

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

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

**PRESENT**

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

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**

John Charles Manton  
Michael Kincade, Lavin Law  
Anthony W. Hurst, Sr., Church of God, 4105 Chestnut St.  
Juanda Myles, Citizen Planner  
Deborah Sanford, House of Our Own Bookstore  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Brandi Levine, St. David's Episcopal Church  
Chesley Turner, St. Rita's Shrine & Rectory  
David Moloznik, Esq.  
Celeste Morello  
Nancy Pontone, Tudor East Falls  
Joseph J. Menkevich  
Bill O'Brien, Manayunk Law  
Sean McCauley, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania  
Steven Peitzman, East Falls Historical Society  
Nicholas Baker  
Anthony M. Santaniello  
J.M. Duffin  
Robert Theil, NewCourtland  
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites  
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer  
George Poulin, PVCA/UHCS  
Melissa Weber, Diocese of PA  
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Helma Weeks, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Theresa R. Stuhlman, Parks & Recreation  
Rob Armstrong, Parks & Recreation  
John Primiano Jr.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. Ms. Klein and Messrs. Cohen, Mooney, and Schaaf joined her.

**ADDRESS: 6625 LINCOLN DR**

Name of Resource: The Nichols-Goehring House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 6625 Lincoln Dr LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of 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 6625 Lincoln Drive satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the building reflects the environment of suburban, residential architecture of the upper classes of Philadelphia in an era characterized by the Colonial Revival style. Under Criterion D, the nomination outlines how the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style, including a historically-symmetrical front façade, front entrance fanlights and sidelights, and a pedimented front doorway.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Jim Duffin represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Chantry noted for the record that Mr. Farnham is not in the room, and has recused from this review and any discussion related to the proposed designation of this property, owing to his personal involvement in another matter related to this property owner. She stated that letters notifying the property owner of the proposed designation were mailed to both the property itself and the owner's mailing address on file with the City's Office of Property Assessment. The letter addressed to the property was returned to the Commission staff as "undeliverable" owing to the building being vacant; however, the letter addressed to the owner's mailing address was not returned to the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman agreed that the building is currently vacant, and noted that several windows on the building have been open for some time. Committee members agreed that the open windows are not good for the long-term preservation of the building.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Celeste Morello commented that she supports the nomination. Juanda Myles commented that she supports the nomination.

Mr. Cohen commented that he is pleased that this property has been nominated. He described the building as being very broad and appearing as if someone heavy sat on it. Mr. Duffin opined that it is like a miniature Wyck. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that many elements of Wyck show up in designs of this time period. Mr. Cohen commented that he would have liked for the nomination to have more discussion of architects H.C. Wise and W.W. Potter. He observed that the argument rests on a general description of Philadelphia colonial buildings that are more than five bays. Ms. Cooperman commented that many people are not aware of this building, owing to its position up on a hill along Lincoln Drive.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the nominator, Oscar Beisert, who was not in attendance, had made some errors in his use of architectural terminology. She noted that his use of “elliptical arch” is incorrect and is actually a semi-elliptical arch or basket handle arch. Mr. Schaaf commented that some of the language used in the nomination could be improved, perhaps by way of the staff editing Mr. Beisert’s nominations. He referenced page 15, which uses the following modifiers: “likely,” “somehow,” “not quite,” and “appears to be.” Mr. Schaaf continued that the choice of words such as these show hesitation and weaken the argument. Ms. Cooperman agreed. She suggested that Mr. Beisert’s nominations should use more assertive language. Mr. Cohen commented that, despite the suggestions for improvements to the language used in the nomination, the building is worthy of being listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Duffin commented that the building is sited in a prominent location along Lincoln Drive.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

**ADDRESS: 6950 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: Leibert House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Germantown Home Inc

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6950 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6950 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination describes the Leibert House as a commodious Federal-style “Mansion House” with later Gothic Revival stylistic embellishments. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Federal style, representing the original period of construction between 1800 and 1808 and the Gothic Revival style, representing the Victorian improvements that took place and some point between 1840 and 1880. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that, though certain detailing was lost during the property’s mid-nineteenth-century Gothic renovation, the Leibert House retains many features that allow it to continue to embody distinguishing characteristics of the Federal style. It also states that despite the loss of the porch, the building continues to embody a blend of distinguishing features associated with both the Federal and Gothic Revival eras. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the building is significant owing to its association with the Leibert family, specifically William Leibert, a bookbinder who represents Germantown’s rich German-language printing and bookselling history. It should be noted that the front porch was removed recently, before the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction went into effect.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Jim Duffin represented the nomination. Robert Theil of NewCourtland Senior Services represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman asked the staff when the porch was removed, and Ms. Schmitt responded that she believed it had been removed at the end of May 2018.

Mr. Theil introduced himself as the Government Affairs Manager for the property owner. Ms. Cooperman asked him if he wanted to make any comments. Mr. Theil explained that the porch had been removed prior to the Historical Commission's jurisdiction going into effect. The Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued a make-safe order by to take the porch down because it was in such a state of disrepair. He explained that, while he would not speak about economic hardships or the current condition of the building until the Historical Commission meeting, NewCourtland Senior Services is a provider of senior housing and support services. He informed the members that there were approximately 180 affordable senior housing apartments on this campus, and that, prior to learning of the nomination, their plan for the subject building had been to demolish it and then expand the current stock of affordable senior housing, which the city needs. Mr. Theil said that it was a big campus with many senior services and the designation of this building would not help them in the work they do as part of their mission as a non-profit organization. Ms. Cooperman thanked Mr. Theil for his comments.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the nominator wanted to make any comments. Mr. Duffin replied that he had helped with the research for this nomination and was available to answer any questions that came up. Ms. Cooperman asked there was any public comment on the nomination, and there were none.

Ms. Cooperman opened the discussion among the members of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Cohen began by saying that there was really great detective work on the part of the nominator in terms of figuring things out using tax records, adding that he had never seen tax records used so effectively to nail down certain details. Mr. Cohen commented that both the initial state and the later state of the building were very intriguing, and asked Mr. Duffin if he thought that the initial state of the house had a porch or whether it had only been added later. Mr. Duffin replied that he doubted that the original structure had had a porch since the initial state of the building appeared to be from about 1808-1810. Mr. Cohen agreed and said that it appeared that there was an extensive amount of material that would not have been exposed as prominently if there had been a porch. Ms. Cooperman concurred with the remarks.

Mr. Cohen commented that the stone surround was very impressive, but that the nominator had a unique way of describing some of these details by using words such as "keystone" for what were actually flat arches. Mr. Cohen remarked that what was described as a Greek Revival porch was actually an Italianate porch, and Mr. Duffin agreed. Mr. Cohen said that this description could be struck from the nomination unless there was an argument to be made for the house having three different phases, which he did not think was the case. He remarked that sometimes the nomination referred to architraves instead of window surrounds, which caused confusion since architrave was also the word for a lintel; therefore it was better to refer to them as surrounds since they went around the windows. Ms. Cooperman stated that it was useful to talk about windows as the frame and the sash, with the frame having four components; the sill, the lintel and the side rails.

Mr. Cohen said that he applauded the research which dove deep into the world of German publishing in this neighborhood. Mr. Duffin explained that he thought it was important to understand the history of publishing in Germantown if the nomination was going to discuss the subject property as having such significance. Mr. Schaaf remarked that he had been unfamiliar with the way that people had been paid with books. Mr. Cohen commented that it was better to number the figures within the text of the nomination. He added that, at some point, Mr. Duffin would need to help everyone get as good at researching tax records as he was, because a lot unfolded from that research in the nomination. Mr. Cohen stated that he felt that this building was well worthy of listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Duffin said that this building reminded him of several other buildings along Germantown Avenue. He mentioned the tragic case of the Garrett-Dunn House, where on the outside it looked like a very nice Italianate house, but when the contractor stripped all of the stucco off of it, they discovered that it was an eighteenth-century stone house that had been added on to with the Italianate house. Mr. Duffin added that his guess was that if the stucco was ever removed from the subject property, one could probably see the original components of how the building evolved over time. He said that there were many buildings like this one along Germantown Avenue that on the outside today may have one coherent appearance but in reality, are probably structures that had evolved over time. Mr. Cohen commented that sometimes the basements told tales, noting that if joists were exposed it was sometimes possible to determine the period of construction.

Mr. Schaaf said that, if the building was thought to have been constructed around 1800-1808, he was struck by the door with its quoining and keystone surround, adding that he could not think of another example of such a design in the city of Philadelphia that dated from such an early age. Mr. Cohen replied that it was a new form that he was not familiar with, but that he had seen a drawing at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania of a similar door and frame for John Dickinson that probably dated from the late eighteenth century, so it was not unknown; however he could not think of another example that was standing. Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Cohen, remarking that the door and surround were very grand, and Mr. Schaaf commented that it was very unusual for the time. Mr. Schaaf said that the one extraordinary splay that he could think of at this time in American architecture was from 1809 in New Brunswick, New Jersey at Rutgers College's first building called the Queen's Building by architects Joseph F. Mangin and John McComb, Jr. who were also the architects of the New York City Hall. Mr. Schaaf explained that the door of the Queen's Building was similar to that of 6950 Germantown Avenue. Mr. Cohen remarked that he did not doubt the accuracy of the date of construction of the subject property, just that he had not seen many examples of it, and Ms. Cooperman agreed.

