

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

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

PRESENT

Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.
Bruce Laverty
Douglas Mooney

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

ALSO PRESENT

Donna Rilling, SUNY – Stony Brook
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David Moloznik, Esq.
Alex Balloon, Tacony Community Development Corporation
Corey Loftus, University City Historical Society
Steven Peitzman, East Falls Historical Society
Nicholas Baker
Anthony M. Santaniello
Tony Rufo, Gretz Brewery
Mihoko Samejima, T+ Associates
John Carpenter, Central Roxborough Civic Association
Celeste Hardester, Central Roxborough Civic Association
Kay Sykora, Central Roxborough Civic Association
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Oscar Beisert
J.M. Duffin
Amy Lambert
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Fred Risser, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia (LTSP)
Peter Newsom, LTSP
Dr. Karl Kreuger, LTSP
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
George Wilson

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Messrs. Cohen, Laverty, and Mooney joined her.

ADDRESS: 4525 SPRUCE ST

Name of Resource: Hill Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: James Cook

Nominator: Corey Loftus

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4525 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Francis J. Hill residence at 4525 Spruce Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the former Francis J. Hill residence, constructed in 1905, is significant for its association with the life and work of the Barnes Foundation founder Albert Barnes, who purchased the property in 1929 and remodeled it to serve as the publication and administrative office of the educational institution based in Merion. Under Criterion B, the nomination argues that the building is significant for its association with an important tax exemption lawsuit between Albert Barnes and the City of Philadelphia, where a ruling by the City was reversed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1934 – an event considered to be significant because Barnes considered the tax exemption of the property a legitimization of the Foundation’s educational mission.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman presented the request to continue the review of the nomination for 4525 Spruce Street to the December 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney David Moloznik, representing the property owner, stated that he is requesting a continuance owing to the complexity of the matter and the fact that he was retained only 10 days earlier. The owner, James Cook, was also unable to attend the meeting, but intends to attend the next meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for 4525 Spruce Street to the 12 December 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

CAST IRON SUBWAY ENTRANCES THEMATIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Nicholas Baker

Number of properties: 52

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, SEPTA, PATCO

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the cast iron subway entrances located along the Market Street Subway/Elevated, Broad Street Subway, Ridge Avenue/8th Street Subway, Subway-Surface Lines, and PATCO Speedline as part of the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J. The nomination argues that the proposed district, which is comprised of 52 cast iron subway

entrances erected between 1928 and 1955, is significant under Criterion A, because it reflects the development of modern mass transit in Philadelphia. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the varying aesthetic and architectural designs of each entrance reflect the spirit of prevailing styles during the time of construction. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that each cast iron subway entrance stands as a defining visual characteristic within the neighborhood streetscape and city. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that, collectively, the entrances represent the city's commitment to sustaining growth through significant investment in public transportation infrastructure at a time of an optimistic belief in public service and the importance of the public realm.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman presented the request to continue the review of the nomination for the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District to a future meeting. Nominator Nicholas Baker stated that he prepared the nomination for the thematic district and submitted it in 2010. He noted that he met with Commissioner Greenwald of the Department of Public Property and the assistant general manager of SEPTA. He encouraged those parties to reach out to him if there are any further concerns.

Ms. Cooperman asked who requested the continuance. Ms. Keller responded that the Department of Public Property requested the continuance. She explained that the department requested to continue the matter to the December 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation because of the complexity of the ownership of the subway headhouses and the number of parties involved.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination for the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District to the 12 December 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ADDRESS: 348 GREEN LN

Name of Resource: Lepton Terrace/Thomas Kenworthy House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Stone Door LLC

Nominator: Celeste Hardester, Central Roxborough Civic Association

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that property at 348 Green Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 348 Green Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property, constructed around 1872 for mill owner Thomas Kenworthy, is significant under Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that Kenworthy was an influential member of the mill and industrial community of Manayunk, satisfying Criterion A. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the Kenworthy family was part of a wave of mill owners who constructed homes up the hill from their Manayunk mills in Roxborough, particularly in the area around Green Lane and Manayunk Avenue, exemplifying the development of the Roxborough/Manayunk communities in the second half of the nineteenth century.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Celeste Hardester represented the nomination. Property owner Henry Bailey arrived during the review.

Ms. Hardester explained that the property is significant for the reasons cited in the staff overview, and also that Green Lane is a main thoroughfare in Roxborough. She noted that this house and others around this intersection with Manayunk Avenue are significant prominent structures that really define Roxborough. She noted that this house, standing prominently on a corner, creates a character of Roxborough that people expect to see. Because of its connection to the mills, the community feels that this important structure should be preserved. Ms. Hardester noted that the nomination was the work of several people, but that she is the nominator and would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Roxborough resident John Carpenter noted that he lives across the street in a house built by a gentleman named Frederick Soberheimer, an estate attorney who practiced out of Center City but was born and raised in Roxborough and built his home adjacent to what turned out to be four homes built and/or owned by the Kenworthy brothers. Mr. Carpenter opined that it is important to note that across the street and three doors down is the Baldi house (319 Green Lane), which was designated in 2017, and catty-corner across the intersection is the former home of Benjamin Kenworthy (365 Green Lane), which was designated in 2015. He noted that the intersection is occupied by homes that are striking and individually different and represent a remarkable moment in time in the neighborhood.

David Traub of Save Our Sites emphasized Ms. Hardester's point that this is a corner property that anchors the intersection and which is visible from two street frontages.

Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination was remarkably well written and researched. He offered a few minor corrections in terminology used in the architectural description. He noted that the nomination identifies the building as constructed out of "field stone," but it is more likely a quarried stone. He also noted that the nomination uses the term "relieving arches" which are usually not right above a window but somewhere above it. Instead, he suggested that the windows are simply "arched."

Mr. Cohen questioned the property's significance under Criterion A, "has significant character... as part of the development... of the City... or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past." He opined that the nomination emphasizes the significance of Kenworthy, but that stronger part is interpreting this of a class of mill owners. He suggested rather than going biographical, it is more important to address this as a class of people. He noted that it was not necessary for this nomination, but that it would be interesting to see what the houses of other non-Kenworthy mill owners look like. Mr. Laverty responded that he believes that the nomination does an excellent job of putting the house into that exact context in terms of the other mill owners who were building in that area. He further argued that Kenworthy was in fact a significant person in the past, noting that, even within his own family, there was a complex of houses and industrial sites in the neighborhood that were significant.

