Isaiah Zagar
Emily Smith
Sean P. Whalen
Stacey Holder
Nicholas Baker, Philadelphia Streets Department
Paul Steinke, PAGP
Michael Phillips, Obermayer
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Kathy Dowdell
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Carolyn Sutton, East Falls/East Falls Tudor Homes Historic District

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m. Ms. Klein and Messrs. Cohen, Laverty, Mooney and Schaaf joined her.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Ms. Cooperman reminded the public that the business of the Committee is to review nominations on their technical merits. She explained that a building's condition is outside the Committee's purview. She noted that the Committee also does not discuss financial hardship issues. She asked that anyone wishing to speak to please confine their comments to the merits of designation.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Mooney to explain generally how archaeologists determine the archaeological potential of a property or site. She noted that archaeological potential is one of the Criteria for Designation, and that it is important for property owners and the public to understand how those determinations are made. Mr. Mooney explained that Criterion I, the criterion for archaeological potential, states that a site or property may be designated as historic if it has the *potential* to contain information important in history or prehistory. He asserted that it does not mean that an individual knows for a fact that important information is present. Instead, he continued, the possibility exists that the information is there. He explained that the way that one determines archaeological potential is by conducting background research, particularly map research, to determine what had been built on a specific site previously, how that site has changed over time, and how those changes over time may have impacted what was there previously. He noted that archaeologists start their analysis by researching the area's prehistory, what the original landscape would have been prior to the establishment of the City of Philadelphia, and whether the site would have attracted Native American peoples. For example, he explained that archaeologists look at whether a given property was located on high, dry ground near sources of fresh water, which is where most Native American sites are located. He noted that one could infer such information by looking at historic maps that show many of the streams that cross Philadelphia. He continued to explain that, moving forward in time into the historic period, archaeologists determine when the first buildings were built on a property and how they would have affected the original landscape. Mr. Mooney described the process of determining whether construction of the first homes would have destroyed all of the original ground surfaces and, consequently, all Native American artifacts on those grounds. He distinguished between that scenario and when a property contained an open backyard space where Native American artifacts may have been preserved. In other examples, he continued, larger buildings on a particular site may have had deep basements that would have destroyed artifacts. He then explained that previous research and excavation of sites throughout Philadelphia has shown the kind of archaeological resources that would be found on a given type of property. He added that residential sites from the eighteenth or early nineteenth century would have one or more privies on the site. Later buildings with deep basements, he clarified, may have destroyed parts of those privies, though he noted that privies were sometimes dug 20 to 30 feet in depth, essentially tubes extending straight down. He argued that impacts to the upper parts of the privies may be inconsequential, since archaeologists are interested in artifacts at the bottom. He commented that it is important to determine whether the deepest parts of the privies were disturbed by construction. Mr. Mooney then explained that the determination of archaeological potential is conducted by examining progressive modifications and identifying to what extent those modifications disturb, destroy, or alter what had been on that site previously. That process, he continued, allows archaeologists to assess and predict the types of resources that may be preserved on a particular property. He asserted that the process has been in practice for over 50 years and has worked very well, adding that it is a matter of

conducting proper and accurate background research. He stated that the process does not guarantee that important deposits remain, because, by law, privies were supposed to have been cleaned regularly, which would remove artifacts. Mr. Mooney reiterated that archaeological potential exists any time a privy remains on site and advocated the importance of visiting the site and conducting ground excavation to determine whether artifact deposits are present.

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

Ms. Cooperman noted that property owners had requested continuances for four nominations: 208-10 Rex Avenue, 100 S. Independence West Mall, 230-36 Vine Street, and 1301-25 Chestnut Street. She explained that the Committee would review the continuance requests in two batches, as she needed to recuse for the first two reviews, owing to her association with the nominator of 208-10 Rex Avenue, the Chestnut Hill Conservancy, and her business relationship with the property owner of 100 S. Independence West Mall.

ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE

Name of Resource: William L. Hirst/H. Louis Duhring Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Virginia, William, and Hewson Baltzell

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 208-10 Rex Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the house, constructed about 1857-60, with alterations around 1893 and a substantial rear addition in 1927, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property has significant character as one of the early prominent suburban villas constructed in the first period of the development of the suburban character of the Chestnut Hill area of the city after the introduction of the first railroad from Center City. The nomination also argues that the building is significant under Criterion A for its association with architect H. Louis Duhring, who owned and lived in the house between 1919 and 1946, and under Criterion E as a representative example of his influential architectural work. The nomination also contends that the property is significant under Criterion C as reflecting the environment of both the period of its original Italianate construction and its Arts and Crafts addition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused from the review of the nomination, owing to her association with the nominator, the Chestnut Hill Conservancy. Mr. Mooney assumed the role of chair and presented a continuance request to the Committee. No one represented the owner or nominator.

Mr. Farnham noted that the Chestnut Hill Conservancy is the nominator, and the owner is the Baltzell family. Mr. Farnham explained that he met with one of the owners at the site the previous Friday to discuss the designation process and to walk through the building and grounds. He noted that the owners are still in the process of weighing their various options. He explained that, although the owners are not necessarily opposed to designation, they need to adaptively reuse the property in some way and, therefore, want to explore their options more fully before going through the designation process.

Mr. Mooney opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 208-10 Rex Avenue to the June 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

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 Chantry, kim.chantry@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 of the nomination, owing to her business relationship with the property owner. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance represented the nominator. No one represented the property owner. Mr. Steinke stated that the nominator has no objection to the continuance request.

Mr. Mooney opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 100 S. Independence West Mall to the June 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ADDRESS: 230-36, 238 VINE ST, 255 BODINE ST

Name of Resource: The Painted Bride

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Painted Bride Art Center, Inc.

