

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

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

PRESENT

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

Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Aimee Cicero, Magic Gardens
James Milnes, Wayne Mills Co.
Martin Heilman, Wayne Mills Co.
B. Beck
Gail Lopez-Henriquez, Painted Bride Art Center
Joan Sloan, Painted Bride Art Center
James Sloan, Painted Bride Art Center
Robert Lane, Stevens & Lee
John Carr, Materials Conservation
Sharon Erwin, Painted Bride
Brian Whitham, Extra Space Storage
Rick Snyderman, Old City Arts Association
Tim Monsul, Former President of Painted Bride Board
Isa Velez, MD
William Goldberg, Former President of Painted Bride Art Center
Alfonso Clark
William Groves, University City Housing
S. Witomski
Stacey Holder, Magic Gardens
Stephanie Cabezas, Magic Gardens
Blake Felix DiDonet, Painted Bride
Charles McMehan, Lantern Theater
Judith Robinson, 32nd Ward RCO
Jennifer Johnson, Painted Bride
Susan Donally, Painted Bride
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Mika He
T. Fox, Painted Bride Arts Center
Amelia Longo
Kathy Dowdell
Ursula Rucker, Painted Bride
Gaby Raczka
Grace Wagenfeld

Jim Duffin
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Ben Leech
Faye Anderson, All That Philly Jazz
Carolyn Burgers
Kubra Mocan
Lenny Seidman, Painted Bride Art Center
C. Campbell, Theatre in the X
Michelle Shirk, Magic Gardens
Gregory Corbett
Alice Corbitt
Laurel Raczka, Painted Bride Art Center
Lauren Heting, Painted Bride Art Center
Solomon Silber
Ryan Richmond, Magic Gardens
Hercules Grigos, Obermayer
LaNeshe Miller-White, Painted Bride Art Center
Matthew Thompson, Painted Bride
Henry Clinton
Noah Yoder
Stephen Goniles
Laura Perry, Magic Gardens
April Rose Davis, Painted Bride
Adam Mazur, Magic Gardens
Olivia Edlund, Magic Gardens
Allison Boyle, Magic Gardens
Emily Smith, Magic Gardens
Amanda Grady, Magic Gardens
Carol Finkle, Painted Bride
Yaara Ben-Dor, Magic Gardens
Andrew Perez
Julia Zagar, Magic Gardens
Isaiah Zagar, Magic Gardens
Jane Uptgrone
Leah Keisman
Helen Heinz, Temple University

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. Ms. Klein and Mr. Schaaf joined her.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, I, and J. As the nomination recognizes the archaeological potential of the site, the staff recommends amending the period of significance to 1750-1972.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District located east of the 7300 block Germantown Avenue in the Mt. Airy neighborhood and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, I, and J. The nomination argues that the proposed district, which is composed of 22 buildings constructed between 1750 and 1972, is significant under Criterion A for the Seminary's history and evolution in Philadelphia as representative of, and associated with, the larger historical development of suburban institutional campuses in the city. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that six of these buildings were designed by architect Frank Furness or his firm Furness & Evans and these buildings represent work of an eminent Philadelphia architect whose work greatly influenced the architectural history of the city. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the site where the Seminary currently stands was historically occupied by the Mount Airy Estate and is therefore significant for its archaeological potential. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Seminary represents the historical heritage of religious and theological education and training in the United Lutheran Church.

It should be noted that since the owner was notified of the proposed historic district in April 2018, at least seven of the buildings owned by the Lutheran Theological Seminary are currently up for sale or have recently been sold to new owners.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented a request to continue the review of the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the Lutheran Theological Seminary, which is the largest property owner in the proposed historic district, made the request to continue the review of the nomination, but is not the only property owner in the proposed district.

Ms. Cooperman asked if any property owners or their representatives were present. Attorney Hercules Grigos spoke on behalf of the Lutheran Theological Seminary and the continuance request. Property owner Solomon Silber represented himself and opposed the continuance request.

Mr. Grigos noted that the Seminary sold several of the properties along Boyer Street since notice was sent regarding the nomination. He explained that the Seminary would like additional time to work with the Commission to gather additional information about the nomination. He commented that the nomination was submitted in October 2017 and was not made public until notice was sent at the end of April 2018. He noted that the Seminary has a historian on staff. He acknowledged that there are already historically-designated buildings on the property, but his client would like to be able to appropriately address various claims in the nomination.

Mr. Silber noted that he is playing catch up, having only learned of the nomination a week before closing on his property. He noted that, at the closing, he also learned that the Seminary planned to divide the interior of their campus into an additional three lots. He expressed his concern that he has bought in a beautiful area and would like to see it preserved, and believes that it is historically significant and important. He noted that designation seems to be a positive thing, and does not understand the need for additional time. He stated that, as a homeowner, his purpose is to maintain exactly what is there, which seems to be in line with historic designation. Ms. Cooperman explained that property owners often ask for continuances to study the nomination for various reasons. She noted that it is conventional for the Committee to make a recommendation to the Commission to continue and remand the nomination back to the Committee. She noted that the district as a whole remains under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission during the continuance period. Mr. Silber responded that he does not understand what could be gained by additional time, but that his concern is that some things could be lost in delaying the process. Ms. Cooperman explained that the technical review by the staff was what was going on since October, and that notice was relatively recent. She noted that there are many reasons that a property owner may want a continuance, and that it simply adds time to what is otherwise the standard process. Mr. Silber responded that he still does not understand the purpose of the continuance request. Mr. Grigos responded that it is a broad nomination that includes claims about archaeology and numerous buildings. He conceded that there are additional buildings on the site that should probably be designated, but others that should be considered non-contributing, or areas where there are parking lots, and they want to make sure that things are appropriately addressed. He stated that they will abide by the Commission's jurisdiction and nothing will change during the continuance period. Mr. Silber responded that he is concerned that the surface parking lots, which are the interior lots, will be subdivided off from the Seminary property.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. James Duffin, one of the nominators, noted that they agreed to the continuance request because they understand that it is a complicated property with complicated issues. He reiterated that the entire district is under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission, so they know that nothing can happen to the properties without the Historical Commission's review and approval.

Ms. DiPasquale asked Mr. Grigos if there is a plan to subdivide the Seminary property further than the recent subdivision. Mr. Grigos responded that, as of now, with the nomination, everything is changing for the Seminary, so there is no concrete plan. Previously, the Seminary had some ideas about reusing the property, but there is no plan currently.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District to the September 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. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property. Paul Steinke, Patrick Grossi, and Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked whether the property owner is present. No one came forward. She noted that the nomination has been continued several times.