Ms. Cooperman also offered minor corrections, noting that it is a pet peeve of hers to see the word "home" in a the description of a building. "Home," she argued, is a psychological construct, while "house" is a building type. She also noted that it is important to be precise in referencing cardinal orientation. In the architectural description for this nomination, for example, the southeast elevation is called the south elevation. She suggested for all nominators to get away from using terms such as left/right/diagonal, noting that it is not a deficiency in the nomination, but an area for improvement. She also suggested including dates of construction of various building sections in the architectural description.

Mr. Lavery noted that the nomination form identifies the builder as “S.S. Keely (suspected),” and questioned that reference. Ms. DiPasquale responded that there is a discussion about Keely in the statement of significance.

Ms. Cooperman opined that prominence at an intersection might fall under Criterion H and questioned the absence of that Criterion in the nomination. She acknowledged that simple location per se not a criterion, but prominence is. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the nominator had originally included Criterion H, but the staff had disagreed with that as a criterion for this property. The property is located on a corner, but that is not a unique location or singular visual feature. Ms. Cooperman agreed that simple location at a corner does not satisfy the criterion, and that she is not sure the argument could be made in this case. Mr. Lavery responded that it has been a long time since he drove up Green Lane so he is not prepared to say whether the property is striking under Criterion H. Mr. Lavery opined that the nomination stands on its own merits under Criteria A and J. Ms. Cooperman agreed, and noted that it is wonderful that the nameplate is extant in the wall.

Ms. Hardester noted that the property owner just arrived. Ms. Cooperman asked if the property owner would like to make any comments. Mr. Bailey declined.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 348 Green Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

ADDRESS: 3850 THE OAK RD

Name of Resource: Henry W. Brown House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: William Penn Charter School

Nominator: Steven Peitzman, East Falls Historical Society

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3850 The Oak Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3850 The Oak Road and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property, constructed in 1907 for businessman Henry W. Brown, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The nomination explains that Brown was a notable figure in the insurance industry in his day, and the person responsible for the establishment of The Oak Road. The nomination contends that Brown’s development of the property and The Oak Road connected the history of School House Lane as a secluded realm of country estates to the early twentieth century suburban transformation of the adjacent section of East Falls, satisfying Criterion J. Nearly unchanged since its construction, the grand former residence is an excellent representative example of the Colonial Revival period in American architecture and culture, satisfying Criteria C and D.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Steven Peitzman of the East Falls Historical Society represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that she had distributed a letter from the property owner, Penn Charter School, to the Committee members. She explained that the property owner does not oppose the designation of the house, but is concerned about the large parcel upon which the house sits as it relates to the school's Master Plan. She explained that the school is looking to expand the parking lot on the site in the near future. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the expansion of the parking lot would not necessarily be precluded by the designation of the whole parcel. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that that may even be able to be approved at the staff level, depending on the nature of the project.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society expressed his group's support for the nomination and thanked the East Falls Historical Society for nominating it. David Traub of Save Our Sites also expressed support for the nomination, noting that it is a house an anchor house at the intersection of The Oak Road and School House Lane. He opined that it stands as a marker at the entrance of The Oak Road, one of Philadelphia's jewels, which should be a historic district in itself.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the parcel upon which this house sits used to extend all the way to W. School House Lane.

Mr. Cohen complimented the nominator on an excellent nomination, noting that it brings out a great deal of creativity even in regards to a discussion about as standard an architectural style as the Colonial Revival. He noted that the design of the portico was unusual, in that there is an odd rhythm to the columns, which are set back. He explained that it is one of those details not found in the historic precedent, but is part of the Colonial Revival architect's inventiveness and subtlety. He reiterated that the nomination is excellently researched and makes a compelling case.

Mr. Cohen noted that, if he remembers correctly, Harris, the architect, was the in-law of the client. Mr. Peitzman responded affirmatively, noting that two of Mr. Brown's sons married two of the sisters of the architect, Clinton Gardener Harris, who is not well known and who died very young. Mr. Peitzman noted that The Oak Road functioned both as the home terrain of Mr. Brown as a development but also as a family colony—two of his sons lived there, the Harris family lived across the street in an already-designated historic home. He noted that the East Falls Historical Society hopes to create a district nomination for The Oak Road in the future. Mr. Cohen joked that it is a great strategy, but not a scalable one, to marry the daughters of your clients.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3850 The Oak Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

ADDRESS: 701-65 E WESTMORELAND ST

Name of Resource: Ascension of Our Lord Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: New Phila Investment LLC

Nominator: Amy Lambert, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination for the church building at 725 East Westmoreland Street, part of the larger property known as 701-65 E. Westmoreland Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the church building at 725 E. Westmoreland Street, part of the larger property known as 701-65 E. Westmoreland Street, in the Kensington neighborhood of the city and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination describes the church building, designed in 1914 by architects Henon & Boyle and completed in 1928, as a Romanesque-Revival structure clad in quarry-faced Port Deposit granite with Indiana limestone trim and a red tile roof.

The nomination argues that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the former Roman Catholic church is a particularly spectacular example of the Romanesque Revival style of architecture, giving the undeniable impression of a grand Italian church.

Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the Ascension of Our Lord Church was designed in 1914 by the firm of Henon & Boyle, the precursor to the Hoffman-Henon Company, and completed by Hoffman-Henon Co. in 1928. According to the nomination, Hoffman & Henon built their international reputation based on the deep foundation of church and theater design as pioneered by Henon & Boyle. The nomination also argues that the stained glass windows were designed by artist Paula Himmelsbach Balano, the first woman in the United States to have her own stained glass studio that handled operations from design to installation.

Under Criterion H, the nomination contends that the church is a character-defining feature of this eastern section of Kensington, rising as if in an Italian village church surrounded by ordinary houses.

Finally, under Criterion J, the nomination contends that over the course of 100 years, the parish of the Ascension of Our Lord has been involved with direct and active charitable outreach within and outside of its immediate community. It argues that, while it seems to have been founded mostly by working-class Irish-Americans, the congregation's mission has been deep and wide, reaching all races, ethnicities, and income levels.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation on Ms. Schmitt's behalf. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and Amy Lambert represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the staff had heard from the property owner, and Ms. Schmitt replied that they had not had any contact with them, but that neither notice letter was returned. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Grossi if he had anything that he would like to add, and he said no but he was happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there was any public testimony, and there was none. Mr. Lavery said he had a question for the nominator. He told Ms. Lambert that the research she had done about Paula Bolano was excellent, but he wanted to know if any of her windows were left at the church. He asked if they had all been sold and removed, to which Ms. Lambert replied that she believed that they had all been sold and removed to a church in Raleigh, North Carolina. Mr. Lavery remarked that he did not doubt her importance to the history of American stained glass, but since none of what she created was on the site, and it was extremely unlikely that they would come back, he was not sure how it applied here. He stated that he did not think that this knocked down the potential of the nomination itself, and that the information was great background that indicated the importance of this church in its creation. Ms. Schmitt interjected that, in fairness to Ms. Lambert, it was the staff that had suggested that she include a bit more information in that section. Mr. Lavery responded that he thought that it strengthened the case for the singularity and importance of this church out of the hundreds and hundreds of Roman Catholic churches throughout the greater Philadelphia area. He said that it was one of many sad notes in the nomination because the windows were an asset that was no longer part of the site. Ms. Cooperman agreed that it was important to have this information in the nomination, but that it would not be appropriate for them to recommend the designation based on this as one of Ms. Bolano's works, but it was still important to have. Ms. Lambert said that she agreed, adding that she also like to leave what she called bread crumbs in her nominations so that other people could find them and run with them. Ms. Cooperman remarked that it was for that reason that she thought it was really important to have that documentation.