Nominator: Emily Smith, Philadelphia's Magic Gardens

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends 230-36 satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, H and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 230-36 Vine Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that Painted Bride Art Center, is significant under Criteria for Designation E, F, H and J. Under Criterion F, the nomination argues that the mosaic façade of 230-36 Vine Street is one of artist Isaiah Zagar's defining works. The Painted Bride's 1991 commission to create a public face for their organization represents a pivotal moment in Zagar's artistic development. The exterior facade is artist's first use of his innovative "total embellishment" style—mosaics that encompass a building's exterior walls from street to roofline. Since the late 1960s, Zagar has created hundreds of murals in Philadelphia. Using donated and recycled materials, the artist's community-based works enliven building walls throughout Philadelphia with imagery, stories, portraiture, and word play satisfying Criterion E. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that the vibrant mosaic façade of 230-236 Vine Street is inextricably linked to history of the Painted Bride and is a singular visual feature of the Old City arts district. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends, 230-36 Vine Street exemplifies the Painted Bride's influence on the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Old City and Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman inquired if there was any comment on the request for a continuance. No comments were offered. Ms. Cooperman inquired if the nominator and owner were present. The nominator and the owner were present. The owner supported the continuance request. The nominator provided no comments. Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 230-36 Vine Street, 238 Vine Street, 255 Bodine Street of the June 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ADDRESS: 1301-25 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Grand Court, Wanamaker's

Proposed Action: Interior Designation

Property Owner: Behringer Harvard REIT

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Grand Court satisfies Criteria for Designation A, 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, 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 asked if there was any comment from the nominator or the property owner regarding the request for a continuance. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that there was no comment from the nominator. Attorney Kevin Golden offered no comment on behalf of the property owner. Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 1301-25 Chestnut Street to the June 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ADDRESS: ETING ST, N 1200 BLOCK

Name of Resource: Etting Street, N 1200 block between Flora St and Stiles St

Proposed Action: Rescission of block from Historic Street Paving Thematic District inventory

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia Streets Department

Applicant: Jordan Brody, Etting Street Holdings LLC

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the 1200 block of N Etting Street from the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the 1200 block of N. Etting Street from the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The block was added to the District inventory as part of an amendment in 2014.

In 1998, the Historical Commission designated the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, a collection of several hundred blocks of streets in the city that retain their historic street paving materials. In 1999, the Commission amended the district, adding a few streets that had been initially overlooked. The designation covers the cartway itself, but not the curbs or sidewalks.

The historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to review building permit applications issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, but not streets permits for work within the right-of-way, which are issued by the Streets Department of the City of Philadelphia. Therefore, with regard to historic streets, the Historical Commission acts in an advisory capacity, providing advice to the Streets Department about the appropriateness of alterations to historic cartways. Per an informal agreement, the Streets Department consults with the Historical Commission whenever it undertakes work to historic streets or reviews applications from third parties for work to historic streets. The Streets Department should be commended for its stewardship of historic streets, which it undertakes voluntarily at great expense.

In 2014, the Streets Department commissioned Gilmore & Associates Inc. to study the conditions of streets that retain their historic paving materials and generate a report that would allow the Streets Department to plan strategically for the maintenance of the historic streets. The consultant surveyed every block listed in the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District as well as several that were not included in the district. The subject block had been overlooked in the late 1990s, when the nomination was prepared. It, along with 24 other blocks which had been initially overlooked, were added to the Historic Street Paving Thematic District as part of the 2014 amendment.

Since that time, multiple developers have constructed several buildings on this block, resulting in the removal of sections of the historic red brick paving. The applicant constructed multiple houses on this block, and as such, the Streets Department is requiring that the applicant restore the entire block to its historic appearance. The applicant claims that the requirement to reconstruct this block is cost-prohibitive and an undue burden, and is requesting that the block be removed from the District inventory so that the Streets Department will allow repaving in asphalt.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the rescission request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Owen Flannery represented the developer.

Mr. Flannery stated that they are not the first developers to have a project on the street. He noted that when his company arrived in late 2017, the street was not in very good condition. He argued that the Streets Department had failed to enforce any sort of historic street paving rules beforehand and now is penalizing his company because it is completing a large project associated with the City of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Land Bank, and the City Council's Workforce Housing Program. He explained that his project is geared toward people who meet certain financial incomes and that his company is limited in terms of how much it can spend on the project and how much it can charge for each property.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance expressed the Alliance's support of the staff recommendation to deny the rescission request. He asserted that to grant the request would set a precedent for other historic cartways and streets in the city, such that if they are damaged during construction, they too could be subject to a rescission. He recommended that the developer work with the Streets Department and the Historical Commission to do its best to restore the street, pending the Streets Department retaining additional funding to reduce their own backlog in repairing historic streets throughout the city.

Nicholas Baker, transportation planner, represented Streets Department Commissioner Darin Gatti. Mr. Baker stated that the Streets Department has no position on the request. He noted

that the Streets Department does not see an engineering reason to have the street removed from the historic district inventory, but that it will defer to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over historic street paving differs from its jurisdiction over designated properties in that the Historical Commission is advisory to the Streets Department and does not have plenary jurisdiction over streets. He noted that, if the Historical Commission decides to retain the block within the thematic district, it would not necessarily be approving or denying any request from the property owner; the Streets Department would still be free to work out any compromise solution with the developer. He emphasized that the Committee and Commission are advising the Streets Department as to whether it considers the street historic or not, and then the Streets Department will act based on that recommendation and a variety of other factors. He also noted that it appears that there may be a replacement of the water main along this block in the near future, and that may provide the opportunity to restore the historic street paving without placing all of the financial burden on the developer(s) who have built along the street.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend denial of the removal of the 1200 block of N. Etting Street from the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ADDRESS: 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: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@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 6365-67 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. Chantry explained that the Committee on Historic Designation had just received a request to continue the review of the nominations for 6369 and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the owner of both 6369 and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue.

Mr. Phillips explained that they are in the process of finalizing an agreement with the nominator.