Mr. Mooney said that he felt that this particular nomination made a very strong case for the inclusion of Criterion I for its archaeological potential. He said that the information that was listed in support of Criterion J regarding the fact that the site was only surviving home and work place of the Leibert family who was associated with Germantown's German-language printing heritage also supported the archaeological sensitivity of the site. Mr. Mooney said that the question was whether the site still retained any kind of archaeological potential. He commented that since the house would not have been hooked up to any sewer, it certainly would have had a privy, which could still survive on the property. Mr. Mooney added that he could tell from the images that there had been some landscaping in the vicinity of the house and the addition of some walkways; however no significant changes appear to have been made to the landscape, which meant that there was potential for shallowly buried archaeological evidence, including out buildings or evidence connected to the printing business. Mr. Mooney commented that he felt that there was great archaeological potential, not only about the Leibert family but about the printing industry in Germantown at this time period. Mr. Cohen added that it looked like there was a fair amount of land that appeared not to have been altered around the subject property. Mr. Mooney agreed, adding that for him, the question was how to define an appropriate area of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Cohen asked the nominator what the black rectangle on page two of the nomination was intended to depict, and Mr. Duffin responded that it was intended to indicate that the nomination was only for this specific building and a small buffer area on the larger tax parcel. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Mooney if he was looking for a larger buffer than what was shown on page two of the nomination, and Mr. Mooney responded that he would probably want to see it made slightly larger. He further commented that he did not want to

be in a situation where they would be cutting off the ability to expand further out into the parcel. Mr. Mooney suggested that perhaps they could use those portions shown on page 22 of the nomination of the original 1799 property that fell within 100 feet of the building. Mr. Cohen clarified that the recommended area would be 100 feet deep from the building within the section shaded purple on the graphic on page 22 of the nomination, and Mr. Mooney agreed. Ms. Cooperman explained that this would need to be expressed in their motion in order to make it a part of their recommendation.

Mr. Mooney stated that that the Leibert House, located at 6950 Germantown Avenue, met the standards to be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places under Criteria for Designation C, D and J, and also under Criterion I, and that the area proposed for the Historical Commission's jurisdiction related to Criterion I include all of those portions of the original 1799 property that fall within 100 feet of the existing building. Mr. Cohen agreed.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6950 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J and that the property also satisfies Criterion I, with the area proposed for the Historical Commission's jurisdiction to include all of those portions of the original 1799 property that fall within 100 feet of the existing building.

**ADDRESS: 1400 E PASSYUNK AVE**

Name of Resource: Moyamensing Prison Wall Remnants, Part II

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: SUSTEVE, LLC

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation E and I.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the existing wall remnants of the former Philadelphia County Prison, also referred to as the Moyamensing Prison, at 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the wall remnants, designed by architect Thomas Ustick Walter and constructed between 1835 and 1839, are significant under Criteria for Designation E and I. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that Walter, who served as the first vice president of the American Institute of Architects, was an important architect whose work included the United States Capitol dome in Washington D.C. and Girard College's Founder's Hall. His role in the construction of the Philadelphia County Prison and walls satisfies Criterion E. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the north/northwest corner of the parcel contains wall remnants above grade and possible evidence of water and sewer pipelines dating back to the construction of this second phase of the Philadelphia County Prison, which could provide information about the development of sanitary infrastructure prior to 1840. The nomination seems to limit the application of Criterion I to this section of the parcel because it was the area where the most concentrated group of inmates expelled waste water.

**ADDRESS: 1430 E PASSYUNK AVE**

Name of Resource: Moyamensing Prison Wall Remnants, Part I

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the existing wall remnants of the former Philadelphia County Prison, also referred to as the Moyamensing Prison, at 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the wall remnants, designed by architect Thomas Ustick Walter and constructed between 1832 and 1835, are significant under Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination suggests that, the Philadelphia County Prison was Walter's "version of the English rural castle jail in the undeveloped Moyamensing Township." Though Walter was tasked with designing a prison that could accommodate prisoners in solitary confinement, the nomination argues that his actual execution of the interior spaces and their relationship to the walls was ultimately unsuccessful. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that Walter, who served as the first vice president of the American Institute of Architects, was an important architect whose work included the United States Capitol dome in Washington D.C. and Girard College's Founder's Hall. His role in the construction of the Philadelphia County Prison and walls satisfies Criterion E.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Theresa Stuhlman from Philadelphia Parks & Recreation represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman asked if a representative from the Department of Public Property was present, and Ms. Schmitt explained that she had spoken with members of the staff of Philadelphia Parks & Recreation about the nomination. Ms. Cooperman asked what their response was, and Ms. Schmitt explained that Philadelphia Parks & Recreation was trying to determine if the entire parcel was under its jurisdiction or whether perhaps the parcel was split between Parks & Recreation and the Department of Public Property.

Ms. Cooperman asked the nominator if there was anything she wanted to add, and Ms. Morello replied that she had brought along some stone samples from the walls because she really wanted to explain why she had prepared two separate nominations. She explained that she had discussed this with the staff, and that originally she had wanted to prepare two nominations because the walls were designed in two completely different architectural styles, but the actual materials used to construct the walls were also different. Ms. Morello said that she had a piece of granite from the first phase of the wall that had been built on the southern side of the parcel, and then a piece of red sandstone that had come from the second phase, located at the northwestern side of the parcel. She commented that a large block of the sandstone had been cut out from the wall and placed in Columbus Square, which really demonstrates the red color of the stone that Thomas Ustick Walter found so appealing. Ms. Morello explained that the red sandstone was only a veneer that covered up some kind of granite that was of a lesser quality than had been used on the south wall. She also mentioned that she had with her some samples of the mortar that would have been used in the construction of the walls. Ms. Morello noted that Mr. Laverty was not present at the meeting to bring the samples back to the Athenaeum so that they could be added to the Thomas Ustick Walter collection. Mr. Cohen asked if he could

examine the samples, and Ms. Morello handed him the small bags with pieces from both the north and south wall, acknowledging that the stone was not in very good condition and was in need of conservation.

Ms. Cooperman told Ms. Morello that one of the samples was Wissahickon schist, not granite, and Mr. Cohen explained that that schist is a local stone. Ms. Morello responded that she had not seen any mention of Wissahickon schist in the materials she researched. Ms. Cooperman asked Ms. Morello if she could remove a piece of stone from one of the bags, and Ms. Morello replied yes.

Ms. Morello stated that she wanted to add for the record that she had spoken with Geppert Bros., Inc., the demolition company that had taken down the Moyamensing prison in 1967. She said that she had spoken with a man who worked on the site and he explained that the City of Philadelphia directed him how to dismantle the walls, which is why some sections of the remnants are higher than others.

Mr. Cohen identified one of the samples as the early mortar that Ms. Morello had mentioned previously, and he also agreed that one of the samples was granite.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there were any members of the public that wanted to comment on the nomination. Ms. Morello interjected that Councilman Squilla was aware of the nomination, though she did not receive a letter of support from him. She also mentioned that the Passyunk Square Civic Association had been silent about the nomination even though they had known about it for about one year.

David Traub identified himself as speaking on behalf of Save Our Sites. He said that he was having a difficult time understanding which section of the wall was being shown in the image projected on the screen, and Ms. Morello and Ms. Schmitt clarified that the view was looking at the wall and the backs of the houses on Gerritt Street. Mr. Traub described the wall remnants as an evocative feature of the neighborhood and if retained, they would give the city a lot of color and character. He said the remnants would also serve as a memory of a very distinctive Egyptian Revival prison that was unfortunately demolished. Mr. Traub stated that he was in support of the nomination.

Ms. Morello commented that she wanted to add for the record that this was a prime area for archaeological research, and she thought that Committee on Historic Designation members Doug Mooney and Jeff Cohen would agree. She remarked that some previous studies on Eastern State Penitentiary were relevant to this site because they dealt with new utilities such as water and sewer that were coming into areas of Philadelphia that had not been developed yet. Ms. Morello asked if Mr. Cohen wanted to add more about the work he had done with the David Cornelius study, to which Mr. Cohen replied that Ms. Morello had done a great job at tapping into this research in her nomination. Mr. Cohen explained that David Cornelius was considered to be the expert on early heating and sanitary systems of prisons, and his research looked at these early, pioneer systems. Mr. Cohen said that he believed that Ms. Morello was referring to Mr. Cornelius' possible interpretation of this site as contributing to the early record of these systems. Ms. Morello added that it also showed the ties between Thomas Ustick Walter and John Haviland, with Walter depending on the knowledge that Haviland had of the English tradition of utilities.

