

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

**13 FEBRUARY 2019, 9:30 A.M.
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	x		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.	x		
Janet Klein		x	
Bruce Laverty	x		
Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.	x		
Douglas Mooney	x		

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Tom Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
- John Manton
- Joseph J. Menkevich
- Sean McCauley, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania
- Steven Peitzman, East Falls Historical Society
- J.M. Duffin
- David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
- Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
- Melissa Weber, Diocese of PA
- John Buffington, Historical Society of Frankford
- Oscar Beisert
- Nick Lobuglio, University of Pennsylvania
- Starr Herr-Cardillo
- Nancy Pontone, Tudor East Falls
- John Sereda
- Amy Lambert
- Adam Lampl, Toll Brothers

Ben Davis
Jed Levin, PAF
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Jeff Dvoretz, Midwood
Rick Young, Midwood
Peter Kelsen, Blank Rome
Thom Nickels

AGENDA

JEWELERS' ROW HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Jewelers' Row Historic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The proposed district is located on Sansom Street primarily between S. 7th and S. 8th Street, and along a portion of S. 8th Street between Chestnut and Walnut Streets. The nomination contends that the proposed district, which is composed of 57 buildings constructed between 1800 and 2015, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H and J.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination states that as the site of Carstairs Row, Printers' Row, and Jewelers' Row, the district has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of Philadelphia and exemplifies the community's cultural, economic, and historical heritage. In support of Criteria C and D, the nomination asserts that the architectural resources of Jewelers' Row span more than two hundred years and include significant examples of multiple building types and architectural styles important to Philadelphia's history, including (but not limited to) Federal rowhouses, Victorian and early 20th-century commercial lofts, and Depression-era and postwar commercial fronts. The district includes surviving works by a number of architects whose careers have significantly influenced the architectural development of the City, including Thomas Carstairs, Collins & Autenrieth, Theophilus P. Chandler, Frank T. Watson, Louis Magaziner, and possibly even Frank Furness, supporting an argument for Criterion E. Furthermore, under Criteria H and G, the nomination contends that owing to its unique location along a block of Sansom Street offset from Center City's otherwise regular grid and distinguished by an iconic and distinctive streetscape, the district represents an established and familiar visual feature of Philadelphia and constitutes a distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural and architectural motif.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Jewelers' Row Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H and J. The staff proposes updating 113-15 S. 8th Street as a non-contributing addition to 731 Sansom Street. The staff also proposes that all buildings be categorized as Significant, Contributing or Non-Contributing without separate determinations for façades and storefronts.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the review of the nomination for the Jewelers' Row Historic District to the June 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented 27 property owners in the proposed historic district.
- John Sereda, owner of 128 S. 7th Street.
- Paul Steinke of Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia represented the nominator.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham stated that an attorney representing the majority of the building owners has requested that the matter be continued to the June 2019 Committee on Historic Designation meeting and the August 2019 Historical Commission meeting.
- Mr. Phillips stated that he is representing 27 parties, who own 34 properties in proposed district, and confirmed the continuance dates requested. He continued that he understood that Mr. Steinke had submitted a letter requesting a shorter continuance period. Mr. Phillips stated that he respectfully asks that issues for the length of the continuance be addressed at the 8 March 2019 Historical Commission meeting. He noted that, for now, they are requesting the additional time for a full and complete response to the merits of the nomination.
- Mr. Sereda affirmed that he is in agreement with Mr. Phillips on the continuance request and would like to see the nomination reviewed at the June 2019 Committee on Historic Designation meeting and the August 2019 Historical Commission meeting.
- Mr. Steinke stated that the Preservation Alliance is not objecting to a continuance but is suggesting that a continuance to the April 2019 Committee on Historic Designation meeting and June 2019 Historical Commission meeting. He contended that they see no reason to push the matter to almost Labor Day and have not yet hear a reason why it is necessary.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that they have the option of leaving the matter to the Historical Commission to determine the length of the continuance or the Committee on Historic Designation can make a recommendation.
- Mr. Cohen commented that the nomination is very well prepared, well researched, and concisely written. He stated that he thinks the case it makes for historic significance is very clear. Mr. Cohen continued that he doubts if the owner representative's arguments are going to be based on historic significance but rather they will be about matters of the priority of a demolition permit or not and that is something to which he cannot speak. Mr. Cohen commented that he would prefer a shorter continuance although he is not sure there should be any continuance.
- Ms. Cooperman explained the Committee on Historic Designation has a convention of recommending that continuance requests be honored. She continued that this does not mean the Committee has to do that but it is conventionally what happens-- at this point it is a recommendation to the full Historical Commission and they can make up their minds.
- Mr. Phillips agreed that the nomination is thorough and acknowledged that the district is nominated under nine Criteria for Designation. He contended that the property owners should have a full and equal opportunity to address the merits of

each of the Criteria. Mr. Phillips pointed out that the nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission on in March 2017 and was not accepted until December 2018. He noted whereas the nominator had almost two years to fully prepare the nomination, the property owners should have an equal opportunity to look into this and put the owners' side of the story out there. Mr. Phillips continued that this is a district that impacts 56 properties not just one and remarked on the length of time other district reviews have taken. He commented that Lutheran Seminary took approximately six months, Awbury Arboretum took two years, and other districts have taken a good amount of time presumably to address the merits, retain experts, and that is the reason for seeking a continuance. He concluded that the property wished to have sufficient time to review and flesh out their case.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Committee on Historic Designation found that it typically supports continuance requests proffered by property owners.
- The Committee found that the properties would remain protected by the Historical Commission during the continuance period.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of the Jewelers' Row Historic District to the April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and the June 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission, not the June and August 2019 meetings as requested by the property owners' attorney.