Mr. Lavery turned his attention to the photograph of the building that was projected on the screen at the front of the room and told Ms. Lambert that he agreed with what she had written in the nomination that it would be difficult to photograph this church because it was so large and so densely packed into the community immediately around it. Ms. Lambert told the members of the Committee on Historic Designation that her back had been against a wall when she took that photograph. Mr. Lavery said that it looked like there was an enormous pile of rubble on the left hand side of the double door way and asked Ms. Lambert what it was they were looking at. Ms. Lambert replied that she could only guess that they had boxed in the stairwell on both sides of the primary elevation and the pile might be some kind of detritus from that work. Mr. Lavery remarked that he had never seen that sort of treatment to prevent people from going up a set of steps.

David Traub of Save Our Sites introduced himself for the record and said that he had been visiting this church about two years ago and noted what a troubled neighborhood it was then and supposed that it was even worse now. He said that he believed the retention of this church would certainly provide hope in the neighborhood. Mr. Traub suggested that the church could also meet Criterion H though it was not included in the nomination. Ms. Cooperman clarified that Criterion H was, in fact, included in the nomination. Mr. Traub pointed out that this was a corner property that was visible from two streets which gave the church even greater significance and presence in this neighborhood. Ms. Cooperman thanked Mr. Traub for his testimony and agreed that in this case, applying Criterion H was appropriate.

Mr. Cohen complimented Ms. Lambert on her job with the nomination but said that he still had a few comments. Mr. Cohen suggested that Ms. Lambert include photographs of the building throughout the text of the architectural description. He said that what he would describe as a corbelled table frieze, Ms. Lambert referred to as a blind arcade cornice. Mr. Cohen said that there was a paragraph in the nomination where Ms. Lambert used the word "rather" five times, and noted that he would rather she did not use "rather" so much. Mr. Cohen said that it would be helpful for Ms. Lambert to show images of the other buildings that she references in the

nomination. He added that he did not think that an element of the building was meant to be a Renaissance arcade as much as it was an arcade that some medieval churches had, noting that it jumped right from the capital to the arch. Ms. Cooperman commented that the round arches were misleading.

Mr. Cohen stated that throughout the nomination, whenever Ms. Lambert mentioned a junior partner coming into the firm, it almost seemed like that junior partner got the lead name in the firm. He asked Ms. Lambert if she was referring to ramps when she used the word gradients, and she confirmed that was the case, explaining that the presiding priest had specifically requested that they be built. Mr. Lavery asked Ms. Lambert if the ramps were intended for wheelchair access, and she replied that the reference she found did not get that specific.

Mr. Cohen said that the 1949 aerial photograph that showed the church in a sea of row houses was fantastic. Ms. Lambert said that she had pushed for Criterion H because in previous nominations the staff had not always agreed with her on it so she was trying to get a better understanding of its use. Mr. Lavery replied that he did not think that there was any doubt of its relevance in this case, in part because of how visible the church was from the Market-Frankford Elevated line.

Mr. Cohen said that he had another minor comment regarding Ms. Lambert's use of graphics, pointing out that Figure 23 was her best image, and that she should lead with that one. He suggested that she insert the images into the body of the text rather than clustering them all at the end. Ms. Lambert thanked Mr. Cohen for the great feedback and remarked that she wanted to better understand how to structure her nominations. Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Cohen's comments and said that though the formatting could be challenging within Microsoft Word, it could be done. Mr. Cohen added that it was always helpful to mark the atlas images with an X to indicate where the building was on the map. He reiterated how well researched and written the nomination was.

Mr. Cohen called out the photograph of the marble benetier with the used needles in it, and Mr. Lavery commented that he had seen that image in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* last summer and that it was the most disturbing news image that he had seen since Kent State. Ms. Lambert agreed that she had had a very visceral reaction to it as well.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia said that Mr. Lavery's comments reminded him of an article that had been written by Mike Newall in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* about the opioid addicts using the church as a shelter and in the article Mr. Newall actually called for the building to be demolished in order to solve the problem. Mr. Steinke said that he had called Mr. Newall out on the comment, and Mr. Newall later apologized for conflating the church building with the issue of drug abuse in the area. Mr. Steinke said that this comment only increased the Preservation Alliance's desire to have the building listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman thanked Mr. Steinke for his comments.

Mr. Lavery noted that this church was the church of the former Mayor of Philadelphia Bill Green, who had been an altar boy there. He added that Mayor Green's father had been the congressman for the greater Kensington neighborhood for many years.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 725 E. Westmoreland Street, part of the larger property known as 701-65 E. Westmoreland Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H and J.

ADDRESS: 2301-03 AND 2305-07 N BROAD ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 2301 North Broad Associates; Broad Street Equities LLC

Nominator: Amy Lambert, The Keeping Society

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2301-03 and 2305-07 N. Broad Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 2301-03 and 2305-07 N. Broad Street and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the properties satisfy Criteria for Designation C and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the properties reflect the distinctive residential form of high Victorian eclecticism. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the properties exemplify the upper middle-class housing that once lined and significantly characterized North Broad Street toward the end of the Gilded Age and before the turn of the twentieth century.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owners. Amy Lambert and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the property owners were present. No one came forward. She asked the staff if there has been any communication with the property owners. Ms. Keller replied that another member of the staff spoke with one of the property owners and that the owner voiced his opposition to designation.

David Traub of Save Our Sites commented that the buildings consist of a corner property anchoring this corner of N. Broad Street. He called the properties a very architecturally distinctive ensemble of buildings.