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 6369 Germantown Avenue to the June meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

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. Chantry explained that the Committee on Historic Designation had just received a request to continue the review of the nominations for 6369 and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the owner of both 6369 and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue.

Mr. Phillips explained that they are in the process of finalizing an agreement with the nominator.

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 6365-67 Germantown Avenue to the June meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ADDRESS: 4800-14 LANCASTER AVE

Name of Resource: Our Mother of Sorrows Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 4800-14 Lancaster Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Our Mother of Sorrows Church at 4800-14 Lancaster Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. While the larger parcel includes several buildings and an expansive cemetery, the nomination proposes exclusively to designate the church building itself. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. Constructed in 1867 on a design by preeminent ecclesiastical architect Edwin F. Durang, the church building is significant as the work of an architect whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E. The church also embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Romanesque Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, and St. Ignatius of Loyola parish. Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Phillips stated that his client does not have any objection to the proposed nomination, but added that he does not believe the Historical Commission would have purview over the church's stained-glass windows. He asserted that the Archdiocese should be allowed to remove the windows, as is customary when a Catholic church is closed and objects related to sacred worship are removed.

Ms. Cooperman asked whether the Committee members had any comments on the property's elements aside from the church. Mr. Mooney inquired as to why the cemetery was not included in the nomination. Mr. Steinke replied that he wanted to focus on the most prominent feature of the campus, the church building. He added that he recognizes the potential for other historic resources on the property; however, the decision to focus on the church was made in the interest of time.

Ms. Cooperman asked the staff whether designation of only the church building would preclude future nominations of other components of the property. Mr. Farnham responded that it would not.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that 4800-14 Lancaster Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

ADDRESS: 2101 WASHINGTON AVE

Name of Resource: Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 2101 Washington Real Estate

Nominator: Dennis Carlisle

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2101 Washington Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The staff recommends that the period of significance end in 2005, when Frankford Chocolate Company relocated and sold the property. The staff also recommends classifying the main structure, additions, and supporting buildings built between 1865 and 1912 as contributing and the later, makeshift additions, post-1912, as non-contributing to the overall significance of the complex.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2101 Washington as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that 2101 Washington Avenue is significant under Criterion A in the area of development and culture as the site Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory, which was first constructed on this property in 1865. As one of the most successful wallpaper manufacturers during the second half of the nineteenth century, the company transformed the methods for manufacturing wallpaper in the United States while simultaneously influencing American interior design. Howell & Brothers Wallpaper was the first American wallpaper manufacturer to utilize machine-made wallpapers, and at one point the largest wallpaper factory in the country. The nomination asserts that 2101 Washington Avenue satisfies Criterion J, owing to its influence on the growth of Washington Avenue as an industrial corridor and its representation of Philadelphia as a domestic and international manufacturing center, first as the Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory, and followed by the John Wanamaker Department Store Furniture Warehouse and the Frankford Chocolate Company.

The staff recently approved a complete demolition permit application based on the Department of Licenses & Inspections' finding that the property is Imminently Dangerous. The staff subsequently approved a partial demolition permit application based on the Department of Licenses & Inspections' finding that the property is Imminently Dangerous, but that a portion of the complex could be preserved. The partial demolition plan will retain the 1916 building at the southwest corner of the site including the smokestack and a portion of the original 1860s building directly behind that building. The demolition is underway.

DISCUSSION: Prior to beginning discussion of 2101 Washington Avenue, Mr. Farnham made a statement to the Committee. He stated that there is a request to withdraw the nomination by the nominator. He added that the Law Department advised the Historical Commission at the March 2018 meeting that the Historical Commission should not be allowing nominators to unilaterally withdraw nominations at their pleasure, but instead that the prerogative belongs to the Historical Commission. Once a notice is sent to the property owner, he continued, the Historical Commission should decide whether to accept a withdrawal from a nominator. He commented that, if there is a request for a withdrawal from a nominator, the Historical Commission may consider it at their next meeting.

Mr. Farnham remarked that yesterday, 17 April 2018, he approved a demolition application for the entire site. He explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had deemed the site imminently dangerous and that the demolition had to move forward to ensure public safety. There is a request for a withdrawal of the nomination, he continued, and an outstanding

demolition permit application being reviewed by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, which, if issued, will allow the property owner to demolish all of the structures on the site. Mr. Farnham noted that the property owner may consider retaining some portion of the existing buildings, but he would let the property owner explain his intentions to the Committee if they get to that point in their deliberation.

Mr. Farnham stated that there is question for the Committee of whether to continue with the review of the merits of the nomination or postpone that review until those open issues related to the nomination's withdrawal and the property's demolition are resolved. Mr. Farnham noted that it was up to the Committee to decide how to move forward on the nomination. He commented that the staff is prepared to present an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation and reiterated that it is the Committee's decision on how to proceed.

Ms. Cooperman inquired if the Committee needed to make a motion to proceed. Mr. Farnham responded that it was not required. He stated that the Committee could make a recommendation on the merits of the nomination or recommend to the Historical Commission to accept the nomination's withdrawal or continue the matter until a point where these questions are answered. Mr. Cooperman thanked Mr. Farnham for this clarification.

Ms. Cooperman stated that, before the Committee opens the floor to the property owner, nominator, or the public, the Committee should discuss the question of how to proceed. She added that with the understanding that the demolition permit has been issued, that the merits of the nomination were still before the Committee. She recalled that at the March 2018 Historical Commission meeting, one of the questions before the Historical Commission was whether or not all the buildings contribute. Ms. Cooperman noted that an opinion on this question had not been formulated and suggested that it might be useful for the Historical Commission to have the Committee's opinion on what portion of the complex might be most significant.

Mr. Farnham stated that he and staff member Allyson Mehley have toured the entire complex and have been in most of the structures on site. He added that he would be happy to provide information garnered from that visit.