ITEM: Jewelers' Row Historic District				
MOTION: Recommend to continue review to April 2019 CHD and June PHC meetings				
MOVED BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Mooney				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

SOCIETY HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT INVENTORY AMENDMENT

Proposed Action: Amendment

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

OVERVIEW: The Philadelphia Historical Commission, the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation agency, designated the Society Hill Historic District on 10 March 1999 and has been regulating it for historic preservation purposes since that time. The Historical Commission found that the historic district satisfies several Criteria for Designation, including Criterion I, the archaeology criterion. While regulating the district, the Historical Commission has realized that a small number of properties in the district were incorrectly classified in the historic district's inventory of properties. The Historical Commission recently requested that its staff propose an amendment to the historic district's inventory of properties to correct the faulty classifications.

The staff of the Historical Commission proposes to amend the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District to remove conflicts from several entries. In 28 instances, the inventory classifies sites as Non-contributing, but also notes that they have "Archaeological Potential." By definition, Non-contributing indicates that the site in question has no historical significance including archaeological significance. The staff proposes to remove the conflicts, either by reclassifying the sites as Contributing or Significant when the site has undergone no or limited ground disturbance since designation; or by retaining the Non-contributing classification and removing the claim of archaeological potential when the site has incurred significant ground disturbance since designation. In many cases, the sites classified as Non-contributing are not, in fact, stand-alone properties with property tax accounts, but are merely parts of larger properties. In those cases, the staff proposes to collapse the entries for the parts of the properties into the larger properties, which were already classified as Contributing or Significant. In all cases, it has been assumed that the original assertion of archaeological potential made at the time of the designation of the historic district was correct. No sites have been newly evaluated for their archaeological potential as part of this exercise; the conclusions reached at the time of the designation of the historic district have been accepted at face value.

If implemented as proposed, the amendment would reclassify 15 properties from Non-contributing to Contributing with archaeological potential; consolidate 10 inventory entries into entries for other parts of the tax parcels that are already classified as Contributing or Significant; and remove the archaeological potential note from the inventory entries for three Non-contributing properties where significant ground disturbance has occurred since designation. Although the amendment only involves 28 sites, those sites are owned by 139 entities, all of whom have been notified of this proposed amendment. Several of the sites, primarily parking lots shared by townhouse developments, have multiple property owners. The attached pages provide descriptions of each of the 28 amendments with mark-ups of the proposed revisions to the associated inventory pages.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adoption of the proposed revisions to the Society Hill Historic District Inventory to remove the conflicts between "Non-contributing" and "Archaeological Potential."

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:11:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the amendment to the Committee on Historic Designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Mooney, the archaeologist member of the Committee on Historic Designation, asked whether, if reclassified to contributing, these lots would still be subject to review-and-comment jurisdiction only, or would they be subject to plenary jurisdiction.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that, if reclassified as proposed, the sites in question would be subject to plenary jurisdiction and could be regulated for archaeological resources.
- Mr. Mooney noted that these sites can be considered “undeveloped sites” and therefore would be limited to review-and-comment jurisdiction only, even if reclassified.
 - Mr. Farnham disagreed, stating that the definition of an “undeveloped site” in the Commission’s Rules & Regulations stipulates that it is a site that the inventory indicates has no historical value including archaeological value. With the proposed change, the inventory would now indicate that the sites in question have archaeological value and are therefore not “undeveloped” and therefore subject to plenary or full jurisdiction.
- Mr. Mooney asked about the three properties that have been redeveloped since the district was created and are proposed to retain their non-contributing classifications. He asked if we have evidence that they were excavated to 25 feet below grade. He said that, if they have not, they may still hold archaeological resources.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that several sites have been redeveloped. Most would be reclassified as contributing, despite the redevelopment. The three in question, however, have been completely redeveloped, leaving no part of the site undeveloped. Mr. Farnham conceded that the staff did not review the architectural plans for the new construction to see how deep the foundations were laid, but could investigate.
 - Mr. Mooney suggested that the fully redeveloped properties should be reclassified as contributing unless it can be shown that the excavations for the construction were at least 25 feet deep.
 - Mr. Farnham offered to review the architectural plans for the new construction.
- Mr. Mooney stated that he is concerned that the district nomination attributes archaeological potential to all sites in the district, but the inventory only calls out about 75 sites for archaeological potential. He asked which sites can be regulated for archaeology.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that he believes that all sites in the district classified as contributing and significant can be regulated for archaeology, even if the inventory entry does not explicitly attribute the sites with “archaeological potential.” He added that the Historical Commission might have difficulty regulating for archaeology at sites classified as non-contributing.
- Mr. Mooney asked if the owners of the properties had been notified of the proposed changes to their property’s descriptions and classifications in the district inventory.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the property owners implicated by this proposed amendment have been notified as required in the preservation ordinance.
- Mr. Mooney stated that the entire historic district should be reconsidered for archaeological potential. He listed several properties in the historic district that have archaeological potential. He noted that there are many former cemeteries in the historic district.

- Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Cohen thanked the staff for preparing the amendment. Mr. Cohen asked why no archaeology was required when the hi-rise was constructed at the southwest corner of 5th and Walnut. Mr. Farnham responded that that site was one that included an inherent contradiction in the inventory. The inventory classifies the site as non-contributing, but also notes that it has “Archaeological Potential.” By definition, non-contributing indicates that the site in question has no historical significance including archaeological significance. When the Historical Commission reviewed the project, it noted the contradiction and was obligated under the zoning code to reconcile the contradiction in favor of the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jed Levin of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum stated that archaeological resources have been largely unprotected in Philadelphia. He thanked the Historical Commission for taking this small step toward correcting that problem. He stated that the Society Hill Historic District was designated under Criterion I, the archaeological criterion, and every site within the district should be regulated for its archaeological potential. He claimed that, even with this change, the entire district will not be protected under Criterion I.
- Joe Menkevich stated that he supports the amendment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The proposed amendment would remove the contradiction that has prevented the Historical Commission from requiring archaeology at these sites;
- The three sites that are proposed to retain their non-contributing classifications should be evaluated to ascertain whether the recent construction at those sites destroyed any archaeological potential;
- The Historical Commission should reevaluate the entirety of the Society Hill Historic District to identify other sites with archaeological potential.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend the adoption of the proposed amendments except Amendments 2, 5, and 19. Those sites should be reclassified as contributing unless architectural plans demonstrate that the recent construction destroyed all archaeological potential. The Committee also recommended that, in the future, the Historical Commission consider reevaluating all sites in the Society Hill Historic District for archaeological potential.