Ms. Cooperman said that she was slightly troubled at the extent of the fragmentation of the wall remnants and the minimal amount of material they were talking about, adding that if they were



going to be looking at this as a design, the building itself was gone. Ms. Morello explained that the walls emerged from the buildings, one that was English Gothic and the other that was Egyptian Revival. Ms. Cooperman responded that there was nothing left that allowed one to tell that the buildings there had been either English Gothic or Egyptian Revival and Ms. Morello said there were just the walls left. Mr. Cohen remarked that to him, the remnants only became an articulate part of the past with good interpretive signage, and Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Schaaf agreed. Ms. Cooperman added that she would appreciate it if Mr. Mooney would weigh in on the issue of archaeology, especially in understanding what the boundary would be. Mr. Mooney replied that he did not know about the archaeology of prisons, but that it seemed to him that there was the potential for a tremendous amount of information preserved on the site, and under the surface parking lot for sure. Ms. Cooperman agreed but remarked that they were not considering designating the parking lot because it was a different parcel that was owned by the Acme. Ms. Schmitt clarified that that parcel was discussed in the second part of Mr. Morello's nomination, reminding the Committee on Historic Designation members that Ms. Morello had decided to document the two different wall building campaigns separately.

Mr. Schaaf asked if there was a diagram in the nomination that showed the locations of the walls they were discussing. Ms. Cooperman said that she thought it would be helpful to look at both of the nominations simultaneously. Mr. Cohen directed the members to the diagram on page four of the nomination, and Mr. Schaaf replied that, for the first site under consideration at 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue, they did not have such a clear diagram to refer to as they did for the wall remnants located on 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there was anything they needed to add procedurally in order to move forward with reviewing both nominations at the same time. Mr. Schaaf responded that he believed they would need to change something because the two parcels were being nominated under different Criteria for Designation, but he did not know why that was true. Ms. Schmitt clarified that Criterion I was being applied to the wall remnants at 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue which had to do with the location of the pipes that were laid at that facility. She explained that Criterion I had not been applied to the wall remnants located on the 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue parcel. Ms. Schaaf noted that, for 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue, Criterion A had not been applied and he wanted to know why. Mr. Mooney interjected that he had the same question and wondered why Criterion I could not be extended over both parcels. Ms. Cooperman responded that they could always make the recommendation that it be the case. Mr. Mooney pointed out that these would have been massive structures that would have had foundations deep underground, mentioning that he guaranteed that much of that material would not have been removed at the time of demolition but would rather have just been left in the ground. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Schaaf agreed with this point. Mr. Mooney also pointed out that the one-story Acme building likely did not have a basement, and Ms. Cooperman agreed. Mr. Cohen clarified that within the nominations, the wall remnants located on the parcel at 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue were outlined in red on the site plan, and the wall remnants located on the parcel at 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue were outlined in thick black lines. Mr. Schaaf requested that the length of the wall remnant at the southern parcel be clarified, and Ms. Morello explained that it extended from E. Passyunk Avenue west, almost the entire extent of the parcel.

Ms. Klein commented that two photographs in the nomination showed sections of a very low wall compared with the image that was projected on the screen which was of the higher remnants on the southern parcel behind the Gerritt Street houses. She remarked that the lower sections were more like fragments, rather than showing the height of the existing wall at the southern parcel. Ms. Klein stated that she found this questionable, and Ms. Morello explained that the image that was projected on the screen was showing the remains of the wall that

currently stood about six or seven feet high behind approximately 20 residences on Gerritt Street. Ms. Morello stated that while that section was quite intact, it was still not the original height of the wall, which according to some reports would have been about 20 feet high. Ms. Morello explained that moving around the parcel, to the rear of the Acme, the remnants of the wall were much lower, standing approximately 22 to 30 inches high. She noted that the remnants were constantly getting hit by automobiles, which is leading to further deterioration. Ms. Morello said that, as one continued around the parcel to where the remnants of the red stone-faced sections of the wall were, approximately at the corner of 11<sup>th</sup> and Reed Streets, this was the location of the only bastion that architect Walter designed for the prison. She added that this was also the location of the early water and sewer systems that serviced the prison.

Mr. Cohen said that there was an architectural historian named Ed Teitelman in New Jersey who had passed away several years ago, and he had pieces of the wall remnants that may have been donated to the University of Pennsylvania's Architectural Archives. Mr. Cohen added that Mr. Teitelman was also a prolific photographer, and it was possible that he had photographs of the prison from the 1960s, and it would be great to see what the wall looked like at its full height prior to demolition. Ms. Morello responded that she had included such a photograph in the nomination from the water company from 1896, as well as the lithograph, though she acknowledged that the lithograph did not really convey the scale of the wall. Mr. Cohen asked what page the water company's photograph was on, and Mr. Schaaf confirmed that it could be found on page 13 of the 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue nomination. Mr. Schaaf asked what view they were looking at in the photograph, and Mr. Cohen replied that they were looking at the back of the prison. Ms. Morello explained that the reason this section of the site was referred to as the wharf was because it was a loading station, which was also why there were still some interruptions at the wall at this area. Mr. Cohen clarified that the 1896 photograph was showing them the wall at its full height, along with a back entrance to the prison. Ms. Cooperman asked if they were currently discussing remnants of this back wall, and Mr. Cohen replied yes, and referred her to the site plan on page four of the 1400 E. Passyunk Avenue nomination. Mr. Schaaf remarked that there had been an Egyptian pylon at this location, and they were likely looking at the feet of them. Mr. Cohen commented that this was what Ms. Morello was calling the bastion, to which she responded that the bastion had been on the corner where the turn was from Reed Street slightly southward to get to 12<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Cohen asked Ms. Morello if they were seeing the gateway in the 1896 photograph, and she replied that it could barely be seen. Ms. Morello further commented that if one did not know what a bastion looked like, it would appear as nothing more than a small projection.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia asked if it was an appropriate time for him to comment, and Ms. Cooperman replied that there was someone else sitting behind him who had a comment first. Ms. Cooperman asked if Joseph J. Menkevich had a comment, and he responded that though he was there for a different nomination, he wanted to support Ms. Morello's nomination for the site's archaeological potential. He told the members of the Committee on Historic Designation that he had brought some documents with him regarding the nomination of Penn Treaty Park that included a letter from the Philadelphia Historical Commission's former Historic Preservation Officer, Richard Tyler, which Mr. Menkevich asserted set the standard for archaeological potential. Mr. Menkevich said that he wanted to pass out copies of the documents to the members of the Committee on Historic Designation, to which Ms. Cooperman replied that he could not since the members of the public would not be able to see them. Mr. Menkevich responded that it was the Committee on Historic Designation that was judging, not the public. Ms. Cooperman suggested that Mr. Menkevich submit the documents at a later time, and asked if he could summarize the content. Mr. Menkevich said that, in summary, wherever there was human activity, regardless of how deep it was, there was

probably archaeological potential. He further commented that if someone wanted to build on top of such a site, unless a full archaeological excavation was conducted, this potential would never be known. Mr. Menkevich said that he would submit the documents at a later time to the members of the Historical Commission, and Ms. Cooperman suggested that it was best if he gave his materials to the staff ahead of time so that they could get it to the Commissioners and because it would also allow members of the public to look at it.

Mr. Steinke introduced himself and said that he wanted to speak in favor of both Moyamensing Prison wall remnants nominations. He remarked that he was tickled when he saw that Ms. Morello had taken the time to do the research and submit the nominations, having himself been aware of the walls for decades. Mr. Steinke commented that he was always pleased when he would go by to see that something remained of the great prison structure that once sat on this site. Mr. Steinke said that he wanted to make three points, the first being that the City of Philadelphia retained very few Thomas Ustick Walter-designed resources. He pointed out that Washington D.C. had the National Capitol dome which was a proud part of Walter's legacy, but here in his hometown of Philadelphia, there was not much left. He said the only other extant work that he could think of was the Sedgely Porter House in East Fairmount Park, which once belonged to the mansion that Walter had designed. Mr. Steinke said that with the wall remnants, here was something in the heart of a neighborhood that spoke to a larger complex that once stood there. Mr. Cohen interjected and said that he thought Mr. Steinke was thinking of the architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe for Sedgely, and Ms. Cooperman agreed. They added that Walter's great work at Girard College still survives. Mr. Steinke said that he stood corrected and withdrew his first point from the record.

Mr. Steinke addressed his second point, remarking that the public had become more sensitive to the importance of archaeological resources in recent years for good reasons, and to him, the wall remnants almost served as above ground archaeological resources. He remarked that they venerated foundations of historic buildings when they were discovered, such as the President's House at 6<sup>th</sup> and Market Streets, yet here was something that stood above ground that was almost like an archeological resource even if it did not quite meet the definition, but it did speak to the larger resource that once stood on the site.

Mr. Steinke said that his third point was the fact that the lot was owned by the City of Philadelphia meant that under its care, it could be stewarded and adapted to future new uses, where the memory of the prison would have a physical manifestation, not just a mention in history books. He said that for all of these reasons except for the first one that he mentioned, the wall remnants really merited consideration for the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there was any further public comment, and there was none.