Mr. Schaaf commented that it is remarkable how huge the 1865 building is. Contextually, he added, in considering Philadelphia in 1865 with Washington Avenue emerging as a rail corridor, the property at 2101 Washington Avenue is a grand structure. He observed that its length consists of 43 window bays, adding that he cannot name a manufacturing building of that time that would have been as large. He noted the building's accretions shown through the Hexamer survey and other early illustrations of the site. Mr. Schaaf then agreed with the staff's recommendation that the main structure and additions built between 1865 and 1912 would classify as contributing and suggested that after 1912 the accretions do not necessarily contribute to the significance of the building.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the public has not heard the staff recommendation.

Mr. Schaaf stated that this is the type of building the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) would want to document.

Mr. Mooney and Ms. Klein contended that the nomination should be considered by the Committee.

Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee is providing guidance to the Historical Commission, so it can form some basis for a decision about designation for any part of the complex that may remain. She asked that the staff read its recommendation and then suggested that the Committee move to public comment.

Ms. Mehley read the overview and staff recommendation.

Ms. Cooperman asked to hear from the nominator and property owner. Attorney Sean Whalen identified himself as the property owner's representative. Mr. Whalen stated that the owner is working closely with the nominator, Dennis Carlisle, and noted that Mr. Carlisle was not in attendance, although his request to withdraw the nomination was already presented by Mr. Farnham. Mr. Whalen noted that Mr. Carlisle will attend the May meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Whalen commented that Mr. Farnham and Ms. Mehley toured the property and provided an exemplary explanation of the site's status. Mr. Whalen remarked that he has also toured the building and that it is unfortunate that the 170,000 square foot property is in the position that it is. He then directed the Commission to page 2 of the nomination form to discuss the various pieces of the complex. He stated that the owner is working closely with his architects, the nominator, engineers, and the Department of Licenses & Inspections to save portions of the 1912A building, the smokestack, and a portion of the 1865 building. All other buildings, he continued, will be demolished under the demolition application that was approved on 17 April 2018.

Mr. Whalen distributed copies to Committee members of a rendering showing a portion of the complex proposed to be saved from demolition. The image was also projected on screen for the public. Mr. Whalen reiterated that the owner intends to retain the 1912A building, the smokestack, and the portion of the 1865 building from S. 22nd Street to the pilot house. He indicated that the owner did not intend to retain the middle portion of the building.

Ms. Cooperman interjected that Mr. Whalen's comments were entering into a discussion on physical condition, which the Committee cannot address. She contended that the Committee understands that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had deemed the building structurally unsound. Ms. Cooperman reminded Mr. Whalen that the Committee's purview extends only to the merits of the nomination.

Mr. Whalen responded that the nomination provides a discussion of the significance of the Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory and the Wanamaker's warehouse. He questioned whether the very limited portion that is intended to remain would qualify the property for designation under the Criteria for Designation set forth in the nomination. However, he noted that the nomination does not delineate the portions of the property used by Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory and the Wanamaker's warehouse. All historically relevant fabric significant under Criteria A and J would be demolished, he asserted. Mr. Whalen reiterated that the property owner is committed to working with the Department of Licenses & Inspections and Commissioner Perri to save the portions of the building discussed earlier and shown in his rendering. He argued that the Committee should recommend that the Historical Commission accept the withdrawal of the nomination by the nominator, whom they are working closely with on this project. If the Committee does not recommend that the nomination be withdrawn, Mr. Whalen suggested that it recommend that the property not warrant designation due to deterioration and demolition of historic fabric.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the question before the Committee is whether the

nomination meets the Criteria for Designation put forward by the nominator. He continued that the building complex was in use as a factory until 2006 and that was 12 years ago. He commented that it is well known that buildings fall into disrepair when not maintained for such a long period of time. He opined that the building is likely well built, possibly overbuilt, and has been standing since 1865. Maybe 12 years, he opined, has not devastated the building to the extent identified with the imminently dangerous status assigned to it. He added that he has requested that Commissioner Perri allow the Preservation Alliance to retain a structural engineer of its choosing and be permitted to review the property and observe the condition that led to the property's imminently dangerous status. Mr. Steinke remarked that the property was added to the National Register of Historic Places as recently as December 2017, only five months ago. The National Register nomination, he continued, was submitted under the site's previous ownership, when the owner intended to redevelop and maintain almost all historic fabric and adapt the property for use as apartments.

Ms. Cooperman reminded Mr. Steinke that the purview of the Committee is not the structural condition of the building. Mr. Steinke asserted that the former owner's project team included Cecil Baker, Bob Powers, and Tom Lussenhop, who thought the redevelopment scheme was feasible as recently as December 2017. Mr. Steinke then contended that this property stands as the last industrial survivor of this part of Washington Avenue and that it clearly satisfies Criteria A and J. He noted that the nominator, Mr. Carlisle, disclosed his business relationship with the current owner at the March 2018 Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Steinke added that he was unsure whether Mr. Carlisle had a relationship with the owner when the nomination was filed. He asserted that the Committee should be aware of the relationship.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he agreed with Mr. Steinke's comments and expressed his concern over the situation and other similar situations when a building is determined to be imminently dangerous. Mr. Traub contended that in cases such as this, a second opinion by an independent consulting engineer should be sought to examine the property and verify whether the original determination is correct. Mr. Traub noted that, in general, caution should be exercised in making these types of determinations.

Ori Feibush of OCF Realty explained that he is one of three owners of the property. He clarified that the property had not been vacant for 12 years but for 24 years. He asserted that it had been out of service for 24 years and was last used for storage, not manufacturing. Mr. Feibush claimed that the previous owner's proposal to reuse the building was disingenuous at best. He argued that the previous architectural team peddled plans for complete demolition and for the construction of a 26-story tower at the same time as it advocated for saving the building. He claimed that discussions of saving the building were a false pretense to secure the zoning permits needed to build the 26-story tower.

Ms. Cooperman reminded Mr. Feibush that the discourse should stay focused on the merits of the nomination.