Ms. Lambert remarked that she always wondered if Willis Hale was involved in the design of these properties. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

Mr. Cohen further opined on Hale's involvement, noting that the Zanes hired Angus Wade, who was Hale's godson. Wade, he added, followed Hale's lead throughout the 1880s and, between the elder Zane as developer and the younger Zane as architect, there is a real continuity with Willis Hale. He then suggested that identifying the buildings' style as High Victorian is a mistake, adding that the buildings stand as excellent examples of Late Victorian, even if informed by the spirit of such a rogue architect as Hale. Mr. Cohen asserted that the architect is very much trying to find harmony between the parts of the building and searching for compositional balance. He argued that that effort is misunderstood in the nomination and offered several suggestions to clarify the architectural description. Ultimately, he continued, the buildings offer an interesting moment in late nineteenth-century architecture where an element from anywhere is fair game and combined in crudeness at times. He described the design as being visually harmonious, but noted that there are borrowed elements from Gothic and Classical motifs, which are woven together compositionally through stringcourses and with asymmetries that are more balanced than what is described in the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman added that the visual harmony is achieved with shared roof forms, dormer roofs, line, and color. She noted that it is specifically brought together by the second-story cornice and unified by a consistent palette of materials.

Ms. Lambert agreed that the buildings are presented in a unified and cohesive manner. Mr. Laverty added that it is very unusual to have two pairs of building connected through the use of an archway. Ms. Lambert responded that a third pair of buildings stood where there is now a PECO station. Mr. Laverty replied that the PECO building is important in itself. Mr. Beisert opined that the third pair of buildings was demolished just at the right time.

Ms. Lambert questioned whether the block should be designated as a district.

In a historic photograph showing the Dauphin Street side of the building, Mr. Cohen pointed to a round window, stating that only Hale incorporates a semicircular window with a square and diagonals. He remarked that it is one of Hale's favorite motifs, adding that Hale often used proprietary motifs. In this case, he continued, Zane borrowed the motif.

Ms. Lambert responded that she wished she could find more information on Zane, commenting that he seemed to understand how to respond to the context where he was working. She observed that his Chestnut Hill designs fit the Chestnut Hill environment, and similarly these properties fit the N. Broad Street context.

Mr. Laverty stated that the 1905 photograph of the south elevation shows the dangers of stucco and the incredible complexity of the design of the secondary frontage. Ms. Lambert agreed and added that the south elevation is what convinced her of Hale's involvement.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2301-03 and 2305-07 N. Broad Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C and J.

ADDRESS: 4111-23 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: African Friends to Harmony Burial Ground

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

Nominator: Donna J. Rilling

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4111-23 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a section of the former African Friends to Harmony Burial Ground at 4111-23 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the property is located in the principal nineteenth-century African American neighborhood of West Philadelphia and served as a nondenominational burial site for the community until 1882. The nomination notes that 136 burials have been documented at the site with no record of disinterment. The nomination further contends that the benevolent society, the African Friends to Harmony, is significant under Criterion J for the role it played as a black mutual aid society and its establishment of the West Philadelphia burial ground. The western section of the former cemetery at 4125 Chestnut Street is not proposed for designation under this nomination. A large building was recently constructed on the site, likely disturbing any subsurface resources.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. University Architect David Hollenberg represented the property owner, the University of Pennsylvania. Donna Rilling represented the nomination.

Mr. Mooney recused, owing to his involvement in the research of the property and assistance he provided to the nominator.

Mr. Hollenberg stated that the nomination is a fine piece of work and the university has no objections to designation. He asked the Committee to clarify the restrictions on the property, adding that the building on the adjacent property is currently under construction. He explained that the nomination does not include the full extent of the burial ground, which originally included a portion of the adjacent property now under construction. He noted that the nomination is very clear about the original boundary, though he requested further clarification on the nominated boundary as compared with the original extent of the burial ground. He opined that it was interesting listening to the previous review in which there was a third pair of buildings, but that the third pair was demolished and therefore not included in the nomination. That case, he added, is the perfect analogy to the Chestnut Street property.

The Committee discussed the location of the adjacent new construction. Mr. Hollenberg reiterated that the construction is currently underway and added that he does not know whether any remains have been uncovered at that site.

Ms. Rilling explained that the original burial ground extended to approximately half of the adjacent western parcel. Mr. Cohen asked whether the current nomination only includes the part of the burial ground that extended onto what is now 4111-23 Chestnut Street. Ms. Rilling affirmed, adding that a building permit for the adjacent property was filed before she could submit a nomination. Mr. Hollenberg responded that the adjacent property comprises approximately 50% of the original burial ground. He commented that there is no way to know whether the 50% of the original square footage on the adjacent lot would also equal 50% of the burials.

Ms. Cooperman clarified that what is before the Committee is a nomination only for 4111-23 Chestnut Street and not a nomination for the adjacent western parcel.

Ms. Rilling stated that the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum used the historic burial map to produce a GIS map and georeferenced images to show the extent and location of the original graveyard. The boundary outlined for the Committee, she continued, shows only an approximation and that the GIS map has more accurate boundaries of the original burial ground. Mr. Hollenberg questioned whether the Archaeological Forum's map should be included in the nomination. Ms. Cooperman agreed that it would be useful to supplement the nomination with the map and asked whether the staff could distribute it to the Historical Commission when the nomination is presented at its November meeting. The staff affirmed. She then stated that when it comes to historic burial grounds, the legal boundaries do not always definitively demarcate the actual boundaries of the burials. She also noted that atlases show the property was composed of multiple parcels as early as 1916.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society expressed his support for the nomination. He then stated that archaeology is often an afterthought added to nominations without supporting documentation or justification. This nomination, he continued, is solely based on archaeology. He commended the nominator for her research, adding that this nomination serves as an example of how Criterion I should be

applied to nominations, rather than randomly including Criterion I without justification, as some are wont to do. Members of the Committee countered that Criterion I is not randomly applied to nominations.

Mr. Hollenberg asked the staff to provide him with a list of properties that have been designated solely for their archaeological significance.

Mr. Cohen commended Ms. Rilling for telling a story that has been forgotten and documenting the site's history beautifully. He offered a few suggestions on the nomination's organization. He then inquired about Isaac Lloyd's background. Ms. Rilling answered that the Isaac Lloyd identified in the nomination was not the developer known historically with the same name. This Isaac Lloyd, she continued, was an African American, though she did not know if he was associated with a specific church. Lloyd, she added, did not seem to have any involvement in any organizations beyond the organization that established the burial ground.