Mr. Mooney remarked that his thought as he was reading through the nominations, was why they could not be combined into one in which case Criterion I could be extended over both parcels. Mr. Schaaf added that Criterion A could then also be extended over both parcels. Mr. Mooney commented that he did not see why they could not be combined since the site had original been one single site; he did not see any reason to necessarily break them up, unless there was something that he was not seeing. Mr. Schaaf responded that he thought a uniformity across both sites was correct for their assessment. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Farnham if there was a reason not to combine the two nominations into one. Mr. Farnham replied that there was no legal reason; however, it was his understanding that the archaeological significance proposed in the nomination applied specifically to the plumbing associated with one portion of the prison and not the entirety of the prison complex or the prison's history. He further commented that he

thought that additional work would need to be done to the nominations to broaden them to include potential archaeological resources for the entire site, but that was not to say that it could not be done. Mr. Mooney said that, along those lines, if the nomination was looking at plumbing as the real area of archaeological significance, the real interest would then be within the interior of the walls, not at the exterior of them since the plumbing system would extend throughout the entire prison.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he would advocate for their treatment of the sites uniformly and for recommending archaeological potential for both sites. Others noted that the nomination did not address any archaeological potential outside of the location where the water and sewer pipes passed under the wall. No other demonstration of archaeological potential was offered in the nomination.

Mr. Cohen asked Ms. Morello if the nominations were currently only suggesting that the archaeological significance be applied to the systems of the prison or did it speak to the whole site. Mr. Mooney interjected that, if the prison's design had significance based on the architect, then that significance would clearly extend over the entire site. Mr. Schaaf and Ms. Cooperman both remarked that there would have to be evidence of the buildings' foundation still remaining on both sites. Ms. Klein asked whether the archaeological potential was only being discussed about the wall or was it being applied to the space within the walls, and Ms. Cooperman responded that this was a very important question. Ms. Klein said that, if the archaeological potential was being limited to the wall remnants, it had nothing to do with the area beyond the existing walls.

Ms. Cooperman commented that there were many things that she was finding very confusing, noting that if they were talking about the wall, it was one thing, but if they were talking about the area around the wall, then it was another thing. She said that she was not clear on the extent of what the actual tax parcel was. Ms. Klein remarked that it seemed to her that as soon as the words wall remnants were used, it limited it to be almost like a monument. Mr. Mooney stated that certainly there would be foundations that would exist underground, and Ms. Cooperman agreed.

Ms. Cooperman said that she was struggling with the application of Criterion E because the walls were a very small portion of a building and a design was a building, not just a fragment of leftover back wall. She further commented that, yes, Thomas Walter was involved with it, but it did not represent his significance as a designer. Mr. Cohen responded that he could see Ms. Cooperman's point, and wondered if Criterion H was more appropriate, naming the walls as a visual feature of the neighborhood, community or city.

Ms. Morello asked Ms. Cooperman if 20 feet of the red stone veneer was good enough for her, to which Ms. Cooperman replied that it was not a matter of dimension, but rather the important features of the design and whether 20 feet of the wall was enough to represent an entire building, because she was doubtful that it was. Ms. Morello explained that she was looking at the wall as a separate part, and that her argument was that the wall did not really serve for any kind of defensive purposes and that it was just about aesthetics. She said this wall obviously did not serve any kind of purpose to keep the prisoners inside, so it was mainly about design. Ms. Morello reiterated that the wall really had no function other than design and conforming with whatever prison style was used at the time. Mr. Cohen commented that usually when they review something that exemplified the work of a famous architect there was enough left of the building to get more than just a few samples of stone. Mr. Cohen clarified that he did not think that this would defeat the nomination if Criterion E were removed, but he was inclined to add

Criterion H which would identify the walls as a neighborhood feature. Ms. Morello suggested that the walls could be described as an early work of Thomas Walter, to which Mr. Cohen responded that he did not think there was enough there to actually see Walter as the architect for the site. Mr. Cohen stated again that he did not think that removing Criterion E and adding Criterion H harmed the nomination substantially. Ms. Morello remarked that when one looked at Eastern State Penitentiary and the depth and design of its walls in comparison to what Walter did at the Moyamensing Prison, they were completely different.

Ms. Klein said that she agreed with Mr. Cohen that it definitely warranted adding Criterion H because the wall was a neighborhood feature that represented a fragment of the work of the architect. Ms. Cooperman responded that it was a fragment but questioned whether it represented the work of the architect. Mr. Cohen repeated that he thought the nomination could be approved with or without Criterion E because there were other Criteria for Designation that were met. He added that the Statement of Significance did apply to the design of the entire site, adding that if it were more labor to ask that the nomination be recast as one when they could achieve the same thing by just approving them both, he would go with the latter. Ms. Cooperman said that she did not think that they could do that. She said that they could make a recommendation about the Criteria that would apply to both parcels, and Mr. Cohen responded that that was what he was suggesting.

Theresa Stuhlman from Philadelphia Parks & Recreation introduced herself for the record. She said that she wanted to clarify the boundary of the nomination because to her it looked like the entire City-owned site was proposed for designation and she wanted to know if that was correct. Ms. Cooperman agreed that she was not clear on the boundary either. Ms. Schmitt confirmed that had been the proposal. Ms. Cooperman said that she found the whole thing very confusing, and Ms. Stuhlman asked again if it was just the walls that were proposed for designation or if it was the entire site. Ms. Morello replied that she had just wanted to protect the walls. Ms. Stuhlman asked if they could just define the nomination's boundary as the walls instead of the entire City-owned parcel. Ms. Cooperman remarked that the walls were what they had been discussing, and Mr. Cohen interjected that he believed that Mr. Mooney had been talking about a more extended area of archaeological interest. Mr. Mooney replied that he had been thinking of something more extensive but that he did not know if they could apply it in this particular situation. He said he was not sure if the nomination would need to be recast to cover archaeological potential for the entire site.

Ms. Cooperman remarked that she thought at this point there were enough questions that, if they made a recommendation to approve the nomination, what they had before them was the proposed designation of the walls. She commented that the nomination could also be amended later, because otherwise there was just too much confusion. Ms. Stuhlman asked if the boundary could just be defined by the walls themselves, and Ms. Cooperman responded yes. Mr. Cohen said that he thought that was what Ms. Morello had intended to propose, and she explained that she had drawn the maps very specifically to indicate that the proposal was only for the walls and not any other section of the parcels.

Ms. Stuhlman said that she wanted to state for the record that Parks & Recreation had been identified as the owner of the parcel at 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue. However, there was a portion of the lot that was not under its control. She noted that she would need to do some additional research because the Department of Public Property may also be an interested party to this matter. Mr. Cooperman said she understood and that the staff had mentioned that point.

Mr. Cohen stated that he had one other question for Ms. Morello, and asked if they just recommended the designation of the walls, would it preclude the archaeology at all. Ms. Cooperman remarked that it seemed like they just did not know enough about the archeological potential to define it at the current moment. Mr. Cohen added that the walls themselves were quite narrow objects, and Ms. Cooperman agreed. Mr. Cohen said that he thought that if there was going to be a designation on the basis of archaeology, it would have to be a different footprint. Ms. Cooperman said that she agreed and that she also thought it would have to be a different nomination. Mr. Cohen commented that they did not need to change it or eliminate it, but the majority of the write up was about the archeology, which might need to be incorporated into a future nomination for the entire site.

Juanda Myles said she would support a nomination that would leave the walls where they were. She commented that she did not think that the significance of the wall was because of the architect but rather because of its history as a part of Philadelphia. Ms. Myles remarked that an entity such as Hidden City would probably like to design tours around the city's old prisons, adding that if the walls were all that was left of the Moyamensing Prison, why knock it down and put a marker there instead.

John Charles Manton introduced himself and explained that he had done a number of nominations for Roxborough and Manayunk and one of them in particular involved the Liebert and Obert Brewery beside St. Mary's Church. He said that whenever a large series of buildings such as a prison were demolished, much of the debris is taken away, but much of it is also used to fill in the basements of the buildings. Mr. Manton asked whether there would be archaeological evidence beneath the subfloor of the basements, which would have been located within the perimeters of the prison walls on what was now a parking lot. Ms. Cooperman replied that there would be, but what they had before them was the proposed designation of the walls which did not preclude that there might be a later nomination for additional areas of the site. Mr. Manton reiterated that there could be archaeological evidence found in the sewers; however, it was under a parking lot and about eight feet of debris because every prison building had cellars. Ms. Morello commented that when she spoke to Mr. Geppert, the demolition contractor, he said that they had hauled away all of the debris to a location outside of Philadelphia.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there was a motion, and Mr. Schaaf asked if they were going to take it one property at a time. Ms. Cooperman replied that she thought they could take them at the same time since they were going to make the same recommendation about both. Mr. Schaaf said that one of the nominations had Criterion A associated with it and one did not. He said that he thought everyone was comfortable using Criterion H, and asked how comfortable the other members were with using Criterion I, to which Ms. Cooperman responded that they were not at all at this point. She added that she personally was not comfortable using Criterion E, but understood that other people make disagree. Mr. Cohen said that he agreed with Ms. Cooperman on that point. Ms. Cooperman opined that Criterion A was applicable, and Mr. Cohen asked if Criteria A and H could be used for both nominations.