Mr. Steinke stated that Patrick Grossi would read from the nomination. Mr. Grossi commented that Mr. Leech wrote the nomination and that he would read some of the concluding paragraphs, because he felt Mr. Leech did a remarkable job summarizing the space's significance. He read from the nomination:

The Grand Court was conceived by Wanamaker and Burnham as a public gathering space in the idealistic City Beautiful tradition of beneficent commerce and democratized luxury. Remarkably, it has functioned continuously since 1911 exactly as intended: as an architectural spectacle, a music venue, a civic crossroads, and an engine of commerce. As the unifying core of one of America's most acclaimed and influential department store designs, it represents both an architectural archetype and a living cultural landscape, a privately-built, privately-owned space inextricably tied to the public life of the city.

He remarked that he could go on and read the final paragraph as well, but that staff has mostly summarized it. That paragraph, he continued, distills why this space is so important to the City of Philadelphia and why it merits listing on the local Register as a public interior. He noted that it would only be the third designated public interior on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places after portions of the Family Court building and City Council Chambers.

Mr. Steinke asserted that the Preservation Alliance contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J. He added that the space has been remarkably well maintained by multiple owners for 108 years, since it opened in 1910. He described the various stores that occupied the space since the building's construction. Mr. Steinke offered some "interesting bits of trivia" from the nomination that included the fact that it is the only department

store building ever dedicated by a United States president, William Howard Taft, in 1911. He also described how architect Daniel Burnham, quite pleased with his work, stated: "The building as a whole both inside and out is the most monumental commercial structure ever erected anywhere in the world." Finally, Mr. Steinke continued, the great Wanamaker organ was first played in the store 96 years ago tomorrow, 21 June 1922. He then expressed his hopes that the Committee would recommend that the nomination satisfies the Criteria for Designation outlined in the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none. She then commended the nominator on the nomination, expressing her appreciation for the hard work and well-written argument.

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

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 that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 230-36 and 238 Vine Street and 255 Bodine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, H and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 230-36 and 238 Vine Street and 255 Bodine 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 the building 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 the 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 the building 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 that the property exemplifies the Painted Bride's influence on the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Old City and Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Robert Lane represented the property owner. Emily Smith, executive director of Philadelphia's Magic Gardens, represented the nomination.

Mr. Lane asked that the nominator present first. Ms. Cooperman responded that there is no set order and that the Committee only asks that everyone has a chance to speak. Mr. Lane commented that he has four witnesses and a short statement prepared, though he asked to hear from the nominator and then to respond to her comments. Ms. Cooperman explained that

the Committee typically hears from the nominator, then the property owner, then from interested members of the public. Given that there are so many people present who wish to speak, she respectfully requested that the individuals not spend too much time reiterating previously stated comments. She acknowledged that people were present because they are passionate about the property and then asked whether the nominator would like to provide comments on the proposed designation.

Ms. Smith stated that she wrote the nomination with generous help from the Historical Commission staff. She welcomed questions from the Committee.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment.

Faye Anderson, citizen preservationist and founder and director of All That Philly Jazz, argued that from South Street to Vine Street, the Painted Bride Art Center is part of Philadelphia's jazz history. The Vine Street location, she contended, is one of the few remaining buildings associated with Philly's golden age of jazz. She stated that under the headline "The Bride Is a Jewel," Suzanne Cloud, cofounder of Jazz Bridge, wrote on TripAdvisor: "The Painted Bride has been a Philly institution for many years and it has a beautiful performance space that features a diversity of talent from jazz to world music to ethnic dance to percussion ensembles." Ms. Anderson then quoted a post on VisitPhiladelphia: "Most major cities have alternative performing arts spaces, but Philadelphia's Painted Bride Art Center is the mother of them all." She explained that the Painted Bride's Jazz on Vine was Philadelphia's longest running jazz series, adding that its jazz programming was nationally recognized. In 2010 and again in 2012, she continued, the Painted Bride received a national award for adventurous programming. The Painted Bride, she observed, is more than a performance space wrapped in bejeweled tiles. Ms. Anderson commented that the Painted Bride is a community space that provided a platform for community engagement and social justice issues. She asserted that it is sad to see the organization downplaying the cultural and social significance of the iconic building with which it has a symbiotic relationship. She then argued that the skin of the building's mosaic has been the Painted Bride Art Center's public face for more than two decades. Tellingly, she continued, the façade is the background in every staff photo. She stated that last week the organization tweeted: "It is more than brick and mortar." Every property owner that opposes historic designation says the same thing, she contended. Ms. Anderson explained that the Painted Bride holds stories of Philadelphia's rich jazz heritage and served as a place where culture was made and lives were transformed. The building, she argued, provides a context and, as such, should not disappear from public memory. She suggested that the organization's opposition to historic designation is fueled by fear and offered a second tweet by the organization: "Potential designation stalls our plans for the organization impacts the property's market value, and ultimately limits what resources we can later allocate to artists." Assuming for the sake of argument the fear is justified, Ms. Anderson added, it is outside the jurisdiction of this committee. She stated that the sole issue before the Committee on Historic Designation is whether the building is significant to the City of Philadelphia, pursuant to the preservation ordinance. She commented that the Painted Bride Art Center building meets several criteria for designation. Accordingly, she concluded, the nomination should be recommended for listing in the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Carlo Campbell of Theatre in the X stated that he has been involved with the Painted Bride Art Center in several capacities and that it pains him to see the organization forced to go through this current phase with the potential for designation. He asserted that with the neighborhood's reconfiguration, the neighbors do not feel safe around the performers, do not acknowledge them, and make them feel like pariahs. He suggested the reason the organization has to enter