Mr. Feibush asserted that he would be happy to provide building access to Mr. Steinke. Mr. Steinke accepted the invitation. Mr. Feibush contended that he has taken dozens of individuals through the building, including individuals from two engineering firms, Pennoni and Orndorf & Associates. He extended an invitation to tour the building to the Committee and anyone else who wishes to see it, with or without an engineer. Mr. Feibush concluded that they have nothing to hide and would welcome having additional individuals tour the building.

Kathy Dowdell encouraged the Committee to continue to review nominations on their merits, independent of extraneous circumstances. Ms. Dowdell expressed her appreciation to the Committee in this case and reminded the Committee and public that imminently dangerous status does not always necessitate demolition. Rather, she continued, it requires the correction of the situation, either by demolition or by repair and adaptive reuse. Ms Dowdell emphasized the importance of the Committee continuing to evaluate nominations on their merits, adding that the real estate market continually changes though the historic merits of a building is fixed.

Kevin McMahon of Powers & Company stated that he wrote the National Register nomination for 2101 Washington Avenue. In reviewing the nomination before the Committee, he noted that it included the same relevant information as the National Register nomination. For that reason, he contended that the nomination is adequate and the property merits listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Mooney asked when the building was listed on the National Register. Ms. Cooperman responded that it was listed in December 2017.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that 2101 Washington Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The Committee recommends that the period of significance end in 2005, when Frankford Chocolate Company relocated and sold the property. The Committee also recommends classifying the main structure, additions, and supporting buildings built between 1865 and 1912 as contributing and the later, makeshift additions, post-1912, as non-contributing to the overall significance of the complex.

ADDRESS: 1416-32 W GIRARD AVE

Name of District: 1416-32 West Girard Avenue Historic District

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Donna J. Rilling

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

Number of properties: 9

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the district at 1416-32 W Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a nine-property historic district at 1416-32 W Girard Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the row, developed in 1882, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the district is significant for its association with William Weightman, one of Philadelphia's wealthiest men and one of the nation's largest landholders. Attributed to Willis G. Hale, the architect of some of Philadelphia's most exuberant and unusual buildings, the row reflects the popularity of the Victorian Eclectic, with the architect's liberal borrowing from a variety of popular ornamental features to create a composition uniquely his own, satisfying Criteria D and E. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that, as some of the grandest remaining examples of speculative housing in Gilded Age North Philadelphia, the buildings represent the brief heyday of this section of North Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Donna Rilling represented the nomination. Angelia Adzic represented the majority property owner, Londin LLC.

Ms. Rilling thanked Ms. DiPasquale for assisting in the revisions and preparation of the nomination. She noted that there were a few typographical errors in the Architectural Description section. Ms. DiPasquale offered to correct those revisions for the Historical Commission review. Ms. Cooperman noted that those corrections could easily be made and do not impact the argument made in the nomination. Mr. Farnham clarified that it is acceptable to make minor typographical revisions, as long as the corrections do not change the overall arguments made in the nomination.

Ms. Adzic explained that her company owns 1416, 1420, 1422, and 1424 W. Girard Avenue and expressed her objection to the proposed designation. She explained that the properties were rehabilitated on the interior and exterior and, therefore, the nomination does not make sense to her. Ms. Cooperman clarified that the Historical Commission does not and would not have jurisdiction over the interiors of the properties.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance expressed the Alliance's support of the nomination. He noted that very few districts have been added in recent years, and this is one small piece of multiple historic resources that should be added to the Philadelphia Register. He sympathized with the owner, but argued that the buildings remain largely intact despite routine maintenance. He stated that he does not see anything that would prevent these buildings from being added to the Register.

David Traub of Save Our Sites heartily endorsed the nomination. He remarked on the intact city block, which appears as one unified composition with a gabled center. He opined that the designation would be an incredible contribution to this part of the city.

Ms. Cooperman stated that she believes that the nomination demonstrates that the district is significant, but questioned the inclusion of Criterion A for the district's relationship to William Weightman. She wondered whether this particular block was significant in terms of Weightman's overall holdings, which were extensive. She agreed that Weightman was an important individual and developer, but questioned what makes this particular development rise to a point of significance for its relationship with Weightman and how it illustrates his achievements. She noted that others may disagree and that there is nothing in the ordinance that would preclude designation under this Criterion. Mr. Schaaf responded that he is not familiar with Weightman's entire portfolio and argued that the block has to be at the top of Weightman's rowhouse development. Ms. Cooperman noted that she believes the block stands on its own merit in terms of architectural design, even without an association with Weightman. She questioned whether everything Weightman developed is significant because he developed it.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the City Planning Commission, as far back as 2005, has had its eye on these properties as a particularly special row. He explained that the intersection of Broad Street and Girard Avenue is a highly significant intersection, and one which has lost considerable historic fabric, including the Widener mansion and Elkins mansion and hotel. He noted that the Metropolitan Opera House, which dates from the same period and is currently being rehabilitated, is just around the corner. He opined that it is remarkable that these buildings remain almost as they were in the 1880s. Mr. Schaaf observed that a 1993 photograph shows the buildings in nearly perfect original condition, and even today they remain remarkably intact.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the district at 1416-32 W. Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J.

ADDRESS: 4200-06 RIDGE AVE

Name of Resource: Odd Fellows' Hall/Palestine Hall

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mark E. Sherman

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4200-06 Ridge Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation H, I, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4200-06 Ridge Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation H, I, and J. Constructed in 1868 for the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and owned and used by several different fraternal organizations, community groups, and commercial tenants, the building at 4200-06 Ridge Avenue exemplifies the social, economic and historical heritage of the East Falls community, satisfying Criterion J. Under Criterion H, nomination argues that the large building stands out in the context of primarily two and three-story rowhouses and is situated prominently at the intersection of Ridge and Midvale Avenues—the heart of the East Falls community. Under Criterion I, the nomination contends that the property may be likely to yield archaeological information owing to its position at the historic confluence of the Ridge Avenue (a Native American trail and early road), a creek (now Midvale Avenue), and the Schuylkill River.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. DiPasquale stated that the staff has not heard from the property owner, but that the notice letters did not get returned as undeliverable.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Steven Peitzman of the East Falls Historical Society spoke in enthusiastic support of the nomination. He stated that the building has been a landmark to “Fallsers,” anchoring an important corner of the neighborhood. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia expressed the Alliance’s support of the nomination. He noted that the building exemplifies the history of the East Falls community and is set at a prominent intersection within the community.