Ms. Morello informed Ms. Cooperman that she had crafted Criterion E differently for each nomination because she wanted to show how Thomas Walter was maturing as an architect and what was influencing him. Ms. Cooperman replied that it was all very valid information. However, she just did not think that there was enough of the buildings left to express that. Ms. Cooperman said that it was very good and useful information in the nomination, but that it was her opinion that the walls were too fragmented to represent Walter's design. Ms. Morello added that she believed that the Moyamensing Prison walls were the only resource south of Washington Avenue and east of Broad Street to be documented in the Historic American

Buildings Survey (HABS), to which Ms. Cooperman replied that recordation by HABS did not necessarily mean the same as meeting the Criteria for Designation. Ms. Morello pointed out that the walls had been recognized at the federal level.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the Moyamensing Prison wall remnants at 1400 and 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue be added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places under Criterion A and H. Ms. Klein agreed.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1400 and 1430 E. Passyunk Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation A and H.

**ADDRESS: 1156-62 S BROAD ST**

Name of Resource: St. Rita's Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archbishop of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1156-62 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1156-62 S. Broad Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that St. Rita's Roman Catholic Church, designed by architect George I. Lovatt and constructed in 1907, is significant under Criteria for Designation A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the church is significant as part of the Catholic history in Philadelphia, and for its association with Lucas E. Burke, whose bequest funded the construction of the church; Archbishop Patrick J. Ryan, who led the charge to build the church; and architect George I. Lovatt, Sr. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Roman Baroque style.

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

Ms. Morello noted that she wrote the nomination on her own and did not receive any support from St. Rita's or the Augustinian community at Villanova University.

Mr. Phillips noted that the Archdiocese opposes the designation, but for reasons unrelated to the historical significance of the property and which are not germane to the Committee's review.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination. He noted that St. Rita's is one of the standout architectural expressions of the Catholic church in Philadelphia. David Traub of Save Our Sites also supported the nomination and noted that the church is an excellent example of the Roman Baroque style.

Mr. Cohen opined that the church also satisfies Criterion H, noting that it is a landmark building and fixture of the neighborhood. He noted that he always thought of this area as being an Italian neighborhood, but the church was built by the Irish. He stated that it is a remarkable design.

Mr. Cohen questioned the inclusion of Criterion A, and whether every church satisfies Criterion A. Ms. Cooperman agreed. Ms. Morello responded that the individuals associated with the church and its construction were significant under Criterion A, particularly because it was funded by an individual and not by the Archdiocese. Mr. Cohen replied that every church has individuals associated with it, and that he prefers to see Criterion A used for properties that have national or whole-city significance. Mr. Schaaf noted that Criterion A does list “significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation...” and this is the National shrine of St. Rita. Ms. Morello responded that that came about in the 1990s and opined that it is not part of the significance of the property. Ms. Cooperman commented that the main question is whether this is an exceptional circumstance with regard to the funder. Mr. Cohen opined that that does not raise it to the level of national or whole-city significance, but that the exclusion of Criterion A would not weaken the nomination or make the building less significant. He opined that Criterion H is more applicable. He asserted that Criterion A is overused and simply because a minor figure donated money for the construction of the church does not mean that the church is historically significant.

Mr. Cohen questioned the materials used in the construction of the building. Mr. Schaaf responded that much of the front façade is terra cotta, and that the working drawings in the nomination show that the base is limestone and the upper portion of the façade is terra cotta. Mr. Cohen noted that the joints have been cleverly recessed.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1156-62 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and H.

**ADDRESS: 1164 S BROAD ST**

Name of Resource: David Garrison Residence/ St. Rita’s Rectory

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Brothers of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1164 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1164 S. Broad Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the former residence, constructed between 1883 and 1884 for manufacturer David Garrison, whose Hall & Garrison’s interior decorations factory was located on the nearby industrial corridor of Washington Avenue, exemplifies the development of South Philadelphia during the Gilded Age. Attributed to Willis G. Hale, one of Philadelphia’s most accomplished late-nineteenth century architects, the house is an outstanding example of Hale’s exuberant domestic designs for Philadelphia’s Victorian elite, satisfying Criterion E, and a masterful example of Victorian eclecticism, satisfying Criterion D.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Michael Kincade represented the property owner.



Mr. Kincade noted that the owners oppose the designation, but for reasons unrelated to the historical significance of the property and which are not germane to the Committee's review.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Celeste Morello had expressed her support for the nomination in the previous review. John Charles Manton questioned whether the design was by Frank Furness. Several people responded that it was not designed by Furness. Juana Myles noted that she was planning to nominate this area as a historic district.

Ms. Cooperman asked about the basis for the attribution to Willis Hale. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the design was attributed to Hale in the Teitelman and Longstreth book on Philadelphia architecture, and because of the stylistic elements of the building. Mr. Cohen stated that he has no doubt visually that it is Hale and that no other architects in Philadelphia designed with the same stylistic characteristics. It is not Furness, as Mr. Manton suggested. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

Mr. Cohen noted that he had the chance to visit the property a year or so ago, and that inside it is filled with Hall & Garrison woodwork that is vividly designed. He explained that, in the obscure magazine called the *Journal of Progress* from the 1880s, he found many designs for Hall & Garrison by Angus Wade, a student of Hale, and by Hale himself. It is clear that there are connections between Hale's office and the Garrison residence. He also noted that the semi-circular windows that have a square inscribed and then go diagonally up to the corners is one of Hale's trademark elements. Other elements by Hale include the exquisite diagonal-lite door and the gratuitously shaved corner with corbels underneath. Mr. Cohen noted that it is an attribution to Hale at this moment, but it is pretty certain that the design is by Hale.

Mr. Cohen commented that it is a well-researched, written, and put together nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1164 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

**ADDRESS: 201 N 36TH ST**

Name of Resource: Simpson's Apothecary

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Christy Garrett

Nominator: Powelton Village Civic Association

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 201 N. 36<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 201 N. 36<sup>th</sup> Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the late nineteenth-century commercial and residential building with relatively intact early twentieth-century storefront embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style and characterizes West Philadelphia's Centennial-era urban expansion. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the building reflects its century-long tenure as a neighborhood apothecary shop, a once-ubiquitous trade with deep Philadelphia roots, and has significant value as part of the cultural and economic heritage of the city.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. George Poulin and Ben Leech represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Chantry stated that letters notifying the property owner of the proposed designation were mailed to both the property itself and the owner's mailing address on file with the City's Office of Property Assessment. In this case, both addresses were 201 N. 36<sup>th</sup> Street, which is currently vacant, and as such, both letters were returned to the Commission staff as "undeliverable." Ms. Chantry explained that the notice requirement was satisfied at that point, as it is a property owner's responsibility to maintain a current mailing address with the Office of Property Assessment. She continued that she decided to go a step further and contact the property owner via an email address, which she obtained from the nominators. She explained that she sent an email with the notice letters attached to the email address provided by the nominators, for which she did not receive a response. She concluded that the staff had gone above its requirements regarding notification of the proposed designation, but had not yet received any communication from the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that he supports the nomination. Juanda Myles commented that she supports the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he does not necessarily agree with the inclusion of Criterion A. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Cohen agreed. Mr. Leech responded that he included it for significance related to the development of the city. He agreed that it is a broad category which is often used. Mr. Cohen commended the nominators for a well-written and well-researched nomination.

Mr. Cohen discussed the remarkable storefront. Committee members discussed architectural terminology related to it. Mr. Traub commented that the curved glass corners are rare.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 201 N. 36<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, but not Criterion A.

**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. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the nomination. Attorney David Moloznik represented the property owner, James Cook.

Ms. Chantry explained that Corey Loftus, the nominator, was unable to attend the meeting, but that Ms. Loftus supplied a short list of minor edits which she wished for the Committee to review and adopt. Ms. Chantry summarized Ms. Loftus’ edits as follows:

- Page 2: The purchase date of property is incorrectly listed as 1924. It is correct elsewhere in the nomination, being 1929.
- Page 12: The residence is described as a “publishing house,” however it was primarily administrative offices and no books were published there.
- Page 12: Barnes was English, not Irish.
- Page 13: Laura Barnes’ horticulture school was on the same property as the Merion residence, but she did not give classes until 1940.
- Page 13: Dr. Lawrence Bauermeyer, introduced to Barnes by mutual friend, John Dewey, did tutor Barnes; however, he completed his graduate education at Princeton University rather than the University of Pennsylvania, where he completed his undergraduate degree.