another phase is due to the “changing complexion” of the neighborhood. He claimed that historic designation of art is beautiful but that it is antithetical to the Painted Bride’s purpose if it hinders the organization’s mission. He asked that the Committee consider that the organization is living on to continue its work, and designation opposes that goal. He stated that he remembered “the brother that did the art,” and that all kinds of trouble was happening on South Street, which caused the artist to start “doing things differently.” He contended that no one rushed to save and historicize that work at that moment on South Street. Mr. Campbell then argued that the South Street site is beautiful and makes the Painted Bride building “look like scrap paper.” He concluded that anyone present concerned about the artists and their value should support the Painted Bride’s position and plans for the future.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that his organization engaged in an extensive internal review of the nomination and expressed its support for its recommendation to the Historical Commission for approval. The nomination, he continued, satisfies the four Criteria for Designation listed. Mr. Steinke then contended that the designer, Isaiah Zagar, is present and is an internationally renowned artist. He further argued that the innovation of Mr. Zagar’s design and technique in terms of combining tile, glass, and found objects in an artful creation on all of the exterior surfaces of this otherwise humble building represent an innovation for which he alone is responsible. Mr. Steinke asserted that the Painted Bride Art Center building is a familiar visual feature, suggesting that some have compared it to Watts Towers, a Los Angeles landmark. The Painted Bride Art Center, he continued, exemplifies the cultural, social, and historical heritage of the Old City community and of Philadelphia. The organization helped transform Old City from a declining industrial and warehousing district into the hub of arts and culture it is today. This building, he noted, exemplifies that criteria in a very special way that is unique. Mr. Steinke then reiterated that the Preservation Alliance supports the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman repeated that the Committee is tasked with evaluating the nomination on its technical merits and asked that any member of the public who wishes to speak confine his or her comments to that matter. She then stated that the Historical Commission can consider issues extending beyond the nomination’s technical merits.

Kathy Dowdell, a member of the Preservation Alliance’s Advocacy Committee, commented that in reading the nomination, she was struck by how important it is that the Historical Commission considers a district nomination for South Street and that she hopes one might be considered now that the Historical Commission has an expanded staff. She questioned whether the walls of the Painted Bride building could be considered under the ordinance as an object instead of a building and asked whether that type of designation had been considered. She compared the Painted Bride mosaics to those of the Dream Garden, which cannot be removed without damage and which was designated by the Historical Commission as an object.

Ms. Cooperman responded that the question depends on how an object is defined in the ordinance, adding that she does not have the definition in front of her. Ms. Smith asserted that her understanding is that an object is moveable. Ms. Cooperman replied that the Committee would need to review the ordinance.

Tim Monsul, former president of the board of directors of the Painted Bride Art Center, explained that the organization was founded in 1969 by a group of artists and was run by the artist group. On South Street, he continued, the center developed a culture and established a presence that later moved to Vine Street. The current building, he contended, contains essence, represents the arts culture, and, as an established arts center, holds value for the city.

Gabby Raczka, long-time member and stakeholder of the Painted Bride, commented that she greatly values the city's public art. In this instance, she argued, there are over two hundred works by Isaiah Zagar and advised against designating the Painted Bride building as unique, one-of-a-kind art, since it is not moveable or adaptable. She called the mosaics a hindrance to any kind of development. She reiterated that she appreciates public art, but asked that it not stand in the way of progress.

Mr. Lane interrupted to state that many people at the meeting attended in support of the Painted Bride Arts Center and asked that those people hold their comments until he could make his presentation. A member of the public asked whether he would be able to speak afterward. Mr. Lane stated that this is the time for those who support the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee's procedure is to ask for public comment and that it has reached that point of the review. Mr. Lane replied that most of the people in the room were asked to come on behalf of the Painted Bride Arts Center and that he was going to ask those members not to speak at this time. Ms. Cooperman replied that she would conclude the public comment portion of the review and that Mr. Lane could present his own comments on behalf of the owner.

Ms. Cooperman asked again if any member of the public would like the opportunity to speak about the technical merits of the nomination.

Richard Snyderman identified himself as a founding member and former president of the Old City Arts Association and founding member of the 1970s South Street Renaissance. He addressed Mr. Lane's earlier request to hold certain public comments to the end of the discussion by asserting that it is inappropriate that there not be an opportunity to speak in a free forum, whether an individual be in support of or against designation. Ms. Cooperman reiterated that the Committee's process is to allow anyone wishing to speak to speak during the public comment period without prejudice. She further restated that comments should focus on the merits of the nomination. Mr. Snyderman agreed, adding that he was concerned that the comments from the public could become unbalanced due to the attorney's request. He provided a statistic on Isaiah Zagar's work, stating that Mr. Zagar's mosaics cover one million square feet of space in Philadelphia and twenty-four acres of landscape. These statistics, he argued, elevate Mr. Zagar's mosaics beyond art that happens to be on the street, and instead classifies it as art that defines Philadelphia's appearance. He added that Philadelphia's Magic Gardens draws more than 150,000 visitors per year to the site that Mr. Zagar created as an individual over a 30-year period. He remarked that visitors come from Spain, Italy, China, and elsewhere. Mr. Snyderman noted that Philadelphia has not produced many iconic artists this century, but that Isaiah Zagar is one. He explained that Simon Rodia's Watts Towers was designated a National Historic Landmark due to its important, adding that Rodia worked on his piece for approximately 33 years. He compared Mr. Zagar's Magic Gardens to Watts Towers and commented that the Painted Bride mosaics took several years to complete. In France, he continued, Maison Picassette in Chartres by Raymond Isidore was declared a national monument in 1983. He suggested that those landmarks be considered as comparables to Mr. Zagar's work. He then suggested that two sites are equivalent to national landmarks and they include Philadelphia's Magic Gardens and the site of the proposed designation, the Painted Bride building. He argued that the Painted Bride does not just contain a bunch of mosaics on a wall and contended that the mosaics are an integrated piece of the architecture. He claimed that the building was without distinguished character when the art center acquired it in 1981 and that Mr. Zagar's mosaics evolved the site to an iconic Philadelphia structure. He noted that the

Painted Bride as an organization is not the topic of the Committee's discussion and stated that he finds it extraordinary that an arts organization would advocate for the destruction of an iconic work of art.

Mr. Lane alleged that he was not trying to suppress anyone's right to speak and requested that all individuals asked by the Painted Bride Arts Center to attend stand to show their support. He then stated that some people thought they were asked to come and speak passionately, but that he wanted to clarify that those asked to attend on the art center's behalf need not speak. However, he continued, if any of those people want to speak, he would not stop them but would suggest they confine their comments to matters he is presenting.

Ms. Cooperman replied that it is quite clear given the number of people in the room that there is a lot of passion over this issue.

Mr. Lane apologized for his previous interruption. He then stated that he represents the Painted Bride Art Center, Inc., which is a nonprofit organization. He introduced four individuals, including Joan Sloan, chair of the board of the Painted Bride, who he asked to explain the Painted Bride Art Center and differentiate the organization from the building.