ITEM: Society Hill Historic District Amendment				
MOTION: Adoption of the amendment with conditions				
MOVED BY: Mooney				
SECONDED BY: Cohen				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

2036-40 CECIL B MOORE AVE

Name of Resource: McDowell Memorial Presbyterian Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the Macedonia Free Will Baptist Church

Nominator: Amy Lambert

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church property, which features building campaigns from the 1870s and 1893, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the 1893 McDowell Memorial Presbyterian Church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Richardsonian Romanesque style, and is representative of the national trend towards theatrical, auditorium-plan churches in the late nineteenth century. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the 1870s chapel is significant as the work of significant local architect Henry Augustus Sims, and that the 1893 sanctuary is significant for its stained-glass windows, many of which were designed by the preeminent Tiffany Studios.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:35:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Amy Lambert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. DiPasquale explained that they had not heard from the property owner. Ms. Lambert noted that she received a phone call from the nephew of the founder of the Macedonia Free Will Baptist Church, who thanked her for the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman noted that she wrote a National Register nomination that listed the property on the National Register of Historic Places.
- The Committee agreed that it is a remarkable building and is also significant for its association with Henry Augustus Sims.
- The Committee discussed the location of the original entrance to the Sims chapel.
- The Committee discussed J. William Shaw, a relatively unknown architect.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property was constructed in phases by two different architects.
- The 1870s portion of the building is significant as the work of an important local architect, Henry Augustus Sims.
- The 1893 church embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Richardsonian Romanesque style, and is representative of the national trend towards theatrical, auditorium-plan churches in the late nineteenth century.

- The 1893 sanctuary is significant for its stained-glass windows, many of which were designed by the preeminent Tiffany Studios.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property at 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: 2036-40 Cecil B Moore Avenue				
MOTION: Recommend for designation; Criteria C, D, and E				
Moved BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Laverty				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

2224 and 2226 W TIOGA ST

Name of Resource: Conkling-Armstrong House
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: Gabriel Crowley; Naomi Turner Riley
 Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
 Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street, known as the Conkling-Armstrong House, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the twin building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F. Under Criteria A and F, the nomination asserts that the buildings, which were developed as terra cotta materials demonstration houses showcasing a multitude of terra cotta architectural elements, are unique. The nomination contends that the Chateausque style buildings satisfy Criteria C and D. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the buildings are significant for their association with architect Edgar V. Seeler.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:43:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Amy Lambert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owners.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee suggested some minor corrections to the text of the nomination.
- The Committee stated that the design of the building draws from many different styles, though it is referred to as Plateresque on page 5. The Committee argued against the use of the term, clarifying that the building draws more from the French aesthetic than Spanish, though it agreed that the overarching style is correctly identified as Chateausque.
- The Committee discussed the inclusion of Criterion A.
 - Mr. Lavery argued that the nomination demonstrates that the properties satisfy Criterion A based on the influence of Conkling and Armstrong in the building industry. He contended that as the Workshop of the World, Philadelphia was known for its building industry and building materials and stated that Conkling-Armstrong had national significance in that industry. He added that the company is a nationally known name that had clients beyond Philadelphia.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance expressed support for the nomination, stating that the buildings have long captured the imagination of the preservation community in Philadelphia and remain on shortlists of properties that are likely candidates for designation. He noted that what is particularly striking about the buildings is their reflection of not just residential architecture but of commercial history. This is a built advertisement, he contended, adding that there are not many buildings like them. He further supported all Criteria for Designation selected in the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The buildings are comprised of a vast array of terra cotta elements manufactured by the Conkling-Armstrong Terra Cotta Company, a nationally significant building supplier, satisfying Criterion A.
- The buildings represent an eclectic collection of architectural styles, though they largely reflect the Chateausque style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The buildings showcase the design of renowned Philadelphia architect Edgar V. Seeler, satisfying Criterion F.
- Built as demonstration houses, the buildings uniquely exhibit the Conkling-Armstrong Terra Cotta Company's portfolio of terra cotta elements, satisfying Criterion F.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 2224 and 2226 W. Tioga Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and F.

ITEM: 2224 and 2226 W Tioga Street				
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A, C, D, E, and F				
MOVED BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Milroy				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

6626 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Pelham Pharmacy, Clement B. Lowe Drugstore & Dwelling

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Hebron Tabernacle of America

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the former pharmacy, constructed between 1904 and 1905 for druggist Dr. Clement B. Lowe, stands as a rare commercial building in the planned Pelham development. The building was designed by architect David Knickerbacker Boyd, a prolific Philadelphia-based architect who designed numerous residential buildings for builders Wendell & Smith in the northern and western areas of the City and whose work and publications significantly influenced the architectural and economic development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, satisfying Criterion E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:51:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert and James Duffin represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if the staff has had communication with the property owner.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that the property owner has not contacted the staff; however, neither notice letter was returned as being undeliverable.
- The Committee remarked that this building is executed in a more robust architectural style than most of the buildings in the Pelham development.

- The Committee asked if there is a Philadelphia Register or National Register historic district for the Pelham neighborhood.
 - Mr. Farnham responded that Pelham is not designated as a historic district on either Register.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, spoke in support of the designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- 6626 Germantown Avenue stands as a rare commercial building in the planned Pelham development, satisfying Criterion J.
- The building was designed by prolific Philadelphia-based architect David Knickerbacker Boyd, whose work and publications significantly influenced the architectural and economic development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, satisfying Criterion E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6626 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.

ITEM: 6626 Germantown Avenue				
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria E and J				
MOVED BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Mooney				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

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

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.