Mr. Moloznik stated that Mr. Cook has been a commendable steward of this property for almost three decades, and has personally restored many parts of the building in a sensitive manner. He stated that the property is not at risk, and therefore Mr. Cook opposes the designation of the property. Mr. Moloznik stated that it is not easy to credibly refute the merits, as it is a handsome building; however, the architect does not appear to be of significance, and the builder has much more grandiose structures elsewhere in the City, and as such, his works have been adequately acknowledged. He explained that it is a corner property, but on a nominal side street, and with an immediate context that does not offer historical perspective. He opined that the tax dispute is not of historical significance because it did not establish the principle of not taxing non-profits. He requested that the property not receive historic designation, because the owner is already preserving it voluntarily, as he has for the past three decades and will continue to do. He stated that any restrictions placed on the property owing to historic designation will create an unnecessary hardship for the owner, and represents a taking without compensation.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commended the property owner for his excellent stewardship of the building. He commented that the property satisfies Criterion A, for its association with Albert Barnes, whose life was significant in the past and remains significant. He commented that the building represents a former mansion district that used to be present in this part of West Philadelphia. He summarized that the Preservation Alliance supports the nomination. Joseph Menkevich commented that Albert Barnes was a significant individual. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, asked why the property owner would oppose historic designation, given his sensitivity to historic preservation and his care for the building. He opined that designation would reward Mr. Cook for the excellent care he has given over three decades. Mr. Moloznik responded that Mr. Cook is opposed to designation because of the mandatory imposition. He explained that the footprint of the property does not lend itself to expansion. He

explained that Mr. Cook is concerned about the uncertainty and additional expense of the permitting process, and also about current historic preservation laws and what changes could be implemented in the future, which could retroactively impact properties that are already designated as historic. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee cannot speak to that concern because it is not something that can be predicted. Mr. Moloznik responded that he understands, but that Mr. Cook is voluntarily achieving the goal of historic preservation, and he asked that the Committee give considerable weight to that fact in its recommendation. He stated that Mr. Cook would be willing to agree to provide notice in the event that he does decide to sell the property, so that the historic designation of the property could be reassessed at that time. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee's purview is to address the technical merits of the nomination, and that Mr. Moloznik should bring these matters to the attention of the Historical Commission. George Poulin, representing the University City Historical Society (UCHS), commented that the UCHS supports the nomination. He commented that it is an example of how a nomination can be prepared by someone who is engaged through conversations with the UCHS and who nominated properties that she felt were significant based on a review of the neighborhood. Juanda Myles commented that she supports the nomination. She commented that she is not aware of historic districts in West Philadelphia, and suggested that this area could be a historic district, rather than a collection of individually designated buildings.

Ms. Klein commented that Mr. Cook has been a great steward of the property, and should be proud of what he has voluntarily done. She agreed that the property is not currently threatened, but that it should be protected to maintain what Mr. Cook has achieved. Mr. Cohen agreed, and commended Mr. Cook for his maintenance of the building. He suggested that no burdens will be incurred by historic designation. He explained that the historic designation program cannot be successfully run by trusting property owners who ask to be excluded during their period of ownership.

Mr. Cohen commented that Mahlon H. Dickinson is an interesting architect, despite not being a household name. He suggested that the inclusion of historic maps would improve the nomination. He noted that another residence just to the west was designed by Dickinson and questioned if perhaps Francis J. Hill commissioned the same architect to speculatively design several mansions. Mr. Moloznik noted that a section of the roof eave on the west side of the building is built into the brick apartment building next door, as if the apartment building had to be constructed around it. He agreed that a voluntary promise from the property owner is not ideal, but that a contractual agreement that mandates that Mr. Cook would give notice upon a sale would protect the interests of the Commission. Ms. Chantry clarified that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over a property begins as of the date of the letter notifying the property owner of the proposed designation.

Mr. Cohen commented that this building and surrounding buildings are extraordinary and that he would have been interested to learn more about their evolution. He stated that the nomination relies more on the connection to Albert Barnes and the tax exemption rather than the building. Ms. Cooperman agreed, and noted that the architecture of the building has merit. Mr. Cohen observed that he has never heard of anyone taking a tax exemption walking tour, and that a better argument is for the architecture of this building and the neighborhood rather than significance tied to Albert Barnes and his tax exemption case. Ms. Cooperman disagreed in regards to significance associated with Barnes. She suggested that the property satisfies Criterion C, which reads, "reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style." Mr. Cohen agreed. He suggested that the nomination would benefit from more information about the architect and development of the property. Ms. Cooperman

commented that the Committee could recommend that, in its opinion, the property satisfies Criterion C. Mr. Cohen stated that he is not objecting to the addition of Criterion C, but opined that the tax exemption case is not significant.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 4525 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and C. Mr. Cohen abstained.

**ADDRESS: 3920 SPRUCE ST**

Name of Resource: House of Our Own

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: University City Assn. Inc.

Nominator: Corey Loftus

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3920 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3920 Spruce Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that 3920 Spruce Street, constructed in 1890, is significant for its association with the life of Philadelphia chemist, entrepreneur, and real estate developer William Weightman (1813-1904). Additionally, the property satisfies Criterion A in its association with the lives of Lin Hui-yin (1904-1955) and her husband Liang Sicheng (1901-1972), who have gained fame in China for their work as architectural historians. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the design of 3920 Spruce Street is the work of Willis Gaylord Hale (1848-1907), an architect who has significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of Philadelphia. In his independent practice, Hale designed a number of notable buildings in Philadelphia including the Mechanics' Insurance Building (1881), the Philadelphia Record Building (1881-2) and the Union Trust Company Building (1884). Unfortunately, many of Hale's buildings have been destroyed or significantly altered since construction. The property at 3920 Spruce Street is a valuable example of a largely preserved Hale design in West Philadelphia.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Corey Loftus, the nominator, was not present at the meeting. No one represented the property owner. Deborah Sanford, the owner of House of Our Own Bookstore, was present.

Ms. Cooperman inquired if the property owner or representative of the property owner was present. Since no one responded, Ms. Cooperman asked the staff if anyone has heard from the property owner. Ms. Mehley responded that the staff had not heard from the property owner, noted that the nominator, Corey Loftus, was not at the meeting.

John. P. Primiano Jr., a member of the public, inquired about the ownership of 3920 Spruce Street. Ms. Mehley responded that the owner is University City Association. Mr. Primiano asked who they are associated with. Ms. Mehley replied that they are associated with the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Cohen noted that the owner, University City Association Inc., is located in an office complex related to the University of Pennsylvania.

Deborah Sanford, owner of House of Our Own Bookstore, spoke that she was identified as the owner in the nomination's text but this is not correct. She explained that the bookstore has been

open for 47 years and has rented from University City Association Inc. during this period of time. Ms. Sanford continued that the notification of proposed designation letter from the Historical Commission was sent to the store and she took it to the owner's office. She stated she is not aware of their opinion on 3920 Spruce Street's proposed designation. Ms. Sanford noted that the nominator, who was a student working on a project, approached her at the store and asked her if she knew anything about the building and they had a long conversation about the property. Ms. Sanford stated that she was aware that it was designed by Willis Hale for some time and that the row of Hale buildings was originally six properties total (not four as nomination states). She noted that the bookstore was opened in 1971 and that the building was abandoned when they took it over and completed a good deal of work to restore it. Ms. Sanford spoke about her personal history in the neighborhood and the search in the early 1970s for a bookstore space. She stated she has no idea what the impact will be of the potential designation on her situation. Ms. Cooperman interjected that the Committee can explain what procedurally would happen in the designation process. Ms. Sanford responded that she meant what the economic impact of the designation may be on her bookstore's occupancy and lease. She continued that she has had generally a cooperative relationship with the University of Pennsylvania over many years. She expressed concern that designation could have some adverse effect on her business in terms of repairs and such but that she personally would support the building's designation.

Ms. Sanford explained that she received the initial information about Lin Hui-yin from a man named Sidney Wong, who was from Oregon State University and was doing research on Liang Sicheng. She continued that Mr. Wong came into the bookstore and told her that Lin Hui-yin had lived in the building. Ms. Sanford noted that a chance remark to Chinese students in the Graduate School of Education led to a network of people knowing about Lin Hui-yin connection to the property and now people come from China to see the building. She explained that Lin Hui-yin is an icon to many in China, for her work in architectural history, writing, and poetry, and the visitors are emotionally moved when they come to the building. Ms. Sanford concluded that she would like to see the building preserved, and in the future, beyond the bookstore's occupancy, she would like to see it as a place where people can visit.

Mr. Cohen and Mr. Schaaf commented that the building's facade has some Chinese characteristics, such as in the loggia and other elements. Ms. Cooperman stated that she had a problem with William Weightman being cited as significant in Criterion A as the developer. She pointed out that he developed many properties and it is not clear what makes this one significant because of his involvement. Ms. Cooperman stated she does not have any issue with Criterion E, as a representative work of Hale, she just did not agree with the significance of William Weightman. Mr. Schaaf stated that he thought the association with Lin Hui-yin is significant. Ms. Cooperman agreed with this. Mr. Cohen asked if they would keep Criterion A for the connection with Lin Hui-yin. Mr. Schaaf and Ms. Cooperman stated they would, just not for the connection to William Weightman.

Mr. Cohen stated that he wished the building was better documented in the nomination submitted but he believes that it is worthy of being protected. He continued that he would like to have seen more about the building's development and additional historic map research. Mr. Cohen stated that despite this, he supports the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 3920 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

**ADDRESS: 3922 SPRUCE ST**

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: John. P. Primiano Jr.