Ms. Cooperman again reminded Mr. Lane that the Committee's purview relates only to the technical merits of the nomination and not to questions of physical condition, financial matters, or institutional organization. Mr. Lane responded that all witnesses will speak to the merits of the nomination. He explained that the reason he has asked for the clarification is that the nomination seeks to designate a building, adding that the nominator did not nominate an object. He observed that most of the nomination discusses the performance space, the jazz program and that the Committee has listened to comments presented on those topics. He explained that he is trying to clarify that the arts aspect will continue in a different capacity and that a nonprofit organization cannot be designated. Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission designates historic sites that are important for their associations with historic events. Mr. Lane responded that he would like to show that the building does not meet the four Criteria selected in the nomination.

Ms. Sloan explained that the board came to the decision to sell the building after three years of careful consideration that involved understanding the limitations of its business model, the millions of dollars it would cost to renovate the building, the dwindling funding of the arts community, the seismic changes in how art is consumed and appreciated, as well as the changes in the Old City neighborhood. The neighborhood, she contended, used to be a place for art galleries and artists' housing, but has transformed into a place of high-rises, condos, and development, where the neighbors are not appreciative of the comings and goings of the theater performers. She described how the organization met with many experts before coming to the decision to sell the building. She further offered further details on the organization's work with nationally-recognized consultants that were funded by the Pew Charitable Trust and the art center's extensive strategic planning process. She noted that the organization engaged focus groups to evaluate the essence of the Painted Bride so that the organization could preserve that legacy, while still striving to survive and thrive in the current climate. She discussed the organization's options, which included renovating the building and searching for new locations. She explained that she worked with realtors to view properties around the city and worked with partners and developers to explore the possibility of constructing on top of the current building. What the organization learned, she continued, is that constructing on top of the building to preserve the mosaic façade would be cost prohibitive. Ms. Sloan added that the board looked at alternative ways of preserving the building which included discussions with individuals at

Philadelphia's Magic Gardens. Ms. Cooperman interjected that Ms. Sloan's comments are moving beyond the Committee's scope, though they are matters often considered by the Historical Commission. Ms. Sloan concluded that the Painted Bride Art Center is not the building. In taking into consideration the building, she contended, the Committee has linked it to the Painted Bride's legacy. She asked that the Committee separate the organization and the building, adding that there is a lot of misinformation about the Painted Bride Art Center.

Mr. Lane asked Laurel Raczka, executive director of the Painted Bride Art Center, to explain how the building relates to the arts organization. Ms. Cooperman asked whether her statements are relative to the technical merits of the nomination. She reiterated that matters pertaining to institutional planning, finance, and building condition can be brought to the Historical Commission but are not part of the technical merits of the nomination, which the Committee reviews. Mr. Lane acknowledged the Committee's purview, adding that the fourth Criteria states that the building exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community and argued that members of the public have been discussing the Painted Bride Art Center as satisfying that Criterion. Ms. Cooperman clarified that the Committee understands that there is an organization that exists within a building and that the organization is not a building. Mr. Lane stated that he respects Ms. Cooperman's understanding and that Ms. Raczka was going to speak to that point. He then asked John Carr to speak about the building and the mosaic. He added that he was going to bring an architectural historian, but there was no allegation to rebut that the building as built without the adornment of the mosaic is architecturally significant. Ms. Cooperman agreed that that is not before the Committee. Mr. Lane commented that an architect or designer of the building has never been mentioned and that the designer of the mosaic is separate. He then distributed curricula vitae for Mr. Carr and Helen Heinz.

Mr. Carr explained that he is an architectural conservator and that his firm has worked on buildings with mosaics, including those designated as objects by the Historical Commission. He stated that his firm was asked to evaluate the materials and their condition pursuant to Criteria for Designation F, in which the building contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation. He asserted that his review supports that the mosaics are a very significant innovation. However, he continued, the materials used have a shelf life, since they include accumulated tiles meant for interior application. That shelf life, he claimed, has expired. Mr. Carr explained that because Mr. Zagar's work stands as a significant innovation, his firm's recommendation states that preservation of the mural could effectively only be achieved if the work is maintained in an interior environment. An exterior environment, he concluded, would continue the degradation and require full replacement.

Mr. Lane noted the earlier comment suggesting that the mosaics be designated as an object with another comment contending that objects are moveable. He offered his assumption that the mosaic is not moveable and asked Mr. Carr to clarify whether the mosaic is moveable and whether the mosaic was intended to be permanent in its construction. Mr. Carr answered that he cannot speak to the intent.

Ms. Cooperman asked Ms. DiPasquale to read the section of the ordinance that defines an object. Ms. DiPasquale read that the ordinance defines an object as "a material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historic, or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, moveable yet related to a specific setting or environment."

Mr. Carr stated that he did not attempt to remove any areas of the tiles. However, he continued, when sounding of the façade was performed, there were significant areas of delamination,

where the flexible latex modified mortar was detached from the tiles. Based on its condition, he added, his firm determined that large sections are removable.

Ms. Heinz, a Temple University professor of history, stated that she is familiar with Philadelphia architecture and speaks as someone who uses the city on a daily basis. Mr. Lane asked Ms. Heinz whether the mosaic has any historical significance. Ms. Heinz responded that she had never looked at the Painted Bride building but that she thinks it has an interesting façade and is beautifully decorated. The building itself, she alleged, is not significant. She commented that she had heard of the Painted Bride before but was surprised to see it located on Vine Street, since she remembered it on South Street when she was a student at the University of Pennsylvania. She remarked that she assumed it was still on South Street and opined that the building on Vine Street does not seem to fit into the neighborhood. She further noted that she often encounters the building in students' papers owing to the association with the Mural Arts Program and the organization's avant-garde nature, which seeks to remain on the cutting edge of the arts.

Mr. Lane stated that he and his colleagues have shown that the building is not historic and has not met any of the criteria. He claimed the building is not the work of a designer, architect, or landscape architect and that only the mosaic satisfies that criteria. The real question, he continued, relates not to the designation of the Painted Bride Art Center, but to the designation of the mosaic. The mosaic, he noted, is one of 220 of Mr. Zagar's works and is one of over 4,000 murals in the city. He stated that if the Committee were to use its power to recommend designation for a mural or mosaic it would be relatively unprecedented. He claimed that real estate lawyers would send letters to their clients advising them to whitewash their murals and remove their mosaics before the property is burdened with historic designation, which would substantially impair its value. He argued that the preservation ordinance was not intended to be used in that manner and that the unintended consequences of using this power in this situation is seriously damaging to the arts and culture in Philadelphia. He implored the Committee not to recommend designation of this property.