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.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:02:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Joe Menkevich and John Manton represented the nomination.
- Attorney Melissa Weber, of Elliott Greenleaf, represented the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.
- Sean McCauley, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Menkevich stated that he brought recent photographs showing the current work on the Parish Hall building. He asked that these be placed in the Historical Commission's files but not be part of the present discussion. He also noted changes made by staff to the original draft nomination he submitted, pointing out that he had originally wished to nominate 150 Dupont as multiple types of historic resources rather than a single type of historic resource, a Building. Mr. Menkevich concluded by requesting that the Committee focus on the nomination rather than paperwork or other items submitted by the other parties.
- Mr. Manton pointed out that church's tower dominates Manayunk's landscape and is very important. He noted that at one time there were discussions of collecting donations from the Manayunk community to make it a town clock rivaling that of St. John's, its counterpart on the other southern end of Manayunk. Mr. Manton continued that the Parish Building, the church, the fence that surrounds it, and the burial ground all form one campus and the nominators believe that they are historically correct and of great value and should not be separated one from the other.
- Ms. Milroy inquired if there is an active congregation in this church.
 - Mr. Menkevich responded that the congregation is struggling and is economically challenged. He noted that half of the pews have been removed from the church and the Parish Building, owing to the level of disrepair, is no longer used by the congregation.
- Ms. Weber stated that she is representing the church foundation, which is the beneficial owner of the church. She explained that a representative from St. David's Church was unable to attend the meeting owing to illness. Ms. Weber pointed out that the property has been subdivided and the Parish Building is no longer owned by St. David's. It is now owned by the entity that purchased it, which is represented by

- Mr. O' Brien. She pointed out that the nomination application refers to all of 150 Dupont Street, but the property now has two owners. She noted that recognizing the division of the property and the rehabilitation activity is relevant to the discussion despite an earlier reference by the nominator to not be distracted by this and the associated paperwork and focus solely on the nomination.
- Ms. Weber stated that she thinks that this Committee needs to recognize that calling out the cemetery for its archaeological significance is quite bristling to those associated with the church. She pointed out that Pennsylvania has its own strict set of rules and laws regarding cemeteries and that could not be more of an expression of one's religion. She cautioned against designating something such as a cemetery as violating the First Amendment. Ms. Weber added that the nominator elaborated on some topics such as identifying streetscapes, objects, site, and structures. Ms. Weber stated she is not as well-versed on this topic as the Committee members, she thinks that some pause should be given, whether it is within this Committee's purview or it is something St. David's Church or the church foundation to the Commission in March, your treading very close or treading upon First Amendment protections in the expressions, for example stained-glass windows that were referenced.
 - Ms. Cooperman interrupted and stated that because of the agenda, they would have to stop there. She commented that the Committee understood the point Ms. Weber was making but that this information is better presented to the Historical Commission itself, and that the Committee's purview was focused on the technical merits of the nomination.
 - Sean McCauley stated that he represented the Bishop's interests in property for the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania and was attending the meeting in the event that the Committee would have informational questions for him.
 - Ms. Mehley stated that Mr. O'Brien contacted the staff a few minutes prior to the start of the meeting to explain that he would not attend. Ms. Mehley relayed the message that Mr. O'Brien's clients, the new owners of the Parish Building, are not in favor of the designation.
 - Mr. Mooney stated that Pennsylvania has some of the weakest laws in the country to protect cemeteries. He continued that the nomination is correct in that it has archaeological potential but that does not mean that anyone is advocating exhuming the remains. He contended that including Criterion I in this case is a powerful tool for insuring that with unknown future circumstances graves do not get disturbed in the site, which is the goal of including this criterion. Mr. Mooney stated that he guarantees there are more graves in the cemetery than there are standing headstones and including Criterion I in this case would ensure that any unmarked graves in the cemetery would be preserved in perpetuity.
 - Mr. Cohen stated that he is glad the Mr. Menkevich and Mr. Manton brought the nomination before them because it is a significant element of the built landscape in Manayunk and the church is an important building. He noted that the nomination provides a lot of evidence but not much narrative. Mr. Cohen stated that most nominations are structured differently than this one. This nomination presents extensive evidence but not much analysis of that evidence. Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination is a collection of documents, some on point, some not. Mr. Cohen stated that the nominator should at least organize the documents chronologically and connect them with a narrative. Mr. Cohen stated that the property has historical significance, but he would not include Criterion A. Mr. Lavery and Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Cohen regarding Criterion A. He added that some of the

documentation should be moved to the appendix while keeping the arguments central to the Criteria in the main document.

- Ms. Cooperman stated that finding the argument in the nomination requires a lot of hard work. She continued that there is a lot of good information in the nomination and a lot of excellent sources.
- Mr. Menkevich inquired if he should revise the nomination.
 - Ms. Cooperman stated that he should not. She explained that the Committee's role to determine whether the evidence presented demonstrates whether the property meets the proposed Criteria.
 - Ms. Cooperman stated that there is enough evidence in the nomination to make a positive recommendation to the Commission.
- Mr. Cohen stated he does not know how to respond to the division of the property.
 - Ms. Cooperman responded that it is a property with more than one owner and the Committee has heard from the property owners. She noted this does not change our technical review.
- Mr. Cohen inquired if the nomination needs to be amended to include two parcels.
 - Mr. Farnham proposed that the Committee's recommendation include the two parcel addresses.
 - Ms. Cooperman noted that perhaps the Committee should refer to the "property as proposed" in the nomination.
 - Mr. Farnham stated that the address changes had no adverse implications for Committee's review and recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub commended the nominators for the aerial photograph included in the nomination showing the overall property with the buildings and burial ground. He pointed out that the photograph successfully shows the urban context of the property.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Under Criterion C, the property reflects an environment in an era characterized by Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival style.
- Under Criterion D, both buildings are an embodiment of two distinguishable architecture style—the Gothic Ecclesiastical Revival church building and the High-Victorian Gothic Parish & Sunday-School building.
- Satisfying Criterion H, the site is an established and familiar visual feature of the Manayunk neighborhood.
- Satisfying Criterion I, the site has a high potential for discovery of significant archaeological resources and artifacts.
- Under Criterion J, St. David's P. E. Church has a place in the development of the Manayunk section of Philadelphia, it exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social historical heritage of the community for its historic connections to immigrant mill workers, mill-owners, the Masonic Lodge, and aid of Ireland during famine.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 Dupont Street as defined in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, H, I, and J.