Mr. Schaaf commented that it is delightful to see a nomination where Criterion H really works, noting that he can think of few buildings that exemplify the Criterion as well. He noted that, while it is a modest building, it is a landmark. Ms. Cooperman agreed. Mr. Mooney commented that he has been by the building hundreds of times and has always loved it, but did not know its history. Mr. Mooney thanked the staff for including Criterion I in the nomination. He stated that the archaeological potential of the site was addressed perfectly.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4200-06 Ridge Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation H, I, and J.

ADDRESS: 3910 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Sarah Price Rose-James A. Connelly House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: University City Associate

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3910 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination contends that the property at 3910 Chestnut Street is historically significant and warrants designation and individual listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, as defined in Section 14-1004(1) of the Philadelphia Code. The main building standing on the property, a four-story rowhouse, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Chateausque Style, satisfying Criterion D and was reconstructed in 1896 by Horace Trumbauer (1868-1938), an architect whose work significantly influenced the architectural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, satisfying Criterion E. The property exemplifies the heritage of the Hamilton Village and University City community, satisfying Criterion J. The nomination proposes a Period of Significance that runs from 1806, when William Hamilton first sold the property, to 1987, when the University of Pennsylvania purchased the property. A two-story structure projects from the rear of the historic building and faces Sansom Street; it is considered non-historic or non-contributing for the purposes of this nomination.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner.

Mr. Farnham noted that the property is owned by the University of Pennsylvania, and that he spoke with David Hollenberg, the University's architect, regarding the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commended the staff of the Historical Commission for an excellent nomination, which, he opined, clearly demonstrates that the property meets Criteria D, E, and J.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the check boxes for the Criteria on the nomination form indicate C, D, and J. Mr. Farnham responded that the Criteria argued in the nomination are D, E, and J, and that there must have been an internal miscommunication between staff members that resulted in the incorrect completion of the nomination form.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination is also rich as a compendium of buildings that are no longer extant and which constituted a profound environment for this building. He opined that it is an extremely well done nomination. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that there still are a handful of Trumbauer houses, including one on the 3800 block of Walnut Street and one on 40th Street. Ms. Klein noted that it is thanks to William Hamilton, who owned all of this acreage, that lots were available for these grand homes to be built upon. She noted that Hamilton named the area Hamiltonville himself.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3910 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

ADDRESS: 3549 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Western Saving Fund Society

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 3549 Germantown LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3549 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, F and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3549 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building, constructed ca. 1925, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, F and J. Under Criteria C, D and F the nomination contends that the subject property is reflective of the transition that was occurring in local bank architecture at the time, a trend towards the use of Stripped Architecture. The nomination argues that the building is an excellent and early example of the Art Deco style. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the architectural firm that designed the building, Willing, Sims & Talbutt, was one of the most important in Philadelphia, finding success first mostly in residential design, and later on in institutional design. The nomination argues that the building also satisfies Criterion E, owing to the impressive ironwork that was done by the highly regarded Philadelphia ironworker, Samuel Yellin. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Western Saving Fund Society was a significant Philadelphia institution that was in the service of the “common laborer.” Founded in 1847, the Western continued to open branches in the neighborhoods of their working and middle-class patrons up until 1982.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner. Donna Rilling represented the nominators, James Duffin and Oscar Beisert, who were not in attendance.

Ms. Cooperman asked Ms. Schmitt if she had heard from the property owner. Ms. Schmitt responded that she had not, but that the required notice letters were mailed to the building and the mailing address on file with the City.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment, of which there was none. Mr. Schaaf commented that he is struck by the nobility of this relatively small, extraordinarily handsome building. He remarked that the detail was unmatched for a branch bank on a very tight and unusually configured corner, claiming that the result was simply fabulous. He suggested that the building is an obvious candidate for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, based on the merits of its excellent as a piece of art. Ms. Cooperman agreed. Ms. Klein remarked that she is pleased that Samuel Yellin’s metal work is still visible on the building.

Ms. Cooperman commented that she has a bit of trouble calling the style of the building Art Deco, but that is a minor detail. She continued that she understands the issue, because it depends on how one defines Art Deco, but she considers it to be more Neo-Classical, or a free reinterpretation of Neo-Classical elements that have been combined. She commented that if one was talking about an American example of Art Deco such as the Chrysler building, the subject property was not that. She noted that this does not take anything away from the quality of this building’s design; however, she just has a bit of an issue with the Art Deco label. Mr. Schaaf commented that he does not know very much about Stripped Classicism. Ms. Cooperman replied that it is a particularly important strain of Philadelphia design, seen perhaps

most notably in the work of Paul Cret. She continued that it is very interesting to see the style manifest in this building, as well as in other bank buildings, noting that Mellor, Meigs & Howe and PSFS were also classicizing banks. She remarked that the idea of Stripped Classicism as a Modernism of its age is under recognized. Mr. Schaaf commented about the working drawings showing the ceiling.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3549 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, F and J.