Nominator: Corey Loftus

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3922 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3922 Spruce Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that 3922 Spruce Street, constructed in 1890, is significant for its association with the life of Philadelphia chemist, entrepreneur, and real estate developer William Weightman (1813-1904). Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the design of 3922 Spruce Street is the work of Willis Gaylord Hale (1848-1907), an architect who has significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of Philadelphia. In his independent practice, Hale designed a number of notable buildings in Philadelphia including the Mechanics' Insurance Building (1881), the Philadelphia Record Building (1881-2) and the Union Trust Company Building (1884). Unfortunately, many of Hale's buildings have been destroyed or significantly altered since construction. The property at 3922 Spruce Street is a valuable example of a largely preserved Hale design in West Philadelphia.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the nomination. John Paul Primiano Jr. represented the property owner.

Mr. Primiano stated he was never given a copy of the nomination. He inquired if he could get one. Ms. Mehley responded that the notice letters sent to the property owner indicate that the nomination is posted on the Historical Commission's website. Ms. Mehley stated that she would see that he received a copy. Mr. Primiano requested that the Committee consider the rejection of the nomination because University of Pennsylvania removed the porch roof from 3920 Spruce Street and in the process damaged the 3922 Spruce Street porch roof. He continued that the University has been promising to put back the 3920 Spruce Street porch for decades and has yet to do so. Mr. Primiano argued that this situation should be resolved before the building is considered for designation. He also pointed out that the nominations are flawed because they should include 3912-14 Spruce Street and 3916-18 Spruce Street rather than just 3920 and 3922 Spruce Street. He continued that they should make the University responsible for the mess they created with these properties. Mr. Cohen asked if 3912-18 Spruce Street included the two fraternity houses. Mr. Primiano confirmed this is what he meant. He concluded by stating he wants the porch put back on 3922 Spruce Street. Ms. Cooperman responded by stating that what they have before the Committee is the present nomination for 3922 Spruce Street and they do not have authority to place such requirements on the University. Mr. Primiano inquired if review of the nomination could be delayed until something is done with the porch. Ms. Cooperman stated they could not and must review what is before the Committee, which is the nomination for 3922 Spruce Street.

Mr. Primiano asked again for a copy of the 3922 Spruce Street nomination. Ms. Mehley gave Mr. Primiano her copy of the nomination document. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Primiano if, other than trying to force the hand of the University, he was opposed to listing the property on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Primiano responded that he would like to wait until the porch work is done and would also like to see the 3912-14 and 3916-18 Spruce Street

buildings to be nominated as well. Ms. Cooperman pointed out that you could not see the Willis Hale design anymore on those buildings. Mr. Primiano stated that they should have the University put them back to how they originally looked. Ms. Cooperman responded that then it would not be Willis Hale's work; it would be someone else's. Mr. Primiano continued that it is really disturbing to him that Samuel Sloan's house at 40<sup>th</sup> and Pine Streets was destroyed and everyone should be preparing for the next time something like that happens. Mr. Cohen stated that nominating 3922 Spruce Street was a step toward that. Mr. Cooperman noted that is why they are reviewing the nomination. Mr. Cohen added that, if the nomination is approved at the Committee's meeting, the University will not be able to tear the building down like they did at 40<sup>th</sup> and Pine Streets. Mr. Primiano stated again that if the building is nominated he will not be able to get the University to repair his porch and the expense will be on his shoulders. Ms. Cooperman disagreed and stated that is not necessarily the case. She continued that Mr. Primiano is mixing apples and oranges, that the only thing that will happen with designation is that any building permit submitted for work will have to be reviewed by the Historical Commission before submission to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Primiano stated that the Department has been aware of the porch issue for awhile and has not done anything. Ms. Cooperman replied that she cannot speak to that because she has no control over the Department. She added that the work he is seeking to have done and designation are not mutually exclusive. Ms. Cooperman concluded that the building's designation may make Mr. Primiano's request to the University to fix the porch more attainable.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there was any other public comment and there was none.

Mr. Cohen stated that much of the Committee's discussion for 3920 Spruce Street applies to 3922 Spruce Street's nomination. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Schaaf agreed, noting that the only exception is that this building's nomination does not include information on architectural historian, Lin Hui-yin. Mr. Cohen added that, when you look at the building's details, it is amazing what is coming out of Hale's head. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman wished that nomination was more thoroughly researched. Mr. Cohen added that, despite this, they should still move ahead with the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 3922 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

**ADDRESS: 150 DUPONT ST**

Name of Resource: St. David's Protestant Episcopal Church of Manayunk

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. David's PE Church

Nominator: Joe Menkevich

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 Dupont Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 150 Dupont Street, including the Church (1880-81) and Parish & Sunday School (1876-77), and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that 150 Dupont Street has significant interest and value as part of the development and heritage of Manayunk in the city of Philadelphia. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that 150 Dupont Street is



reflective of an environment in an era characterized by Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival style. Both buildings are an embodiment of two distinguishable architecture styles, the Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival church building and the High-Victorian Gothic Parish & Sunday-School building, satisfying Criterion D. Satisfying Criterion H, the site is an established and familiar visual feature of the Manayunk neighborhood. Satisfying Criterion I, the site, which was largely settled in the early nineteenth century, containing a church-yard as a burial ground, has an extremely high potential for discovery of significant archaeological resources and artifacts. For its historic connections to immigrant mill workers, mill-owners, the Masonic Lodge, aid of Ireland during famine, St. David's P. E. Church has a place in the development of the Manayunk section of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J as it exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social historical heritage of the community.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Joseph Menkevich represented the nominator. Attorney William O'Brien represented the new owners of Parish Hall LLC. Attorney Melissa Murphy Weber, of Elliott Greenleaf, represented the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.

Ms. Mehley stated that an attorney representing the Episcopal Diocese of Philadelphia contacted the staff the evening before the meeting. The attorney stated that a portion of the property had been sold, with the closing occurring during the week of 2 December 2018. Ms. Mehley noted that this is the portion of the property that holds the Parish Hall/Sunday School building. Mr. Cohen inquired if this would affect the Committee's deliberation in some way. Ms. Mehley stated that it would not as the property was a single parcel at the time of notification and the owners were notified before the property transfer occurred. Mr. O'Brien stated that he is representing the new owners of the subdivided property, Parish Hall Manayunk LLC. He continued that these owners have been aware of the pending nomination for some time and he has discussed with them that they probably have sufficient development activity prior to the nomination to avoid designation. Mr. O'Brien specified that zoning permits and building permits had been issued before the Historical Commission jurisdiction attached. He pointed out that in two days the Historic Preservation Task Force is going to issue its final report and one of the things it was tasked to do was to research peer cities and identifies ways to incentivize or reward historic designation and ownership. Mr. O'Brien stated that his client would like to request that this nomination be continued as their position may be affected by the Historic Preservation Task Force's recommendations.

Ms. Cooperman pointed out that conventionally when continuances are requested they are often granted. She continued that a continuance could be requested of the full Historical Commission since this request is coming late in the process. Mr. O'Brien stated that he would ask that this be reconsidered especially in light of the fact that the Parish Hall/Sunday School building is no longer legally part of 150 Dupont Street as a matter of law. He added that he does not understand what the urgency is in considering this matter now. He noted that his client would prefer not to raise the issue that building permits have been issued and exclude the property because after the Historic Preservation Task Force releases its report there may be reasons for the owners to support the designation of the Parish House/Sunday School.

Mr. Mooney, who is also a member of the Historic Preservation Task Force Committee, clarified that the final version of the Historic Preservation Task Force report would be issued in January or February, after 30 days of public comment, and that there were no guarantees that the recommended incentives will ever be adopted by the City.

Ms. Mehley stated that the Historical Commission's staff approved an interior demolition permit application in the week before the meeting. She noted that the permit provided to the staff was listed as 150 Dupont Street and not the new address. Mr. O'Brien responded that zoning permits were issued in May and building permits were issued in October and November 2018, and he could provide copies of the permits.

Mr. Menkevich requested to speak as the nominator. He noted that the new owners of the Parish Hall were referred to as the "equity owners," which meant they had an agreement of sale, in their permit applications for the property. Mr. Menkevich stated that the Zoning Board of Approval (ZBA) did not challenge this even though their prospective plan to separate the property was based on unsworn falsification. He stated that they did not tell the ZBA that their plans involved digging up the graveyard. He stated that these people have the burial records and they know who is in that graveyard. Mr. Menkevich added that the nomination includes a map of the graveyard. Mr. Menkevich stated that he had spiritual advisers that told him to file the nomination, noting that they are buried in the graveyard, and did not want to be dug up.

Ms. Cooperman interjected it is a little late for the continuance request and that the notice went to 150 Dupont Street, the full owners of the property, and the Committee has to deal with the nomination before it.