ITEM: 150 Dupont Street				
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria C, D, H, I, and J				
MOVED BY: Laverty				
SECONDED BY: Cohen				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

204 S 12TH ST

Name of Resource: Minton Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: South 12th Street Owner LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street that corresponds to Parcel Number 002S15-0050. The overall property at 204 S. 12th Street is comprised of several smaller parcels that have been consolidated into one property with one tax account. Several buildings that have been interconnected internally stand on the property. The building in question was constructed in the early nineteenth century and subsequently modified several times. Only the front façade of the building facing S. 12th Street is visible to the public. The side and rear facades are party walls abutting adjacent buildings.

The nomination contends that the building is significant for its association with Henry Minton, a prominent African-American caterer, and his family. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Minton owned the property from 1853 to his death in 1883. He resided at the property and operated a restaurant and catering business out of it. His family continued to own it until 1893. The nomination defines the period of significance from 1853 to 1893. The nomination provides a lengthy biography of Minton and his offspring.

The nomination contends that the building was constructed at some point between 1818 and 1836, was renovated in 1853 and 1854, and the front façade was replaced about 1880. In fact, the front façade of the building was replaced in a different style after the Minto family sold the property to Thomas C. Kelly in 1893.

The building has undergone numerous changes over time and appears to bear little resemblance to the building purchased by Henry Minton in 1853, which was presumably a Greek Revival rowhouse. The original three-story front façade was replaced with a taller step-gabled façade, by Kelly, a subsequent owner. The nomination claims that front façade was replaced about 1880 but provides no evidence for this assertion. The post-Minton façade was then significantly altered in the late twentieth century. The first floor was rebuilt to accommodate the commercial use, when several adjacent buildings were interconnected. Double glass doors with a metal and glass canopy and large brick stoop were added; the windows were replaced

with a small single window; the first floor was clad in metal; and the entire façade was painted. Owing to the alterations at the ends of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the building does not retain its mid nineteenth-century appearance, when Minton occupied it.

Neither Philadelphia’s historic preservation ordinance nor the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations explicitly mandate an integrity test as part of the designation process, but, nonetheless, an integrity test is inherent in the designation process. Before designating, the Historical Commission should find that a property retains sufficient integrity to convey its historical significance. Without integrity, a building cannot convey its history to the public. The National Register provides a roadmap for evaluating integrity; it recognizes a property’s integrity through seven aspects or qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Of the seven, this property retains integrity of location and, arguably, integrity of setting. Owing to its many alterations that postdate Minton, it has no integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. In a case like this, where the significance is predicated on association, the direct link between a property and the person for which the property is significant, the lack of integrity of association should preclude designation. The building does not retain sufficient integrity to warrant designation. It is noteworthy that another nomination by the same nominators proposing designations of other portions of this tax parcel asserts that sufficient integrity is required for designation, but that same test is not applied to this portion of the property. The nomination for the Camac Baths at 204 S. 12th Street states that “By 1959, it appears that an entrance to the Camac Baths existed on S. Twelfth Street, and while that section of the building may have significance, it no longer has sufficient integrity to convey that significance as shown in the photographs from 1959, the 1970s, and 2018.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff acknowledges that Henry Minton is an important figure in Philadelphia’s history and certainly worthy of commemoration but recommends that the portion of the property in question at 204 S. 12th Street does not satisfy Criteria for Designation A and J, owing to the altered state of the building. The only publicly accessible façade of the building lacks integrity; it was constructed after Henry Minton’s death and after the Minton family’s ownership of the property. The publicly accessible portion of the property has no association with the Mintons. Criterion A authorizes the Historical Commission to designate a property if it “is associated with the life of a person significant in the past.” Owing to the new façade, this property is not associated with the Mintons. Criterion J authorizes the Historical Commission to designate a property if it “exemplifies the ... heritage of the community.” Owing to the new façade, the only publicly accessible façade of the building, this property cannot exemplify the heritage of the community as that heritage and community are defined in the nomination.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:30:32

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.
- Attorney Peter Kelsen represented the property owner and opposed the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained the relationship between this building and those of the following two nominations, noting that the first two are part of the same tax parcel, which includes several structures that are internally connected. The third property, 204 S 12th Street, is owned by the same entity, but is a separate property.

- Mr. Kelsen stated that the owner agrees with the staff overview and recommendation and does not believe the property warrants designation. He noted that the building is approximately 1,800 square feet, but the designation would cover a parcel that is closer to 17,000 square feet. He expressed concern over the inherent ambiguity and flaw in that fact.
 - Ms. Cooperman disagreed, noting that the proposed boundary to be regulated is shown in an aerial photograph in the nomination.
- The Committee asked if the nominator would like to respond.
 - Mr. Duffin stated that the Committee and Commission should be explicit in terms of what, if anything, they choose to designate.
 - Mr. Duffin disputed several points in the staff overview, including that the nomination does not document the construction of the building, and that the 1907 insurance survey implies that Thomas C. Kelly, the owner after the Mintons, reconstructed the façade after the Minton family occupancy. He referenced an 1897 advertisement for rentals at the address as a “Pompeian brick front apartment house.”
 - Mr. Duffin acknowledged that the dates included on the nomination form should be cited in the nomination. He explained that the 1880 construction date for the façade was taken from the 2009 inventory of the proposed Washington Square West Historic District nomination, but the 1984 National Register nomination for the East Center City Commercial District lists the building as circa 1890, which seems more in keeping with the architectural style. He opined that this construction date fits within the ascribed period of significance.
 - Mr. Farnham asked why the Minton family members would construct a new façade on the building the same year that they sold the property. He opined that it is more likely that a new property owner would purchase a property and then construct a new façade.
 - Mr. Duffin opined that the Mintons may have wanted to fit in with the elite African American community that developed around St. Thomas Episcopal Church, which purchased a property across the street in 1888.
 - Mr. Beisert commented that, from an aerial perspective, the building retains the gable roof and dormer windows that pre-date the reconstructed façade. He opined that the building could be restored to its earlier period. He opined that it is important to designate sites related to underrepresented communities.
- Mr. Kelsen explained the ways in which the building has been altered, including extensive storefront alterations.
- Mr. Kelsen opined that a historical marker or other interpretation of the site would be more appropriate than listing on the Philadelphia Register.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that there is nothing in the Philadelphia Code that explicitly describes integrity, and that the Historical Commission may take integrity into account if it wants to, but that it is not required to account for it.
- Mr. Cohen opined that there are some stories that are not easy to expose in the public sphere, including the story of Minton as part of a whole class of black caterers who achieved upper-middle-class status. He noted that there is not a lot of visual evidence of these stories on the streets of Philadelphia. Mr. Cohen suggested that the Committee should have slightly lower standards for how much evidence is required when telling such stories.