Carol Finkle stated that she has been close to the Painted Bride Art Center since around 1970 and remains just as close as the day the art center opened. She offered anecdotal stories about her life as a rebel when the Painted Bride opened and her life now as an "old Jewish grandmother." She opined on the history of South Street and the years the Painted Bride operated at that location.

Bill Goldberg, former president of the Painted Bride Art Center, stated that it is remarkable that the nomination has pitted artist against artist. He recounted that he attended one of the first board meetings in the 1980s in the home of Isaiah and Julia Zagar. Mr. Zagar, he continued, produced the work on the walls of the Painted Bride building out of love. Mr. Zagar, he continued, is integrally allied with the Painted Bride. He agreed with Mr. Snyderman's comments on the artistic merit of Mr. Zagar's work, adding that there is no way to disconnect the work of Mr. Zagar from the Painted Bride. He contended that they are one and the same.

Ms. Cooperman stated that, with respect to Criterion J, it is the Committee's purview to determine whether a site is associated with the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community. She clarified that the criterion does not speak to whether there is still an institution in the building or not and that the criterion is intended to recognize that some aspect of city history is associated with the property. She asserted that many sites have been designated owing to associations with history important to the city and emphasized that the Criterion is not about the present but is about the past.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination dates the building's construction to the 1950s and indicates that it was built as a garage. He observed that when the elegant skin was placed on the garage, the building was transformed and became something different. It is no longer that same building, he remarked. A new finish is on the building, he continued, and the finish happens to be stucco with beautiful tile and ceramic mirrors. Mr. Schaaf suggested that the new skin is part of how this building lives in our present. He clarified that the nomination form asks whether the historic resource satisfies the Criteria for Designation, not the building. Criterion E, he explained, refers to the work of a designer in broad terms, and a designer is an artist. Ms. Cooperman affirmed that a designer does not have to be an architect, noting that the definition of the Criterion distinguishes between designer and architect. Mr. Schaaf stated that Criterion E certainly applies to the property. Addressing the argument that portions of the building are delaminating, Mr. Schaaf argued that every building needs maintenance, adding that in the life cycle of buildings, property owners simply have to repair their buildings. The skin of this building, he concluded, is unusual, though it can be repaired.

Ms. Klein stated that through the centuries buildings have been embellished. She commented that in some cases they survive and in others they deteriorate. She asserted that a building's deterioration does not prevent it from being recognized as an important historic resource.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 230-36 and 238 Vine Street and 255 Bodine Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, H and J.

ADDRESS: 228-36 S 52ND ST

Name of Resource: The Locust Theatre

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Bushfire Theatre of Performing Arts

Nominator: Noah Yoder

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 228-36 South 52nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 228-36 S. 52nd Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Locust Theatre, constructed in 1914, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the Locust Theatre is emblematic of the construction of small, neighborhood theaters in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century, as movies became affordable entertainment. The Theatre is also associated with successful baker William Freihofer, and the Bushfire Theatre of Performing Arts. Having entertained audiences for over a century, the Theatre exemplifies the development of the 52nd Street strip as a major cultural and commercial corridor of West Philadelphia. Under C, D, and E, the nomination contends that the Theatre still retains much of its original terra cotta, Beaux-Arts classical detail, and typifies the high architectural standard to which neighborhood movie theaters were held. The Theatre is clad in terra cotta ornament by the Conkling-Armstrong Terra Cotta Company, and is the work of noted Philadelphia architectural firms Stuckert & Sloan, and later the Hoffman-Henon Company.

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

Ms. Cooperman asked if there was anyone present representing the property owner, to which there was no response. Ms. Schmitt confirmed that the staff had been contacted by a representative of the ownership prior to the meeting, and that the owner was aware of the nomination. Ms. Cooperman then asked if the nominator was present, and Noah Yoder introduced himself and said that he was available to answer any questions. Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak, and Paul Steinke from the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia introduced himself and said that they were in support of the nomination. He stated that he wanted to commend the nominator, Mr. Yoder, on his first nomination, which was very well done and also fun to read. Mr. Steinke said that the nomination read like an episode of *Boardwalk Empire*, with stories of infidelities and crimes of passion. He said that the building's association with the Freihofer family, which for Philadelphians of a certain age, was a household name of bakeries. He continued on, saying that, architecturally, the building was a remarkably intact survivor of a building type that was once ubiquitous in neighborhoods throughout the city, but had increasingly become rare. Mr. Steinke stated that the building's heritage was serving both the early, first-run, motion picture industry, and more recently, the Bushfire Theatre and the surrounding community. He said that it was really remarkable how the building had been adapted over the years, and that the Preservation Alliance believes that the nomination demonstrates that the property meets the technical Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J.

David Traub introduced himself as representing Save Our Sites, and stated that under Criterion for Designation A alone, the building deserved designation. He said that the way that the building anchored the corner site, and its remarkable cornice and cartouche, made for a remarkable piece of architecture, designed by a well known firm. Mr. Traub commented that, as Mr. Steinke had pointed out, there were so few remaining examples of this kind of buildings left in the city, especially with the demolition of the Boyd Theatre. Mr. Traub said that Save Our Sites heartily recommended this designation.

Mr. Cooperman asked if there was anyone else who wished to comment, to which there was no response. Ms. Cooperman then agreed that the nomination was very nicely done, and that the graphics had been very good in addition to the written content.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the City Planning Commission had recommended that this building be designated in its West District Plan which was adopted by the City Planning Commission on 17 April 2018.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 228-36 S. 52nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J.

DIAMOND STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT BOUNDARY AMENDMENT

Proposed Action: Boundary amendment

Applicant: Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends amending the boundary of the Diamond Street Historic District to remove the vacant lots at 2028-2042 and 2100-2116 Diamond Street from the district.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend the boundary of the Diamond Street Historic District, removing all properties from the district on the south side of Diamond Street between N.