Mr. Lavery also commended Ms. Rilling on the nomination, adding that it offers a great confluence of the work undertaken by the Archaeological Forum.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4111-23 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

ADDRESS: 6907-11 TORRESDALE AVE

Name of Resource: Tacony Post Office

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Eugene C. Cheung and Diana Kwok

Nominator: Alexander Balloon

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6911 Torresdale Avenue, part of the larger property known as 6907-11 Torresdale Avenue, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Tacony Post Office building at 6911 Torresdale Avenue, part of the larger property known as 6907-11 Torresdale Avenue, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The former post office was constructed in 1935, during a time when Art Deco architecture was commonly used for commercial buildings. The nomination, while brief, argues that the building's façade is an example of Art Deco Classicism, incorporating classical elements of architecture, including pilasters, pediments, and capitals, in a stylized and streamlined form, resulting in a unique building for the Tacony Disston Community Development District.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mooney rejoined the meeting. Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner. Alexander Balloon represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the staff received any communication from the property owner. Ms. Chantry responded that notice letters were mailed to both the building and the mailing address on file with the City for the property owner, and neither was returned as undeliverable, but the staff has not had contact with the property owner.

Mr. Balloon thanked the Tacony Historical Society for its letter of support, and the staff for assistance with preparation of the nomination.

Mr. Lavery commented that he wished there was an archival photograph of the building, as it seemed to be a big deal upon opening, as evidenced by the parade which was held. He commented that the building does not read as Art Deco to him, particularly when compared to United States Customs House. Mr. Cohen agreed, and suggested that these buildings from the 1930s are sometimes referred to as Moderne rather than Art Deco. He agreed that the building is part of Classicism. Mr. Lavery asked if the flanking windows ever extended down to the first-floor level. Mr. Balloon responded that they did not, based on the interior floor level and the panels below the windows on the façade. Mr. Cohen agreed. He asked what it means to have been speculatively built for a post office. Ms. Chantry explained that the listing in the *Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide* is for a speculative store owned by local developer P.E. Costello & Son, and it appears that the United States Postal Service (USPS) entered into a 20-year lease very shortly after the building was constructed, and therefore the building was not designed for the USPS but rather the USPS was a tenant. Mr. Lavery responded that this makes a lot more sense, based on the design of the facade. Ms. Cooperman agreed. Mr. Balloon commented that he appreciates the suggestion made about the Moderne style, and opined that this building represents a transitional moment in architecture. Mr. Lavery agreed, and noted that there is a different dynamic that goes into the design of a speculative commercial building rather than a purpose-built federal building. He observed that this building does not have a federal presence, but rather is a fine example of late Classical features in a commercial structure on a major commercial thoroughfare in the 1930s. He noted that it could have housed an insurance office or small bank. Mr. Cohen asked about Morris & Erskine, the architects of the building, and if they done any similar work. He suggested that this building could be looked at in the context of other 1930s street-front commercial buildings. Mr. Balloon responded that both he and Ms. Chantry were unable to find similar examples of this building in other work by Morris & Erskine. Ms. Chantry agreed that a brief look at their other work proved it to be unremarkable.

David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that the doorway is a distinctive feature.

Ms. Cooperman commented that this building really stands out when viewed in its context on Torresdale Avenue. She commented that it was part of the development of Torresdale Avenue as the new Main Street of Tacony, and has more of a grand presence than is able to be discerned from the photographs in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6911 Torresdale Avenue, part of the larger property known as 6907-11 Torresdale Avenue, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

ADDRESS: 1524-38 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Gretz Brewery

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TR-GRETZ LP

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1524-38 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, but that the brick and concrete block building at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street, constructed in 1946 and identified in the nomination as Building 12, should be considered to be non-contributing for the purposes of the designation.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Rieger & Gretz Brewery complex at 1524-38 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that eight of the eleven surviving buildings that comprise Rieger & Gretz represent a distinctive period of Philadelphia's architectural heritage at a time when German brewers were commissioning buildings that employed a stylistic treatment greatly influenced by the *Rundbogenstil*. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the former brewing complex represents a significant period of Philadelphia's commercial and industrial heritage as an important American brewing center, home to one of the most prominent mid-sized breweries in Philadelphia, and represents the cultural, economic, and social heritage of brewing history in Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Anthony Rufo and architect Mihoko Samejima represented the property owner. Patrick Grossi and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Ms. Chantry displayed several photographs of Building 12, which the staff recommended for a non-contributing classification. She explained that architectural drawings show restoration and redevelopment plans for the site. Ms. Samejima stated that her firm began working on redevelopment plans for this site several months prior to the notice of proposed designation. She stated that developmental plans were in place at the time of the issuance of the notice of the consideration of the nomination. She acknowledged that the Committee's purview does not take that into account, but she wanted to ensure that it was understood that this project has been in the works. She stated that the owners are not opposing the historic designation of the site, but request that Building 12 be considered non-contributing. She explained that Building 12 was a later addition to the complex and has none of the architectural characteristics of the other buildings on the site. Mr. Rufo concurred, and restated that he is not in opposition to the historic designation, but requests that Building 12 be considered non-contributing.

Mr. Grossi stated that he does not have any objection to Building 12 being considered non-contributing, speaking for the organization responsible for the nomination. He explained that this is their second attempt to nominate the Gretz Brewery complex. He stated that they submitted a nomination back in 2012, which was returned with an explanation that aspects of the statement of significance were insufficient. He explained that more recently they reached out to Mr. Beisert, and he revised the nomination. He stated that, despite some neglect and the loss of the corner tavern, the Gretz Brewery complex is probably the most intact collection of brewery buildings in the city and still reads as a functioning brewery campus. Mr. Beisert explained that the nomination required a tremendous amount of work in terms of dating buildings and discerning their functions. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