ADDRESS: 1632 POPLAR ST

Name of Resource: Green Hill Market

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Church of the Living God, The Pillar + Ground Truth

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1632 Poplar Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1632 Poplar Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building, constructed about 1859-61, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property is significant as an example of the evolution of public markets in the 1850s, transitioning from municipal government ownership to ownership by private market house companies. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that markets such as the subject property were crucial to supporting daily life in Philadelphia's densely populated neighborhoods outside of Center City. The nomination further argues that these neighborhood markets not only provided access to fresh food, but they also served as venues where neighbors convened at political, social, and religious events. The nomination further contends that the Green Hill Market House satisfies Criteria C and D, as an example of the Rundbogenstil or Romanesque Revival Style of architecture.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner. Donna Rilling represented the nominators, who were not in attendance.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the nomination, stating that he agreed that it satisfies the Criteria for Historic Designation put forward. He commented about the general history of public markets and their importance to neighborhoods. He concluded that it is time for the building to be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. David Traub representing Save Our Sites commented that Save Our Sites endorses the designation. He commented on the handsomeness of the building.

Ms. Cooperman asked Ms. Schmitt if she had heard from the property owner. Ms. Schmitt responded that she had not, but that the required notice letters were mailed to the building and the mailing address on file with the City, and only one of the letters was returned as undeliverable.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the property description on page 19 should say “17th Street” instead of “7th Street.” He continued that he is interested in one of the observations concerning Gustav Runge and the American Academy of Music building. He referenced the nomination’s description of Philadelphia as a city “with a largely forgotten German population.” He expressed some doubt about this statement, mentioning the entire profile of Germantown and the legacy of Germans coming to Philadelphia, saying he wondered if this characterization in the nomination was correct, because he did not think that the city had ever forgotten about its German heritage. Ms. Cooperman responded that perhaps the question is whether it had been forgotten in other parts of the city other than Germantown. She asked whether many people were as aware of concentrations of German-speaking immigrants in other locations in Philadelphia. Mr. Schaaf responded he was curious about the observation made in the nomination because he could not think of another East coast city that was informed as much by Germania as Philadelphia, to which Ms. Cooperman suggested Baltimore. Mr. Schaaf agreed. Ms. Cooperman commented that it is an important question because the Rundbogenstil is now being invoked frequently, and sometimes there needs to be more focus on what it really means. A Samuel Sloan design, for example, would look very similar and was built in the same decade, but by a different ethnic group, and would be called simplified Romanesque Revival. She continued that if one was speaking about German immigrant architects, it might be more legitimate to call it Rundbogenstil, which is really just round-arched style. Ms. Cooperman stated that she hopes not to see the term Rundbogenstil used as frequently as it has been, unless it is really meaningful. Ms. Klein asked if the German immigrants were the ones who used the term, to which Ms. Cooperman responded that that was the question.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1632 Poplar Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J.

ADDRESS: 622 N 16TH ST

Name of Resource: 622 N 16th Street

Proposed Action: Reclassification from contributing to non-contributing in Spring Garden Historic District Inventory

Property Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

Applicant: Robert Powers, Powers & Company

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the reclassification of 622 N 16th Street as non-contributing, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the property at 622 N 16th Street as non-contributing in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building is described as follows in the entry from the inventory of the Spring Garden Historic District:

622 (a.k.a. 1600-08 North Street) 3-story, 2-bay, brick vernacular house. Bluestone and brick steps with replacement railing; squared entrance opening; single-leaf door; 2-light basement windows; 1st story windows boarded-up, 1/1 vinyl sash on 2nd and 3rd stories; brick sills; corbelled brick cornice; flat roof.

South elevation: stucco with mural.

North elevation: 3-story, stucco; 1st story boarded-up; 1/1 aluminum window on 2nd and 3rd stories.

West elevation: stucco.

Built c. 1859. Alterations: new brick façade, window openings reduced in size, c. 1985. Contributing.

The application asserts that the vacant building, constructed in 1855 or 1856, has undergone extreme alterations that have significantly impacted the building's integrity. These alterations include façade replacement, installation of smaller window openings with vinyl windows, replacement of marble stoop with poured concrete, removal of all other marble features including water table, door surround, and window sills and lintels, removal of cornice, stuccoing over the brick North Street elevation, removal of a two-story side window bay, and removal of small rear additions.

The application notes that the historic district nomination, prepared by Powers & Company, classified the subject building as a non-contributing resource when the final draft version of the nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission in 2000. The status was subsequently changed to contributing based on a recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation at its 26 July 2000 meeting that suggested that all properties with "questionable classification" be classified as contributing if they have at least two of three characteristics of the historic buildings in the district, including scale and massing, materials, and rhythm of the façade. The Committee recommended that a building should be revised from non-contributing to contributing in the inventory if it conforms to the character of the district with regard to at least two of the three measures. The reclassification application also notes that the subject building is listed as an intrusion (non-contributing) in the Spring Garden National Register Historic District, which was listed in 1977.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the reclassification request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Consultants Bob Powers and Kevin McMahon represented the property owner, the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation.

Ms. Chantry noted that the staff recommendation was not unanimous, and that the staff understands the arguments on both sides and does not necessarily feel strongly about the request one way or the other.

Mr. Powers explained that he is a resident of the Spring Garden neighborhood, and that his firm prepared the original historic district nomination. He argued that the question here is what really is left of the historic building, other than it being a three-story brick building. He stated that he takes serious exception to the argument that the building contributes to the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its substantial modifications. He argued that there are no distinctive watertables, marble lintels or sills, or cornice. He asserted that the front façade brick is from the 1970s, and is very different in texture from the nineteenth century red brick found throughout the

district. He noted that, in evaluating the district, his firm did not feel that this was an appropriate property to be listed as contributing to the district.

Mr. Powers explained that the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation recently purchased the property, which had sat vacant for many years, from the Philadelphia Housing Authority. Mr. Powers added that the context of this building is lost, conceding that if it was part of an intact block or row, he could perhaps see an argument that the property is contributing. He argued that the building and the vacant lots to the south, which previously held buildings demolished by the Philadelphia Housing Authority, are examples of the Housing Authority's negligence over the years.