Lambert Street and N. Van Pelt Street, at the far southwest corner of the district. All of these properties are currently vacant lots. The Diamond Street Historic District was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1986. At the time of the designation, buildings classified as contributing in the district inventory, which were in very poor condition, stood on these blocks. Not long after the designation of the district, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited these buildings as “imminently dangerous” and the blocks of houses were demolished, resulting in the vacant lots that are present today. In 2001, the staff of the Historical Commission presented a proposal to amend the historic district boundary to account for extensive demolition, but that proposal called for cutting the boundary to 20th Street, which would have removed several historic buildings from the district. No action was taken by the Commission on the proposal, owing to community opposition to amending the district boundary. This current proposal requests the rescission of two vacant blocks only, where the buildings were demolished approximately 20 years ago. Historic preservation standards advise against including non-historic or non-contributing properties on historic district boundaries. Best practices suggest that the boundary should be amended to remove the vacant blocks.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the historic district boundary amendment to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Ms. Cooperman called for public comment. Alice Corbitt, mother of the property owner of 2034 Diamond Street, commented that her son Gregory Corbitt received a letter from the City which stated that it would like to buy the property from him, and that it intends to put a police station on the site. Ms. Cooperman commented that the Committee is reviewing only a proposal to amend the historic district boundary, and has no knowledge of a proposed police station. Ms. Corbitt responded that there is no building on the site, so it has no historic value. Ms. Cooperman responded that she is correct in that the Committee could recommend removal of the property from the historic district boundary because there is no building remaining on the site.

Attorney Henry Clinton represented Alfonso Clark, the owner of 2102, 2110, 2112, 2114, and 2116 Diamond Street. Mr. Clinton asked about the driving force behind removing the properties from the historic district, if they have remained historically designated for many years. Ms. Chantry responded that there is a proposal for a police station on this site, as Ms. Corbitt mentioned that the letter from the City had stated. She stated that she is unaware of any specifics related to the proposal, except that the 2100 block on the north side of Diamond Street, between N. Lambert and N. 21st Streets, which contains two contributing buildings flanking now-vacant lots, was initially considered as part of the development site, and the staff advised against it owing to the two remaining contributing buildings. The staff recognized that there are two entire blocks at the edge of the historic district without any historic resources remaining, and put forward this proposed amendment as a result. Mr. Clinton asked if it would not be a good situation for the Commission to keep the historic district boundary as it is, and to have the Commission remain an integral part of the process so that a new police station or other structure would conform with the remaining aspects of Diamond Street from N. 15th through N. 18th Street. Ms. Chantry responded that she would be offering her opinion if she were to respond, but that these two blocks are at the edge of the historic district and retain no historic significance and therefore the staff recommends that the blocks are removed from the historic district. Mr. Clinton asked again what prompted this proposal. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee does not know, as that is not part of the proposal, but that the amendment would be conforming to best practices.

Ms. Cooperman stated that, from a technical standpoint, this would be an appropriate adjustment to the edge of the historic district, where the buildings have been gone for some

time. She noted that the conventional process is to remove the regulation of something that is not worthy of regulation.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the Commission would have review and comment jurisdiction over proposed new construction, owing to the properties being vacant lots. Ms. Chantry corrected this assertion, and explained that there were buildings on the lots at the time of historic district designation, and therefore the Commission currently enjoys plenary jurisdiction over work to these sites. Ms. Cooperman commented that the issue is that these empty lots are at the edge of the historic district, rather than being more within the district. Ms. Klein commented that in the past, the Commission had the opportunity to make recommendations and suggestions regarding new construction on vacant lots. She asked if this was still the case. Ms. Chantry reiterated that these lots had buildings on them at the time of the historic district designation, and were not vacant lots at the time of the historic district designation. She explained that, if these were vacant lots at the time of the historic district designation, then the Commission would have review and comment jurisdiction, but that is not the case in this circumstance. She reiterated that there were contributing buildings on these lots at the time of the historic district designation, for which the Department of Licenses & Inspections ordered the demolition after the creation of the Diamond Street Historic District. Therefore, the Commission currently enjoys plenary jurisdiction over any proposals for new construction on these parcels.

Mr. Clark commented that his father was a physician across the street, and over time his father purchased the properties in question now. He commented that he has a receipt that his father paid for the demolition of his buildings. He commented that Diamond Street has a name to it for a purpose. He commented that Diamond Street was, or is, and would like to continue to be, the Spruce Street of North Philadelphia. He commented that there are homes to the north and south of Diamond Street so it is not on the edge. He suggested that a police station would destroy the continuity of the residences from Broad Street to the N. 22nd Street area. Ms. Cooperman commented that there are difference processes and responsible agencies within the City, and that planning for what happens to a property is outside of the purview of this Committee. Mr. Clark commented that the technical aspect would be to maintain the historical significance of the area as residential. Ms. Cooperman commented that the Committee is focusing its discussion on the existing boundary of the historic district, shown as a red line on the image projected on the screen, despite there being surrounding residential areas. She noted that anyone may author a nomination to amend the boundary of the historic district to include other areas, but that is not before the Committee today. Ms. Klein noted that other City departments, such as City Planning and Zoning, could have an effect on what gets constructed on the vacant lots that are no longer considered historic. Ms. Cooperman agreed that there would be other City processes that would determine what would be appropriate on this site.

David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that it could be argued that vacant lots such as these within historic districts can be considered just as valuable as the actual buildings that are located on the other blocks. He commented that if these blocks remain in the historic district, the Commission would have jurisdiction over the design of any new construction. He commented that vacant lots are very valuable in terms of maintaining a consistency of fabric of historic districts, and there seems to be an attempt to whittle away at the totality of the historic district. He asked how far the historic district extends west beyond the 2100 block. Ms. Chantry responded that Mr. Traub is literally looking at the boundary of the district on the screen, which is at the end of the 2100 block of Diamond Street. It is the red outline referenced earlier. It does not extend further west. These blocks are at the very edge of the historic district. Mr. Traub asked for clarification as to if these blocks are at the very edge of the historic district. Ms. Cooperman confirmed that they are. She stated that when the historic district was created, it

was a residential district. These properties were included in the inventory because there were historic buildings on them. Those buildings are no longer there. Mr. Traub stated that he understands, but is trying to make the argument that vacant lots at the edge of a historic district are just as valuable as the historic buildings, and maybe even more valuable. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee's purview is the technical merits of designation or rescission. It is not planning.