Ms. Weber stated that the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania is the beneficial owner only, the owner of the now church and cemetery at 150 Dupont Street is the Parish of St. David's Protestant Episcopal Church of Manayunk. She explained the Parish holds the real estate in trust for the Episcopal Diocese. Ms. Weber clarified that she represents the beneficiary which is Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania. Mr. Cohen asked for clarification on what it means to be a beneficial owner. Ms. Weber responded that the property is held in a trust and the Episcopal Diocese is the beneficiary of that trust. She continued that the Parish owns the property in trust. Mr. Menkevich inquired as to who holds the deed. Ms. Weber responded that it is the Parish in trust.

Ms. Cooperman restated that the Committee has to address matters on its agenda, which, in this case, is a nomination. Ms. Cooperman added that the Committee is tasked with speaking to the technical merits of the nomination and that is what they need to do today.

Ms. Weber stated that the Episcopal Diocese would be objecting to the designation but recognizes that the Committee on Historic Designation is not at this venue, but is present if there are questions. She also wished to confirm the ownership nature of 150 Dupont Street. She continued that there has been a closing and that the church and cemetery are now owned by the Parish, and the Parish Hall is owned by the entity represented by Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'Brien noted that he is submitting to the Historical Commission a copy of the subdivision plan depicting the plot line changes that are final. He pointed out that his client did not acquire the graveyard but acquired the Parish Hall and 5-foot perimeter around the Parish Hall. Mr. O'Brien continued that the property was carefully surveyed so that it did not affect any graves. He also presented a deed of confirmation that was recorded 29 November 2018 from the church foundation to the church foundation which attaches the 1894 deed that was the last recorded deed. He noted that there were three more deeds that were part of the settlement on 29 November, but as of last night they were not available online. Mr. O'Brien stated that the legal address of the Parish Hall is 141 Krams Avenue because the building fronts on Krams Avenue.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Farnham if the Committee should proceed as she outlined it. Mr. Farnham stated that she could accept Mr. O'Brien's request for a continuance as these requests are routinely granted the first time they are proffered. He recognized that the Committee has started to discuss the property and it could be recommended to the Historical Commission to continue it to another meeting or you could reject that and move ahead with the nomination review. Mr. Cohen inquired to Mr. O'Brien if any of the permits were for a demolition request. Mr. O'Brien responded no and that he and his client had previously met with the staff and that the general feedback is their plans for the building would most likely be approved at the staff level.

Mr. Cohen inquired if the building is vulnerable if they grant a continuance. Mr. Farnham responded that the building remains under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during that time. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman discussed continuing the Parish Hall and perhaps consider the merits of the Church alone but together concluded that it would be best to continue the full nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review and remand the nomination for 150 Dupont Street to the 13 February 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

**ADDRESS: 4105-09 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Hamilton School/Radio Church of God

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Gospel Spreading Church

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4105-09 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4105-09 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property is significant for its association with Elder Lightfoot Solomon Michaux, one of the most influential African American religious personalities of his generation. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the property retains significant architectural integrity from its original construction and reflects the Late Victorian era of design in Philadelphia. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the building's use as a public library, political clubhouse, and evangelical church exemplify the cultural, political, and social heritage of the community and city.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination. Anthony W. Hurst, Sr. represented the property owner.

Mr. Hurst explained that he is a lifelong member and associate pastor of the church and agreed that the building holds the significance outlined in the nomination. He stated that in 1991 he was intrigued by the cornerstone. A mason in the congregation, he continued, sawed through the mortar and discovered a lead box that contained documents related to the school's 1891 construction. He elaborated that he then researched the building and found that it was

constructed over a former graveyard. The bodies, he continued, were moved to a cemetery outside a VA hospital. Mr. Hurst stated that his great-grandfather discovered the building, which had been vacant for approximately ten years prior to the establishment of the congregation in 1934. Prior to their occupancy, he added, the building found use as a school and also housed the Republican Club. He noted that inside the building, the locations of the gaslights are still visible.

Mr. Grossi stated that Benjamin Leech prepared the nomination on the Alliance's behalf. He added that sometimes buildings come before the Committee and Commission and have one consistent use over its period of occupation. Sometimes, he continued, buildings come before the Committee and Commission that have had multiple uses over time, and this is an example of a building with multiple uses. He noted that the building housed the Hamilton School, an early branch of the Free Library system, the Republic Club, and notably the Church of God. That layering of history, he continued, lends the building its significance. He then asserted that Criterion A is appropriate for those varied uses and its association with Michaux. He contended that it is not the most ornamental building from the street but is largely intact.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. David Traub of Save Our Sites described the building as handsome, adding that it could also satisfy Criterion D. He noted that the roofline continues the sense of the residential architecture to the east and completes the block, though he observed that there is an empty lot immediately to the west of the property. He stated that it would be nice to see something on that site to continue the row of houses. He then commended Mr. Hurst for supporting the designation of the property, adding that many congregations have abandoned their sacred spaces.

Mr. Mooney responded that portions of the adjacent parking lot immediately to the west of the church were recently added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as the African Friends to Harmony Burial Ground. He commented that the site is potentially the oldest African American cemetery in West Philadelphia.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the architect's name Joseph Anshutz, questioning whether there is a link to Thomas Anshutz. Mr. Leech replied that he did not know and that he had a difficult time finding a consistent spelling.

Mr. Cohen called the building handsome, reiterating that it has many layers of history. He stated that the case was effectively made for what is, in many ways, a landmark building. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Hurst if he found the original plans when he removed the cornerstone. Mr. Hurst affirmed, adding that it has been twenty-seven years since he opened the corner of the building and found the documents, though he still has the plans at home. He explained that the plans were in a lead box and that after removing the box and its contents, he took a photograph of the congregation and prepared a message for the next individuals who find the contents in 2091. He then recounted the recent history of the awnings at the Chestnut Street façade.

Mr. Cohen inquired about the window over the eastern entrance, adding that historic photographs show that the infill area once accommodated a large window. He asked Mr. Hurst what is behind it. Mr. Hurst answered that the sanctuary was once located upstairs, but in 1985 the church renovated the first floor and relocated the sanctuary. He explained that there is still a sanctuary on the upper level that is used for overflow. The founder's study, he added, remains on that level as well.

Mr. Schaaf noted that fifteen of Anshutz's public schools remain standing, ten of which are listed on the National Register as part of the Philadelphia Public Schools Thematic Resources District. Eight, he continued, remain in use as schools.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 4105-09 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

Mr. Mooney excused himself from the meeting.

### **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/8<sup>th</sup> 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. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nicholas Baker represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the nomination had been continued from a previous meeting.

Mr. Baker stated that he wrote the nomination almost ten years ago and added that he hopes the nomination satisfies the criteria. He commented that it has an impact on the history of the city's development.

Ms. Cooperman asked whether anyone was present to represent the owner, and questioned whether that would be the Department of Public Property. Ms. Keller responded that the staff notified the Department of Public Property, the Office of Transportation Infrastructure Systems, the Streets Department, SEPTA, and PATCO. She clarified that the previous continuance request came from Public Property.

Ms. Cooperman then asked if anyone was present who represented any of the agencies notified. Anthony Santaniello identified himself as a representative of the Streets Department, adding that the Department supports the nomination.

Mr. Farnham explained that he has had extensive discussions with the Department of Public Property, which is the official property owner of most entrances. He elaborated that the Department of Public Property had a series of questions, which he worked through with them. Now, he continued, there is no opposition from the Department. SEPTA, he asserted, still has some concerns, which were expressed when the district nomination was presented to the Planning Commission, as it is required under the preservation ordinance. Mr. Farnham stated that he believed SEPTA may participate in the discussion at the Historical Commission meeting, but that he did not think any party was contesting the historical or architectural significance of the entrances.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance had previously expressed support of the thematic district nomination and wanted to reiterate the support today.

The Committee members commended the nominator for compiling such comprehensive information. Mr. Cohen questioned why it took eight years to come before the Committee from the date the nomination was submitted. He then commented that the nomination is well-documented. He asked whether there was a specified color for painting the cast iron elements. Mr. Baker replied that he has not seen one, adding that he has not located the original drawings or specifications for the entrances. Mr. Cohen responded that the entrances are varied, though the PATCO entrances are red. Mr. Baker clarified that a coloring convention was enacted well after the entrances were constructed.

Mr. Cohen asked whether an individual was responsible for the design. Mr. Baker answered that he did not find an architect responsible for any of the designs, though they were all constructed by the Department of City Transit.

Mr. Cohen asked if ownership is shared by the City, SEPTA, and PATCO. Mr. Baker clarified that the entrances are all owned by the City of Philadelphia with a long-term lease to SEPTA and an operating agreement with PATCO.

Mr. Schaaf thanked Mr. Baker for the profound compilation of research. He then opined on the significance of the urban furniture and the connotations implied in the subway enclosures, which he referred to as quintessential hallmarks of the city we inhabit. He added that the nomination provides a wonderful chance to appreciate the entrances and elevate them through historic designation.

Ms. Klein agreed with Mr. Schaaf's statements, adding that the detail of the photographs is remarkable. Mr. Schaaf commented that the transit history detailed in the nomination is profound and well done.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, H, and J.

## **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.