Mr. McMahon argued that, while the two-thirds rule described in the staff overview may be an appropriate one for evaluating properties with questionable significance or contributing status, this building really only has massing and scale. Because of the loss of historic fabric, he argued, it only has one of the three criteria cited in the two-thirds rule. Mr. McMahon noted that, even though the building has red brick, it is a very different type of brick, more characteristic of the late twentieth century.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. David Traub of Save Our Sites noted that, while his organization consistently opposes downgrading classifications from contributing to non-contributing, he is not familiar with this building or with the request. He asked when the structure was originally built. Mr. Powers responded that it was built in the 1850s. Mr. Traub asked if the original brick was removed from the front façade and reconstructed. Mr. Powers responded that it was. Mr. Traub asked whether the remainder of the building is intact. Mr. Powers responded that the rear ell has also been altered. Mr. Traub asked about the plans for the redevelopment of the site. Mr. Powers responded that the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation owns the building and the vacant lots to the south. Mr. Traub stated that in order to evaluate the property's significance, he needs more information about the plans for the site. Ms. Cooperman interjected that the redevelopment plans are not a consideration of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Traub argued that they are a consideration. Ms. Cooperman disagreed, stating that the question is whether the existing building has sufficient historical significance to merit a classification of contributing. What might be built in its place if it is demolished is entirely irrelevant to the a discussion of the current building's historical significance. Mr. Traub responded that Mr. Powers has argued that the building lacks context. Mr. Traub stated that he is ambivalent, but that Save Our Sites will have to agree with the Historical Commission staff and recommend denial of the reclassification. Mr. Powers acknowledged Mr. Traub's concern, noting that the last thing he likes to do is reclassify buildings as non-contributing, but in this instance, his firm believes that the net benefit from the building's reclassification and demolition outweighs its potential historical significance. Mr. Traub expressed Save Our Sites' concern over "selective pruning" of contributing buildings from historic district inventories.

Kathy Dowdell agreed with Mr. McMahon's assertion that the building satisfies only one out of the three criteria for contributing status. She noted that it is a red brick building, but it is not historic red brick, the windows have been altered, and the materials are all different. She opined that it is a candidate for reclassification and supported the request.

Mr. Powers commented that, knowing the neighborhood well, he cannot think of another building that is like this in terms of having lost this amount of historic fabric and still considered contributing to the district. He opined that it is a unique situation, and does not want it to be construed as a precedent.

Mr. Farnham noted that the staff was reluctant to contradict the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission's position from 2000, which at that time was led by David Brownlee, but stated that he is personally convinced by the argument that the building really only meets one of the three categories set forth, rather than two. He noted that, on a closer look, the brick really is different than the brick found throughout the neighborhood. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Farnham to reiterate the three criteria. Ms. Chantry responded that the three criteria used in the district classification process were: one, scale and massing; two, materials; and three, rhythm of the façade.

Mr. Schaaf noted that much has been said about the brick on the front façade, but questioned the stucco on the other elevations. Mr. McMahon responded that they assume the stucco was applied at the same time the front façade was reconstructed, in the 1970s or 1980s. He noted that it appears that there is still brick under the stucco.

Ms. Cooperman noted that, in contrast to a mid-row building, this building is on the end of the block, with elevations on two different streets, so potentially that is part of the Committee's consideration. Mr. Schaaf agreed, noting that, when considering the building from the rear, it looks pretty compelling as a mid-nineteenth century building. Ms. Cooperman commented that, while she appreciates the thought about it being the last remaining tooth, consideration of context is not part of the Philadelphia ordinance.

In looking at Figure 2 in the application, Mr. Schaaf noted that, while the front elevation of this building has been deformed, there is still tension between this building and the building with a storefront across the street. He remarked that those two buildings have been holding the corner since the mid-nineteenth century. Mr. Powers agreed that there is a structure in this location, but questioned whether the structure is actually historic.

Ms. Cooperman commented that, on the north elevation along North Street, there is a surviving portion of the cornice. She asked whether the portion of the main block with the cornice and the portion without are two separate volumes. Mr. Powers responded that he does not know. Ms. Klein asked whether the material on the North Street elevation is original. Mr. Powers responded that the North Street elevation is covered in stucco.

Mr. Traub asked if there is a photograph of the side elevation. Mr. McMahon responded that there are photographs in the report. Mr. Traub reiterated that it is all about context, because it is a historic district.

Mr. Powers directed attention to Figure 13 of the report, which shows comparable intact resources, and which present a better idea of what the building presumably looked like originally.

Ms. Cooperman opined that, although the front façade openings have been changed, the rhythm of them is still there, so by the terms of the criteria that were established previously, the massing and rhythm are still present. She agreed that the materials are gone. She noted that, although she is sympathetic to the owner's argument, absent an argument about historic changes to the massing of the building, she believes that it meets two out of three of the criteria set forth. Mr. Powers responded that, in creating a historic district inventory, there is a level of subjectivity, and some buildings fly under the radar, and can be reevaluated over the years. He opined that the inventory should not be a static document, but should continue to evolve. Mr. McMahon asked whether there is a record of which two criteria the Committee felt that this

building met back in 2000. Ms. Cooperman reiterated that, short of evidence that the historic massing is not there, she believes that the massing of the building and rhythm of the openings criteria are met. Mr. Powers asked if she really believes that the rhythm of the openings is still there if the openings have been shortened and narrowed. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Schaaf responded that they do. Ms. Cooperman noted that the scale of the openings has been changed, but not the rhythm. Mr. Powers disagreed. Ms. Cooperman responded that the openings are still in the same position on all three floors, thus retaining the original rhythm of the openings, and barring evidence that the massing has been changed, she believes it meets two criteria. She noted that, while she understands both arguments, by the rules used to establish the district inventory, the existing building still meets the criteria to be considered contributing. Mr. Powers reiterated that he feels this is a unique situation and he does not feel it would set a precedent or that there would be a flood of reclassification requests.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend denial of the reclassification of 622 N 16th Street as non-contributing, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 11:37 a.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;
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.