Judith Robinson, representing the 32nd Ward RCO, commented that the historic district is a community asset. She noted that there was a vacant lot on the 1400 block of Diamond Street that went through the Commission review process, and the RCO liked that it had to do so, because it resulted in less work for the RCO to ensure that the new construction was compatible with the surrounding buildings. She agreed with Mr. Traub's assertion that vacant lots are an asset. She referenced the Neighborhood Transformation Initiative under then-Mayor Street which resulted in the demolition of historic buildings that she opined could have been saved. She referenced a Philadelphia Housing Authority proposal from 15 years ago which proposed to construct public housing on the corridor. She commented that there are now houses that are similar to what was existing. She commented that even if it is a municipal building that is proposed for this site, the RCO wants the Commission's input. She commented that the RCO wishes to maintain the historic aspect of the corridor. She suggested that the proposed police station could be treated like the public housing, where there were changes made to the materials. She commented that the Commission must remain in position to protect the commercial corridor. She referenced two National Historic Landmarks, Jones Tabernacle AME Church and New Jerusalem Baptist Church. She commented that Van Pelt Street to the north has historic properties that add to the corridor. She asked that the Commission not relinquish its layer of protection for the commercial corridor.

Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the Committee should think twice before recommending the shrinking of a historic district in a city that has relatively few historic districts. He asked what is in the best interest for the remaining historic fabric. He suggested the options are to leave the parcels in the historic district so that they are subject to the full jurisdiction of the Commission, such that what may be built there, whether it is a police station, apartment building, or a gas station Wawa, does not detract from the rest of the historic district, or, to amend the boundary and leave the design of new construction to whatever the zoning code allows. He suggested the former option. He suggested that the Commission do no harm, and not amend the historic district boundaries.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he was swayed by the "do no harm" aspect of this potential change in boundaries, and that the resources here are connecting to a really profound resource in the Church of the Advocate further down Diamond Street. Ms. Cooperman commented that the district could be expanded. Mr. Schaaf agreed. Ms. Klein acknowledged that the staff researched the proposal and made an informed recommendation based on that, but that she was not convinced that eliminating vacant lots from historic districts is the best thing to do. She noted that some vacant lots are in the middle of historic districts, whereas the parcels in question happen to be absolutely at the edge of the historic district. She continued that when properties are listed in a historic district inventory, they are given a classification of significance. She stated that the parcels in question are non-contributing at the moment, and she sees no reason to eliminate them, because they are non-contributing. Ms. Cooperman corrected Ms. Klein, and noted that the properties are considered contributing to the historic district because there were contributing buildings on the lots at the time of the district designation. Ms. Chantry agreed, and commented that they would have to be reclassified from contributing to non-contributing in order to officially be non-contributing to the historic district. Mr. Schaaf responded

that the Committee does not need to determine that now. Ms. Cooperman agreed, and noted that what is before the Committee is an amendment to the historic district boundary. Ms. Klein asked about the zoning of the parcels in question. Ms. Chantry responded that she does not have that information available.

Ms. Cooperman stated that there are several options, one being that the Committee could recommend that the boundary not be adjusted. She asked if the Commission would be able to change the status of the properties without proper notice to property owners. Ms. DiPasquale reminded the Committee that changing the status of the properties from contributing to non-contributing would have no impact on the Commission's jurisdiction over proposed new construction, as there were buildings on the parcels at the time of the historic district designation, so the Commission would enjoy plenary jurisdiction over proposed new construction. If the lots were vacant at the time of the historic district designation, then the Commission would have only review and comment jurisdiction over proposed new construction.

Ms. Cooperman reiterated that, from a technical standpoint, without considering other factors, the removal of these vacant lots from the historic district would clean up the edge of the historic district.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend denial of the proposed historic district boundary amendment.

WAYNE JUNCTION HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Wayne Junction Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate an eight-property historic district at Wayne Junction and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the distinctive industrial area, centered on the Wayne Junction train station, is significant under Criteria for Designation G and J. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the buildings are part of a distinctive industrial area which should be preserved for its ties to Philadelphia's manufacturing history. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that Wayne Junction is an intact industrial area that exemplifies the economic heritage of the neighborhood and the City of Philadelphia.

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

Ms. Cooperman asked for comment from property owners within the proposed historic district. James Milnes and Martin Heilman represented Wayne Mills Company at 130 Berkley Street. Mr. Milnes asked if it would make sense to trim the boundary of the historic district to exclude parts of the Wayne Mills property that do not have historical significance, such as the large parking lot on the Germantown Avenue side of the property, and also the lot at the corner of Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street, where Wayne Mills recently demolished a non-historic building. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission could identify those particular areas as non-contributing, which the Committee could recommend if it thinks it is appropriate. Ms. Chantry commented that the area referenced at the corner of Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street where a non-historic building was recently demolished was considered non-contributing to the National

Register Historic District, and was a separate parcel known as 4521 Wayne Avenue at the time of the adoption of the National Register Historic District. If it were still a separate parcel, the staff would have considered it to be non-contributing to this historic district. It has been consolidated with 130 Berkley Street so it was not an easy distinction to make in this nomination. Ms. Chantry continued that the large parking lot on the Germantown Avenue side of the site was included because it is part of the tax parcel, but that the boundary could be redrawn to exclude that parking lot. She noted that there is a one-story building, known in the nomination as Building 8, which is against the tracks. Mr. Milnes responded that that building is not historically significant and the boundary could be amended to run between the parking lot and mill buildings until it hits the tracks, so that there are less levels of review in the future, should Wayne Mills decide to do work to this area. Ms. Chantry commented that the staff would agree that the large parking lot does not have historic significance. Ms. Cooperman asked how this change would be accomplished procedurally. Ms. Chantry responded that the Committee could recommend to the Commission that it adopt a boundary that excludes the large parking lot and to consider the undeveloped site at the corner of Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street as non-contributing. She stated that the staff could prepare a revised boundary map prior to the Commission meeting, which the Commission could consider for adoption. Martin Heilman, president of Wayne Mills Company, stated that he came to the meeting to obtain information. He noted that the area became a National Register Historic District several years ago, but that now the City is also taking jurisdiction over the area. He stated that his concern is that Wayne Mills Company is an operating business whereas most of the other buildings in the proposed historic district are vacant, so there is concern as to what restrictions will be placed upon the business, as it must remain competitive. Ms. Cooperman asked about the percentage of building permit applications approved by the staff. Ms. Chantry responded that the staff approves approximately 95 percent of building permit applications that are presented to it. The remaining applications are reviewed by the full Historical Commission. She noted that within the nomination, there is one sentence that states: "The character-defining features of the contributing buildings in the Wayne Junction historic district include massing, scale, façade rhythm, proportions, and exterior cladding materials." She explained that it is meant to be a guide to the staff and Commission as to what is considered significant within the historic district, and by omission, where there may be more flexibility for what the staff can approve when reviewing building permit applications for work to buildings within the historic district. Ms. Cooperman agreed, and added that these buildings would not be reviewed in the same way that a high-style or museum-quality building would be.