Ms. Cooperman commented that this is one of the last brewery complexes to survive. She acknowledged that these complexes grew over time, and did not look like they were designed to present a single unified design front to the public right-of-way. She explained that they often had components that were different heights, with different roof forms, and often had a portion of the complex that served beer to the public. Mr. Beisert commented that Esslinger's Brewery, which he previously nominated, is an example of a later shift away from this type of brewery, to a more corporate look.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the nomination was well done, with clear identification of the components. Mr. Cohen commented that some of the photographs are dark and make it hard to see the details. He stated that he appreciates the extensive information on the *Rundbogenstil*, but asserted that it is describing something that happened between the 1830s and 1860s, but the Gretz complex dates to the 1880s. He commented that there is a sort of Neo-Baroque aspect to the buildings. He suggested that it could be put in that context, as seen in other brewery buildings and other German buildings in the 1880s.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there are any buildings in the complex that correspond with the post-prohibition era, other than Building 12. Mr. Grossi responded that he does not believe so, as all other buildings are pre-prohibition. He commented that it has been suggested that Gretz may have had other buildings nearby, but those were not identified. Ms. Cooperman commented that Building 12 is obviously of a different character, even as seen in historic photographs. She acknowledged that it lacks all ornamentation found on every other building in the complex. She stated that Building 12 is an outlier that as such, it can be considered non-contributing. Mr. Cohen and Mr. Lavery agreed.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Jim Duffin suggested that perhaps the period of significance could end with the date of prohibition, as a means of excluding Building 12 from the significance of the site. Mr. Grossi responded that he appreciates the suggestion, but part of the statement of significance speaks to Gretz Brewery's ability to survive prohibition. Ms. Cooperman agreed that it is clearer to simply consider Building 12 as non-contributing.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee cannot consider the proposed redevelopment of the site or the proposed new construction as shown in the architect's renderings. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, then commended the developer and architect for the rendering showing new construction at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Oxford Street, where there is currently vacant land. He commented that the proposed design is quite compatible with the surrounding buildings, and will create a lovely townscape. Ms. Cooperman reiterated that the Committee is not reviewing nor commenting on the proposed redevelopment plans. She asked Mr. Traub to limit his comments to the matters related to the Committee's purview.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1524-38 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, but that the brick and concrete block building at the corner of Germantown Avenue and Redner Street, constructed in 1946 and identified in the nomination as Building 12, should be considered to be non-contributing for the purposes of the designation.

ADDRESS: 836 N PRESTON ST

Name of Resource: Alexander McGaw house

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Sarah Allen Community Home

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 property at 836 N. Preston Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former McGaw Mansion at 836 N. Preston Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that 836 N. Preston Street is associated with mason and contractor Alexander McGaw, who owned the property from construction in 1890 until his death in 1905. In addition, the property relates to a significant period in which the Belmont neighborhood experienced immense growth and change as residential development increased around emerging institutions and new transportation connections. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the property is distinctive as an example of a freestanding Queen Anne Villa in a neighborhood that primarily transitioned to rowhouse and institutional development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi of Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination. The property owner or a representative was not present.

Mr. Steinke stated that if you go to this site you can see how this Queen Anne house stands out in the community, speaking to Criteria A. He continued that it is a neighborhood that saw the development of upper-class, villa-type structures with this one being bigger and grander than most. Mr. Steinke commented that the story behind the developer, Alexander McGaw, is an interesting one. He continued that he had prominence as an Irish-American contractor on a local and national scale with work that included the Girard Avenue Bridge and the base of the Statue of Liberty. Mr. Steinke stated that, when Alexander McGaw died in 1905, a publication named him “one of the most hard to replace people in Philadelphia,” speaking to his business and social prominence in the city at that time.

Mr. Grossi noted that this property was brought to the Preservation Alliance’s attention by a broader article that the nomination’s author, Joshua Bevan, wrote about the larger residential and institutional development patterns in the Belmont neighborhood. He continued that they reached out to Mr. Bevan to see if there were any standout properties in the neighborhood that were worthy of local listing and 836 N. Preston Street was identified as one.

Mr. Cohen asked what the other structures adjacent to this property are. Mr. Steinke replied they are the former West Philadelphia Women’s Hospital and he believes the buildings are now managed by Friends Rehabilitation as an assisted living facility. Mr. Steinke commented that the Preservation Alliance believes there are other buildings on the campus that are worthy of nomination so they may not want to stop with this one.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the building looks like it had lost a porch due to the brownstone belt course and its oddly flat façade. She wondered if this was a building created without the benefit of an architect and that perhaps McGaw gathered ideas and details for this building from projects he worked on. Ms. Cooperman noted that if McGaw was the designer this

would explain why no architect has been identified for this building. Mr. Cohen added that sometimes a Sanborn map will show if a building had a porch.

Mr. Cohen commented on the formatting of the photographs, noting that it is best if the photographs are aligned with the related text. Mr. Grossi and committee members agreed that Microsoft Word presents challenges for formatting text and photographs.

Mr. Cohen stated that he thinks the building is less Queen Anne and more of an example of Richardsonian Romanesque based on its symmetry and heaviness. He continued that although there are Queen Anne elements, buildings of that style tend to be asymmetrical. Mr. Cohen noted that it is popular to describe buildings that have a round corner tower as Queen Anne. He argued that the design has much more to do with the recently departed H.H. Richardson. Ms. Cooperman added that the Richardsonian Romanesque influence is not in the details or the specific ornament but the overall volumetric organization. Mr. Cohen continued that there is not much of the type of detail that Queen Anne buildings are usually festooned with. He noted that the most Queen Anne detail is the creased gable that might be hung tile rather than painted wooden shingles (as described in nomination). Mr. Cohen pointed out that the clustered chimneys are classic Richardsonian Romanesque.

Ms. Cooperman stated that she would not call this a villa, rather she would call it a mansion.

Mr. Cohen inquired about the use of Criterion A. Mr. Grossi responded that he believed the nomination's author, Joshua Bevan, focused on the Alexander McGaw connection and the development of the Belmont neighborhood for Criteria A. Mr. Steinke pointed out that Belmont at this time was an enclave of successful Irish Americans and this may have been a way for Alexander McGaw signaled his success. Mr. Grossi pointed out that Criterion A does not just focus on the state and national level but also locally on Philadelphia.

Mr. Cohen asked if there were other known examples of buildings designed by McGaw. The nominators and Committee members were not aware of any others. Mr. Cohen commented on the large scale of the buildings currently surrounding the McGaw mansion. He continued that they make the mansion appear smaller than it is which diminishes the fact that when it was originally built it was considered an impressively large building for this area. Mr. Steinke added that like so many mansions, when the original owner passed on, they became attractive for institutional use because they are so big, and in this case, the hospital grew around it.

Mr. Steinke stated that, even though the owner is not represented at the meeting, it appears they are doing a good job stewarding the building. He noted that some of the windows appear to be original.

Mr. Cohen commented that the building looks like one created by a builder without the benefit of an architect. He further stated that Alexander McGaw did a good deal of work in Washington D.C. and 836 N. Preston Street looks like a building more appropriate to Washington D.C. His fellow Committee members and members of the public agreed with the assessment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 836 N. Preston Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

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 shifting the start date of the period of significance back to 1750; it also recommends limiting the area of archaeological potential to the locations of the earliest structures of the Mount Airy Estate. The staff also recommends classifying the garages and Staff House as non-contributing.