- Mr. Cohen commented that, if Mr. Minton died in 1893, the stepped façade could have been constructed during his lifetime.
 - Ms. Cooperman corrected him, noting that Mr. Minton died in 1883, but that his family, most of whom were not in the same business, owned the property until 1893.
 - Mr. Cohen suggested that the success of the family could be evident in the façade, if it was constructed prior to 1893.
- The Committee asked if the upper floors of the façade are constructed of Pompeian brick underneath the paint.
 - The nominators responded that they did not know, but that was how it was described in the National Register nomination.
 - Mr. Farnham showed a current photograph of the building to the Committee and Mr. Cohen concurred that the front façade is constructed of Pompeian brick, which has been painted.
- The Committee questioned whether, with the uncertainty of the date of the front façade, this building is an articulate physical representation of Minton's success as a nineteenth-century caterer.
 - Ms. Cooperman noted that, with the William Still house, only the face brick had been replaced but the form of the original building was still evident. She opined that she is not sure that is the case here.
 - The Committee agreed that, from an aerial perspective, the original building that would have dated from Minton's tenure is visible.
- Mr. Beisert commented that the building is a contributing resource in the East Center City Commercial Historic District.
 - Ms. Cooperman disagreed, noting that the original nomination has been superseded.
- Mr. Mooney opined that the nomination brings up important points that deserve additional debate at the Commission level. He stated that he has no problem accepting Criterion A for its association with the Minton family.
- The Committee questioned what constitutes relevant materiality, or what visual features convey a property's significance.
 - Ms. Cooperman noted that the visual features of a property do not always explain why it is significant.
 - Ms. Milroy noted that there is a façade of a certain scale, and the context and location within the city.
 - Ms. Cooperman explained that the National Park Service defines integrity as the ability of a property to convey its significance, through seven different aspects (location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association), but that these are tied to the National Register criteria, not the Philadelphia Register criteria.
 - Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Historical Commission debate these questions.
 - Mr. Cohen opined that this building may have a more sympathetic audience at the Committee than at the Commission. He suggested that the Committee should report favorably on this nomination, even if the façade was constructed after Minton's death and the Minton family ownership.
- Mr. Kelsen acknowledged the significance of Minton, but asked the Committee to explain the connection of the visible building to the Minton family. He argued that there are clearer and more appropriate ways to acknowledge the history of Minton, or of marginalized communities.

- Mr. Cohen noted that the second and third floors of the building reflect a period prior to the 1890s, and opined that he would like to see the building survive and be interpreted with signage.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the nomination. He opined that Minton was an important member of a marginalized community, and argued that the Commission has designated properties with lower integrity in the past.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination and the importance of recognizing an important member of the African American community. He opined that the building does not completely lack integrity, and that a PHMC historical marker could provide context for the site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- There is a need to tell a story that is untold, and that the normal standards regarding the relevant materiality of the building may need to be lowered.
- Henry Minton was an important member of the African-American catering community.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 204 S 12th Street, known as the Minton Residence, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

ITEM: 204 S 12th Street, Minton Residence				
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A and J				
MOVED BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Milroy				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Lavery	x			
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	5	0	0	1

Mr. Lavery excused himself from the meeting.

204 S 12TH ST

Name of Resource: Camac Baths

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: South 12th Street Owner LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street that appears to correspond to Parcel Numbers 002S15-0035, 0247, and 0248. The boundaries of the proposed designation depicted on Page 2 and Page 15 of the nomination are not consistent, but it appears that the nomination seeks to designate what now might be described as three structures, one at the southeast corner of Chancellor and Camac Streets, one to the east on Chancellor, and one to the south on Camac. The nomination refers to the building at the corner as the 1907 Building; the building to the east as 1204-06 Chancellor Street and Building 2; and the building to the south as 201-03 S. Camac Street. The tax parcel at 204 S. 12th Street, which includes most of the block bounded by S. 12th, St. James, Camac, and Chancellor Streets, is comprised of several smaller parcels that have been consolidated into one property with buildings that have been interconnected internally.

The nomination contends that the buildings are significant for their associations with the Camac Baths, a bathhouse that first catered to a Jewish clientele and then to a gay and bisexual clientele. The nomination also contends that the older structures at 1204-06 Chancellor Street and 201-03 S. Camac Street housed various clubs at times, and therefore participate in the history of the area as a neighborhood of clubhouses. The nomination contends that the grouping of three structures satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J.

The nomination proposes that the three structures in question should be designated as historic for their histories as club buildings and a bathhouse. None of the three buildings was built to serve those purposes identified for commemoration. The so-called 1907 building was constructed as a light manufacturing or warehouse building in 1905 and then converted to provide support services for two nearby residential hotels in 1910 before being converted to a bathhouse in 1928. Since serving as a bathhouse, an overbuild was added and the building has been used as a gym and offices.

The non-descript building at 1204-06 Chancellor Street began life in the first half of the nineteenth century as a two-story store and was used for various commercial and office purposes. It served for a short time as the T-Square Club, an architect's club, from 1897 to 1914, when the club moved to permanent quarters on Quince Street. As an aside, the Quince Street T-Square Club building is designated as historic. The building on Chancellor was then used as offices and a tailor's shop before being incorporated into the adjacent bathhouse in 1938. The exterior has been altered extensively. It has lost all features that identify it as a former clubhouse.