Brian Whitham, representing Extra Space Storage at 4433 Wayne Avenue, commented that the building at 4433 Wayne Avenue could be removed from the historic district because it lacks historical significance. Mr. Schaaf responded that the Brown Instrument Company was a highly significant and innovative company which invented the first pyrometer in the United States. Mr. Whitham commented that the building lacks architectural integrity and is painted, and the company wants the ability to repaint the building as needed in the future. Ms. Cooperman responded that, because the building is already painted, the staff can approve repainting of the building. Mr. Whitham commented that the building is not in good condition and he may present information regarding that concern to the Commission.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commended the staff for preparing the historic district nomination. He noted that there is a difference between a property being considered an undeveloped site at the time of historic district designation, versus non-contributing to the district. He reminded the Committee that the Commission would have review and comment jurisdiction over an undeveloped site, but would enjoy plenary jurisdiction over new construction on a non-contributing parcel with a building on it. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites,

commented that Save Our Sites supports the historic district nomination. Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the Alliance supports the historic district nomination. He commended Wayne Mills Company for remaining in Philadelphia as an active textile mill.

Ms. Cooperman commented that Max Levy Autograph was highly significant as the company that invented the “Levy-type” which was a major advancement in the process of photoengraving. Mr. Schaaf noted that Carpenter Street should be Carpenter Lane on page 63 of the nomination. Ms. Klein suggested that the name of the historic district could be “Wayne Junction Industrial Historic District” or “Wayne Junction Industrial and Transportation Historic District.” Ms. Klein also suggested that the vacant lot at 133 Berkley Street be included within the historic district boundaries so that the boundary outline does not jog around it. Ms. Cooperman responded that historic preservation standards advise against including non-historic or non-contributing properties, including vacant lots, on historic district boundaries. Ms. Chantry agreed, and noted that it was included in the National Register Historic District, because a historic industrial building stood on that parcel at the time of that district designation. However, its demolition was ordered by the Department of Licenses & Inspections in 2012 owing to multiple violations for unsafe conditions. Therefore, it would not make sense to include it in this Philadelphia Register historic district because there is nothing of historic significance remaining on the site. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Wayne Junction Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J, and that the historic district boundary should be revised to exclude the parking lot and Building 8 at 130 Berkley Street, at the Germantown Avenue side of the property, and that the formerly separate parcel at Wayne Avenue and Berkley Street, formerly known as 4521 Wayne Avenue, and now consolidated with 130 Berkley Street, be considered an undeveloped site that is non-contributing to the historic district.

SATTERLEE HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

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 Satterlee Heights Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate an eight-property historic district on the south side of the 4300 block of Osage Avenue in the Spruce Hill neighborhood of West Philadelphia and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the proposed district, which is composed of four sets of twins constructed between 1871 and 1881 as part of the Satterlee Heights development, is one of the first large-scale, multi-block development projects in the area. The nomination contends that this block is unique in the context of nineteenth-century development in West Philadelphia, and as an intact block of twins set on large lots. The nomination further argues that the twins are excellent examples of the Second Empire style of architecture and reflect the environment in an era characterized by that distinctive style.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Property manager Mika He and attorney Henry Clinton represented the property owner of 4300-02 Osage Avenue. Operations manager Bill Groves represented the property owner of 4328 Osage Avenue. Grace Wagenfeld represented the property owner of 4308-10 Osage Avenue, and one of the nominators, Mark Wagenfeld.

Mr. Clinton requested that the review of the nomination be continued owing to the fact that his client had recently learned of the nomination. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the properties at 4300-02 and 4304-06 Osage Avenue are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, having been individually designated in October 2015. Ms. He stated that she was unaware of the designation. She questioned whether the open space on the lot was included in the designation. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the entire tax parcel, which covers both the land surrounding the building and the building itself, is listed on the Philadelphia Register. She noted that designation does not preclude work to the property, but that any work proposed to either the building or the site would need to be reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the current proposal expands the number of properties to be designated along the block. Mr. Clinton withdrew his request to continue the review of the nomination, owing to the information provided by Ms. DiPasquale.

Mr. Groves explained that he had only learned of the nomination two weeks prior when a tenant gave him the mail from the property. He stated that he had not had time to discuss the nomination with the staff and had not been personally informed of the nomination prior to the notice letter. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission is legally obligated to send notice to both the property itself and to the owner and address on record with the Office of Property Assessment. Mr. Groves responded that he did not receive the letter sent to the owner of record. Ms. DiPasquale noted that no letters for this property were returned as undeliverable.

Ms. Wagenfeld explained that she represents her father, Mark Wagenfeld, who recently passed away. She noted that Mr. Wagenfeld had worked hard to ensure consensus among neighbors on the block regarding designation, and was an advocate for preservation in the community. She noted that the corner properties, which are not owner-occupied, were more difficult to get in touch with. She commented that it is a wonderful block, admired by residents and tenants in the community.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the nomination.

Kathy Dowdell spoke on behalf of herself as a member of the Preservation Alliance's Advocacy Committee, and on behalf of the nominator, Oscar Beisert, and the University City Historical Society president, Elizabeth Stegner, both of whom were unable to attend the meeting. She expressed her condolences to Ms. Wagenfeld, noting that she had not known Mr. Wagenfeld very well personally, but that he was a stalwart member of the community and a preservation advocate. Regarding the nomination, Ms. Dowdell expressed concern that the nomination does not make a strong enough argument for the significance of the open space around the buildings in the district, but that she feels that is a character-defining feature of the block. She asked whether the Historical Commission would allow the properties to be subdivided and new buildings constructed on the open space between the houses. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission can consider any proposal brought before it, but that the Commission would look at the impact of the proposed project on both the historic properties themselves and

the district as a whole. She agreed that the open land around the buildings is a character-defining feature of the district.

David Traub of Save Our Sites expressed his organization's support of the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that a minor edit be made to page 42 of the nomination, and that 8th Street should be described as being to the west. Ms. DiPasquale replied that the staff could make that minor typographical correction.

Ms. Cooperman stated for the record, for nominators and future nominators, that hyperbole should be avoided in the writing of historical information, explaining that it is not persuasive.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:20 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.