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 are currently up for sale by the Lutheran Theological Seminary or have been recently sold to new owners.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Michael Phillips, Reverend Dr. Karl Krueger, and Peter Newsom represented the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, the owner of most of the property in the proposed district. Oscar Beisert and James Duffin represented the nomination.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia (LTSP) supports the nomination. He noted that they do have a few suggested revisions that they would like to be made, most of which have already been supported by the staff. These revisions include the following properties deemed non-contributing:

- Garage, 30 E. Gowen Ave., rear
- Staff House, 7241 Germantown Ave., alternate address is 7333 Germantown Ave., rear
- 1973 addition to Krauth Memorial Library, 7241 Germantown Ave., alternate address is 7301 Germantown Ave.
- 1974 addition to Hagan Center, 7241 Germantown Ave.

Mr. Phillips stated for the record, since it is outside the purview of this Committee, that LTSP will be requesting that the Historical Commission consider the President's House non-contributing as well, based on factors such as the condition of the property.

Mr. Phillips also noted that LTSP does not have any objection the proposed area of archaeological significance that focuses on the earliest structures of the Mount Airy Estate. He commented that the map prepared by Mr. Duffin showing this area is acceptable to his client, who intends to continue to safeguard this historic property. Mr. Phillips continued that he wished to address the issue raised by Doug Mooney of the Committee on Historic Designation regarding the archaeological potential related to the slave trade and of the LTSP site overall. Mr. Phillips asked the Rev. Dr. Krueger to speak to this matter and also provide information on his educational and professional background.

Rev. Dr. Krueger stated he was the administrator of the Krauth Memorial Library for 14 years, taught courses in church history, and is the Keeper of the Memory for LTSP. He noted that long before this became a topic, LTSP was very interested in keeping all the information they came across about Chief Justice William Allen, who owned the property in the eighteenth century, when it was known as the Mount Airy Estate. He stated that the institution has been very interested in what Allen did and keeping his legacy alive and well, including the installation of a historic plaque along Germantown Avenue.

Mr. Phillips asked Rev. Dr. Krueger if he had looked into the potential for artifacts or remnants reflecting the slave trade at the property. Rev. Dr. Krueger stated he had not. Mr. Phillips inquired if Rev. Dr. Krueger had any knowledge of William Allen's history and ownership of slaves. Rev. Dr. Krueger replied that he had previously read an article, that he cannot currently locate, that William Allen had two slaves, Jim and Rose, and he gave them their freedom and 15 pounds sterling annual. Rev. Dr. Krueger noted that this would have occurred around 1780. He noted that he had spent six hours trying to locate the article that documents this and has not been successful thus far. Mr. Phillips asked him if within the LTSP archives is there any evidence or discussion about the slave trade or a large number of slaves at the Seminary property. Rev. Dr. Krueger stated that Allen did not have large numbers of slaves or conduct slave trading at the property. It was not a plantation as Mr. Mooney has claimed. Allen used Mount Airy as a summer home and had two domestic slaves at the site. There can be no evidence of the slave trade at the site because the site was never used for the slave trade.

Mr. Cohen requested clarity on the properties and additions the property owner requested to be considered non-contributing. Information of the buildings in question was provided to Committee by reviewing an aerial photograph projected onto the conference room screen and the nomination's district inventory.

Mr. Beisert stated that he and Mr. Duffin can answer any questions that the Committee may have about nomination. Ms. Cooperman initiated the Committee's discussion on the nomination.

Mr. Mooney asked for clarification on the reduced area of archaeological potential. Mr. Beisert and Mr. Duffin pointed to the map areas provided with the nomination packet. Mr. Mooney stated that he is opposed to any reduction in the area of archaeological potential for this nomination. He argued that the revised areas of archaeological potential are arbitrary and not based on any archaeological evidence that identifies the areas as having the greatest archaeological potential. Mr. Mooney inquired if the Mount Airy Estate is contained wholly within this campus. Mr. Duffin responded that it extended all the way to Stenton Avenue, more than one-half mile to the northeast. Mr. Mooney claimed that this site is a potentially significant, intact colonial period landscape. He continued that as a landscape and property that was occupied, worked, and more, with activity occurring all over the property, this site has archaeological potential. Mr. Mooney noted that all of this activity can leave traces and provide a better

understanding about this estate, how it was occupied and operated. Ms. Cooperman added that a lot of this type of information will not show up in a paper record and that is really the point. Mr. Mooney stated that a lot of this activity was conducted away from the main house and there were outbuildings surrounding it. He continued that the nomination mentions the estate's decorative gardens and that archaeological investigation can detect these gardens even today. Mr. Mooney referenced work that had occurred at historic Stenton and discoveries made. Mr. Mooney raised the point that this property had also been a battlefield site. He added that activities associated with the opening rounds of the Battle of Germantown could appear anywhere on this campus. He noted that soldiers were often buried where they died and there are many instances where remains have been discovered throughout Germantown. Mr. Mooney explained he is not saying that it is not possible to limit the area of archaeological potential within this property, but that limitation cannot be based on ad hoc information; rather it has to be based on actual archaeological findings. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Mooney if he were to draw a bigger boundary would it go further into the undisturbed area to the northeast. Mr. Mooney confirmed that it would.

Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Newsom to comment on the Battle of Germantown. He noted that Mr. Newsom has done extensive research on this site and on military history. He noted that Rev. Dr. Krueger could also add to the response, given that the history of LTSP has included construction and numerous changes to the site. Ms. Cooperman stressed that, without archaeological survey and field testing such as borings, not simply research, it will not be clear what actually happened on the property. Mr. Mooney added that historical accounts of battles can be notoriously inaccurate. He stated that, for example, recent archaeological work has significantly reinterpreted the Battle of Princeton.

Mr. Newsom, chairman of the board of the Philadelphia Corporation of Lutheran Seminary, stated that they formed a task force that included him, Rev. Dr. Krueger, and Dr. Daryl Black, executive director of the Seminary Ridge Museum and Seminary Ridge Historic Preservation Foundation. He noted this group looked at source material that included Thomas MacGuire's tome, "Volume 2 of the Philadelphia Campaign," which has a number of citations that include first-hand battle reports and five maps from the Library of Congress, including a map drawn by Major Andre. Mr. Newsom explained that, based on the source material, they were able to put together a sequence of events that connected the events of the Battle of Germantown and the Mount Airy Estate. He stated that the task force concluded that the only activity on or near the Mount Airy Estate was an approximately 10-minute engagement of troops. British pickets were located at the seminary site. When they spotted the Americans coming down Germantown Avenue, they fired a warning cannon to alert the main British force nearer Germantown and then retreated south to Mt. Pleasant. One American was injured and taken to Reading, Pennsylvania for treatment. No engagement of forces occurred on the site and no one was killed or buried at the site.