The non-descript building at 201-03 S. Camac Street began life in the first half of the nineteenth century as a row of small court houses at 201 and a larger rowhouse or stable at 203. The houses were significantly altered to create one building that housed the Stragglers Club in 1912. The party walls and roofs were removed, new window openings were created, and a large rear addition was constructed at that time. The club appears to have vacated the building about 1920, after about eight years of service as a club. By 1925, it was being used as a beauty parlor. It was incorporated into the bathhouse in 1942. The exterior has been altered extensively. It has lost all features that identify it as a former clubhouse.

Several other structures on the block were also incorporated into the bathhouse over time, but those structures are not proposed for inclusion in this nomination. The nomination states that:

By 1959, it appears that an entrance to the Camac Baths existed on S. Twelfth Street, and while that section of the building may have significance, it no longer has sufficient integrity to convey that significance as shown in the photographs from 1959, the 1970s, and 2018.

Wrongly identifying the buildings at 1206, 1208, and 1210 S. 12th Street (they are actually 206, 208, and 210), the nomination also states that:

The Camac Baths would again be enlarged in the 1950s with a mid-century building being added at 1206 and 1208 S. Twelfth Street. A photograph from 1959 shows this addition, which was later expanded to the corner, subsuming the property at 1210 S. Twelfth Street. However, as stated in the physical description, only the earlier portions of this complex are subject to the proposed designation due to the physical changes of the façade of the building at the northwest corner of S. Twelfth and St. James Streets.

While the nomination claims that the bathhouse structures on 12th Street do not retain sufficient integrity to be included in the nomination, it nonetheless proposes the designations of the other bathhouse structures, even though they also suffer from a lack of integrity. The three structures proposed for designation under this nomination have also been significantly altered and retain little if any integrity. Their alterations include infilled openings, new openings, replacement doors and windows, glass block, stucco, fire escapes, mechanical equipment, additions, partial demolitions, Zagar murals, and other changes. The three structures included in the nomination, which were not purpose built as either a bathhouse or clubhouses, have lost any historic character and integrity they may have had from their many unsympathetic alterations. Owing to their lack of integrity, they fail to inform the public of any historical significance they may have had and therefore fail to qualify for designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that that the portion of the property at 204 S. 12th Street proposed for designation does not retain sufficient integrity and therefore does not satisfy Criteria for Designation A, G, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:18:45

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.
- Attorney Peter Kelsen represented the property owner and opposed the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee opined that the boundary of the nomination is very confusing. There are two different boundaries shown in the nomination.
 - The nominators clarified that the yellow boundary shown on page 15 is the correct boundary. The red line on page 2 is the boundary of the tax parcel.
 - Mr. Kelsen noted that the three buildings included in this nomination are about 6,600 square feet out of a parcel that is approximately 17,000 square feet.

- Mr. Kelsen stated that there is nothing visual that identifies this property as the Camac Baths, and that they have been heavily modified over time. He also argued that, while it was a street of clubs, these buildings were used as clubs for only a few years.
- Mr. Kelsen acknowledged that there was a social and cultural element to bath houses, and that a historical marker could convey that history, but that this property does not warrant designation for that association.
- Mr. Cohen asked whether the “generator” was one of the three structures included in this nomination.
 - Mr. Duffin noted that the generating station is the building marked as “1907” on the plan.
 - Mr. Kelsen responded that the power house was used by the St. James Hotel at 13th and Walnut Streets and then was adapted later into the Camac Baths.
 - Mr. Farnham clarified that the building was a power house at the lower levels, but also included laundry facilities and housing for support staff for both the St. James Hotel and the St. James Annex. Mr. Farnham noted that in 1909, the City approved the connection of the three buildings by underground tunnels. It served in that capacity until the late 1910s.
 - Mr. Farnham noted that the Sanborn map as well as a newspaper advertisement from the teens explain in detail how each level of the buildings was used.
- Mr. Beisert read a prepared statement. He disputed the staff overview and recommendation as insensitive and stated that the overview focuses too heavily on issues of integrity. He noted that the nomination excludes the gym building and focuses largely on the building at the southeast corner of Camac and Chancellor, the oldest part of the Camac Baths, which looks similar to how it did during the period of significance. He presented a series of photographs. Mr. Beisert stated that the staff assertion that the buildings were not purpose-built bath houses is moot, because immigrant populations and businesses often reused existing buildings. He also noted that very few buildings in the 1930s and 1940s would have been built to serve the LGBTQ community. He also noted that the “little street of clubs” features several clubs that were assembled from multiple buildings. He noted that the Camac Baths were given a Spanish Mission treatment by 1934, but opined that it was more likely given that treatment at the time of its conversion in 1928. Mr. Beisert opined that a portion of the rooftop overbuild was constructed during the building’s use as a bath house, and that the Commission has approved rooftop additions on historic buildings. Mr. Beisert explained that this portion of the property retains many of its historic features present during the period of significance. He noted that the building is a contributing resource on the National Register. He reiterated that the Camac Baths has a rich history related to immigrant and marginalized communities, starting as a Turkish bath house, a Jewish schvitz, and a discrete meeting place for gay men in the post-World War II period through 1984.
- Mr. Farnham clarified that the staff recommendation was neither predicated on the fact that the building does not retain any elements that indicate that it was a bath house, nor because it was not a purpose-built bath house. He noted that the staff has recommended designation of numerous buildings that are recognized for significance unrelated to the original purpose of the building, and would have done so here, too. He objected to the assertion that the staff is insensitive to the histories of marginalized communities. The staff’s recommendation was predicated on the fact

that this group of buildings is so altered that it has lost its ability to convey its historical significance.

- Mr. Farnham presented photographs of the buildings included in this nomination and described their alterations.
- Mr. Cohen acknowledged the significance of the under-told stories of gay bath houses and Jewish bath houses. He explained that, especially for gay bath houses, they would have tried to be less visible in the public sphere. It was noted that the Camac Baths had very large projecting signs on both Walnut and 12th Streets.
- The Committee members agreed that only the building at the corner of Camac and Chancellor Streets is clearly recognizable as it was during the period of significance. They noted that the building's position on a back street speaks to the necessarily covert nature of its history.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, spoke in support of the designation. He opined that the intersection of Camac and Chancellor Streets is relatively unchanged, aside from the removal of the sign identifying the building as the Camac Baths. He noted that this building was part of the LGBTQ social and cultural development of the neighborhood, which is now known as the Gayborhood.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, spoke in support of the designation, but opined that Mr. Beisert should have a vision for the building's rehabilitation.
- Thom Nickels commented that the building retains a patina and noted that the area was important to the LGBTQ community.
- Joe Menkevich stated that he attended the Camac Baths and was accepted as a straight person.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Camac Baths were significant to the Jewish immigrant and LGBTQ communities.
- It is important to tell the stories of under-represented and marginalized communities.
- The building labeled in the nomination as dating from 1907, at the corner of Camac and Chancellor Streets, retains sufficient integrity to represent the historical significance of the Camac Baths, but the buildings known in the nomination as 1204-06 Chancellor Street or Building 2, and 201-03 S. Camac Street do not retain sufficient integrity to satisfy the Criteria.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building known as the 1907 building in the nomination, which is part of the larger property at 204 S. 12th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, G, and J, but that the buildings known as 1204-06 Chancellor Street or Building 2, and 201-03 S. Camac Street in the nomination do not retain sufficient integrity to satisfy the Criteria.

ITEM: 204 S 12th Street, Camac Baths				
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A, G, and J				
MOVED BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Cooperman				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty				x
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	4	0	0	2

200 S 12TH ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 200 South 12th Street Owner LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 200 S. 12th Street, a four-story commercial and residential building at the southwest corner of 12th and Chancellor Streets. The building was constructed in the late 1890s.

The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion for Designation C: it reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style; and Criterion D: it embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen. The nomination asserts that the building is “a distinctive example of the Commercial Style,” is “a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival style, and “emulat[es] the external characteristics of the Chicago School.” The staff contends that the building does not characterize any “distinctive architectural style” or embody “distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style.”

The nomination classifies the porch as a Colonial Revival feature and cites the portico at the Bourse Building to corroborate the claim; the Bourse Building is clearly not a Colonial Revival building. The nomination cites the pilasters at the porch as Colonial Revival features; they are not uniquely Colonial Revival. The nomination wrongly points to the symmetry of the façade as a Colonial Revival feature; all styles that spring from Classical architecture feature symmetrical main facades. The nomination asserts that the double-hung windows are Colonial Revival features; such windows are not unique to the Colonial Revival but are common to many architectural styles. The nomination cites the “decorative pendants” as Colonial Revival features; they are not typical of the Colonial Revival but are common to many styles based on Classical and Renaissance precedents. The nomination claims that the cornice evidences the Colonial Revival style; the cornice is not Colonial Revival in style. The two features of the building that might rightly be labeled Colonial Revival, the watertable and the dark or glazed headers on the first-floor north façade, are not mentioned in the nomination.

The nomination also claims that the building exhibits distinctive features of the so-called Chicago or Commercial style. However, any such similarities with that so-called style are merely superficial. The nomination acknowledges that the subject building of four stories is not as tall

as the six to 20 stories that typify buildings of this style. The nomination claims that the flat roof is evidence that this building is of that style; the flat roof is in no way indicative of this particular style. The nomination claims that the building's masonry walls are indicative of the style; the claim is untenable. The nomination claims that the bays with triple double-hung windows are evidence of the style; Chicago style windows, one of the hallmarks of the style, are not double hungs, but are tripartite windows with a larger fixed central window flanked by two narrower casement windows. The nomination claims that the cornice is evidence of this style; the wide, wood, bracketed cornice is stylistically unrelated to the cornices of Chicago style buildings. The nomination notes that Chicago style buildings have steel skeleton structures and claims that the structural system of this building is unknown; the 1916 Sanborn map indicates that this building has masonry, load-bearing walls, not a steel skeleton, the hallmark of the Chicago style. Finally, the nomination notes that buildings of this style typically include ground-floor storefronts; this building does not.

The building is neither Colonial Revival nor Chicago or Commercial style. It features some aspects of the Italian Renaissance style including the recessed front porch with columns, the broad bracketed eaves, and the cartouches and swags, but it is not a "distinctive" example of the style. At best, it is an unremarkable, vernacular version of the Italian Renaissance style, but more likely should be considered an eclectic assemblage of vaguely Classical motifs. The staff suggests that the building might qualify as a Contributing resource in a historic district but does not rise to the level of meriting individual designation, an assessment that is echoed by a Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey Form for the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 200 S. 12th Street characterizes a "distinctive architectural style" or embodies "distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style" and therefore fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:00:03

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination.
- Attorney Peter Kelsen represented the property owner and opposed the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kelsen agreed with the staff overview and recommendation, disputed the nomination's assertion of the architectural style, and opined that the building had been heavily modified.
- The Committee also concurred with the staff overview and recommendation. They agreed that the nomination did not make any cogent arguments for significance, but noted that the building maintains many of its original features.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, spoke in support of the designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building would contribute to a historic district.

- The building is does not represent Colonial Revival or Chicago-Commercial styles of architecture.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 200 S. 12th Street characterizes a “distinctive architectural style” or embodies “distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style” and therefore fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation.

ITEM: 200 S 12th Street				
MOTION: Decline to designate				
Moved BY: Cohen				
SECONDED BY: Milroy				
VOTE				
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain/ Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	x			
Jeff Cohen	x			
Janet Klein				x
Bruce Laverty				x
Elizabeth Milroy	x			
Douglas Mooney	x			
Total	4	0	0	2

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:39 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Committee on Historic Designation are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.

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.