Rev. Dr. Krueger stated again that William Allen used this property as his summer home and they know there was an orchard with a kitchen garden. He continued that, during the many construction projects at the site, they have never found remnants of the Battle of Germantown, and as a church, if human remains had been found, they would have been treated with the utmost respect. Rev. Dr. Krueger commented they know the campus is historic property and LTSP had done its best to honor William Allen long before the nomination was submitted.

Mr. Cohen commented that the archaeological potential is about more than the Battle of Germantown but rather about the potential to learn about eighteenth-century life and how people lived at the site. Mr. Mooney noted that the map presented with the nomination showed

buildings in 1830 but not in 1750 or the time in between. He expressed concerned that there is 70 or 80 years of history that is not represented by the map.

Mr. Beisert stated that the idea for the nomination was originally his and Mr. Duffin later became involved. He continued that part of the importance of the site was that the Mount Airy mansion stood on this site, and because given the significance of this building to the area, the nominators included the archaeological criterion in the nomination. Mr. Beisert pointed out that this is the reason why they felt justified in limiting the archaeological potential to the area of the earliest buildings of the Mount Airy Estate. He noted that, if they are going to expand the area of archeological potential, it should be limited to the boundaries of the Mount Airy Estate, as that is what the statement of significance focuses on. He stated that others are welcome to write a statement of significance that focuses on other areas, but it seems inappropriate to blanket the entire district because there is a chance something is there. Mr. Mooney responded that the nomination itself does not state that there should be a limit to the area with archaeological potential. Ms. Cooperman added that the only way to limit the area would be through physical exploration. Mr. Duffin stated that he objected to the suggestion that documentation should be dismissed in favor of the scientific study. Ms. Cooperman responded that documentation is not being dismissed; she asserted that documentation and testing or scientific study are complementary. She continued that they are two different kinds of information and, often when you undertake testing, you find a lot of information that never makes it into the written record.

Mr. Phillips argued that it is problem to shift the burden onto the property owner to undertake an archaeological survey to demonstrate that there are no artifacts at the site. He continued that the substance and the heart of the process is being distorted. The nominators are stating clearly that their nomination does not make any assertions about the archaeological potential that Mr. Mooney is claiming. Ms. Cooperman is contending that it is the property owner's obligation to refute claims about archaeology that are not in the nomination, but are only being made by Mr. Mooney in the moment. He asserted that the property owner can only respond to the nomination. He stated that something has gone seriously wrong with the process when the property owner and the nominator agree that the nomination does not propose designation for the reasons offered by Mr. Mooney, and yet the property owner is being held by the Committee to that undocumented standard.

Mr. Beisert pointed out this is not a Section 106 process and that there is no local law that requires every undertaking lead to an archaeological survey. He commented that the research for the nomination related to Criteria I focused on the Mount Airy Estate and this is why it was included. He continued that other areas of archaeological potential were not included in the nomination and should not be included at this time because the research has not been done.

Mr. Duffin stated that, in a district nomination, the Historical Commission has the authority to classify specific buildings as contributing and non-contributing. He continued that he sees limiting the area of archaeological potential to the Mount Airy mansion similar to classifying something as contributing or non-contributing. Ms. Cooperman responded that the nominator is doing this based on partial information and stating areas are non-contributing without knowing what is there. The nominators responded that Mr. Mooney is claiming that areas are contributing without doing any research or analysis. Nothing in the nomination supports Mr. Mooney's claims. Nothing in the record supports his claims. Mr. Mooney is the one making claims without knowledge.

Ms. Cooperman commented that she is not sure they are going to reach any resolution, but she is concerned about deciding that one portion of the property is archaeologically significant but

the remainder is not. She expressed concern that this shuts the door on any future understanding of some portion of the property as contributing archaeologically. Mr. Phillips disagreed, stating that the door is always open if the research is done that shows significance; there is always the possibility of amending the district nomination. Mr. Mooney wants the district nomination amended now, without any basis over than a hunch. He has not done any research on the site.

Mr. Newsom addressed the fact that large portions of the seminary campus have been disturbed and altered. He described various construction campaigns and changes that have occurred during the LTSP ownership of the property. He stated that many areas of the campus have been significantly disturbed and regarded during construction campaigns. He pointed out several areas in the aerial photograph where earth-disturbing activities had occurred.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia inquired if the portion of the nomination that focused on the Battle of Germantown could be removed. He pointed out that the research and nomination focused on the Mount Airy Estate; little or no research was completed on the Battle of Germantown. Mr. Steinke proposed that the removal of the three paragraphs on the Battle of Germantown would allow for the approval of the nomination with a limited area of archaeological potential.

Mr. Mooney asked if the review of the nomination could be continued to a future meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation to allow for research to be conducted on the site's archaeological potential. Ms. Cooperman stated that continuing is always an option, but noted that the Historical Commission may opt to conclude the review based on the nomination as it is currently presented. Mr. Beisert stated that he would be willing to remove the Criteria I section altogether, but he was not willing to undertake more research related to the archaeological potential of the site. He stated that, if others are interested in archaeology at this site, they can do the research. Mr. Duffin contended that it is in the Historical Commission's best interest when it considers Criteria cited and supported in a nomination and makes its decision based upon them. If a site is designated under Criteria that are not documented and supported in the nomination, the nomination is susceptible to being overturned on appeal.

Mr. Mooney stated once again that he is not contending that the area of archaeological potential cannot be reduced in size or scope, but he is contending that the nomination must explain why certain portions of the site does not have archaeological potential. Mr. Duffin responded that the nomination includes evidence of archaeological potential for the section of the site where Mount Airy stood, but does not present any evidence for or against archaeological potential elsewhere. He observed that Mr. Mooney wants the area of archaeological potential expanded to the entire district, but no evidence for that potential has been provided in the nomination or at today's review.

Mr. Mooney suggested that the review of the nomination should be continued to the next meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation and the nominator can revise the nomination. Ms. Cooperman stated that the nomination cannot be rewritten in the midst of the process without giving notice to the property owners; the nominators could provide supplemental information, but cannot revise the nomination in a wholesale manner.

Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Mooney had contended that the staff had sought to reduce the area of archaeological potential and had prepared the map showing the proposed area of archaeological potential. He stated that Mr. Mooney's assertion was false. The staff had nothing

to do with the delineation of the area of archaeological potential. The nominators identified the area and prepared the map.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Lutheran Theological Seminary Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, I, and J; that the Garage, Staff House, 1973 addition to the Krauth Memorial Library, and 1974 additions to the Hagan Center should be classified as non-contributing in the inventory; and that the area of archaeological potential should be limited to the section of the historic district once owned by William Allen.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:55 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.