

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

**12 MARCH 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
- Ben Leech
- David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
- Oscar Beisert
- Johnette Davies, Amtrak
- Tania Nikovic, Amtrak
- Alex Balloon, Tacony CDC
- Elizabeth Stegner, UCHS
- George Poulin, UCHS
- Michael Mattioni, Mattioni Ltd.
- Clifford L.
- Claudia Lyles
- Daniel Saidel
- Peter A. Lamlein
- Antonette Hubbard
- Georgette Bartell, Penn Knox Neighborhood Association
- Celeste Morello
- Mary McGettigan

Oscar Beisert
Julia Marchetti, Preservation Alliance
Sue Patterson, Penn Knox Neighborhood Association
Troy Hannigan, Old First UCC
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting
Reverend Michael Caine, Old First UCC
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Steve Peitzman

AGENDA

152-78 W BERKS ST

Name of Resource: Peter Woll & Sons

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: West Berks Community Development LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 152-78 W. Berks Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation G, H, and J.

Under Criteria G and H, the nomination argues the buildings are part of a significant group of buildings that served as the industrial complex of Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, Curled Hair. Under Criterion J, the nomination that Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, Curled Hair exemplified the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the industrial age in Kensington in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff acknowledges that the property at 152-78 W. Berks Street, as part of the former Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company, shares in the same industrial history as the building across the street at 173 W. Berks Street, but suggests that that industrial history of the manufacturing firm is better memorialized and conveyed by the building at 173 W. Berks Street. The staff recommends that the Historical Commission considering designating only the Berks Street façade with the ghost sign at 152-78 W. Berks Street as a structure and not the entire building and site. The staff questions the value to the public of compelling a private property owner to retain and preserve a non-descript, modest industrial building of low integrity and limited reuse potential in perpetuity.

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the review of the nomination of 152-78 W Berks Street to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Michael Mattioni represented the property owner.
- Nominator Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Mattioni stated that the developer applied for the demolition permit in May 2018 and has been pursuing it ever since. He stated that they also received approval for the redevelopment of the property from the Zoning Board; an appeal of the variance granted that has slowed down the demolition process. He added that the project has been in process and is requesting a continuance to allow the demolition permit process to be completed. Mr. Mattioni pointed out that this process was started long before the nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Beisert stated he had no objection to the continuance. He noted that the staff recommendation focused on the protection of the W. Berks Street façade, specifically the wall with the ghost signage. Mr. Beisert asked that, if the current demolition permit is not valid, the developer consider preserving the signage portion of the façade because it is a visual feature that is appreciated by the neighbors.
- Ms. Cooperman acknowledged the receipt of a packet of information related to the developer’s project submitted by Mr. Mattioni to the Committee at the meeting. She stated that this type of information is typically submitted in advance of the meeting. Ms. Cooperman stated that supporting information should be submitted in advance of a meeting so that Committee members and the public have time to review.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Committee concluded that it would support a continuance to the next Committee on Historic Designation meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of 152-78 W. Berks Street to the 17 April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ITEM: 152-78 W Berks Street					
MOTION: Recommend continuing the nomination review to the April 2019 meeting.					
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	0	2

156 W SCHOOL HOUSE LN

Name of Resource: Boxwood

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Teen Challenge Training Center Inc.

Nominator: Penn Knox Neighborhood Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 156 W. School House Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that Boxwood reflects the Colonial Revival style of architecture as applied to upper-class suburban residences in late nineteenth-century Philadelphia. The nomination further argues that the “cottage-stable” at the rear of the property represents Gothic Revival cottage motifs popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that Boxwood was designed by Mantle Fielding, a prolific and significant architect who influenced the built environment in Northwest Philadelphia at the turn of the twentieth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 156 W. School House Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. However, the staff asserts that the so-called “cottage-stable” at the rear of the property does not reflect the Gothic Revival style and, therefore, does not satisfy Criteria C and D as presented in the nomination. While the building has a cross gable, a typical feature of the Gothic Revival, it does not have any other features characteristic of the style. The building may have served as a barn, potentially for an earlier residence predating Boxwood, and was later updated with a cross gable. The staff recommends that the so-called “cottage-stable” contributes to the site’s historical significance but does not exhibit sufficient character-defining features to be considered reflective of or exemplary of the Gothic Revival style.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:03:28

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Farnham stated that he would have no involvement with the review of this nomination because he has been involved in litigation with a partner of the potential buyer. He stated that the staff contact is now Meredith Keller.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the request to continue the review of the nomination for 156 W. School House Lane to the June 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Sue Patterson of the Penn Knox Neighborhood Association represented the nomination.
- No one represented the owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Patterson stated that the property is under agreement with the developer, but a recent community meeting showed that there was no support for the proposal to construct 42 new housing units at the rear of the property. She asked that the designation process not be dragged out for multiple months, conjecturing that the current owner is waiting for settlement so as not to be involved when the Historical

- Commission votes on whether to designate. She claimed that the property will likely sell before that time. She then commented that she supports a continuance, since the owner is not local and the designation process is not familiar to that owner. She asked that the continuance not be granted for three months, adding that, should the property be designated, she would like that status to be clear to a future buyer.
- The Committee asked for clarification on whether the nominator is opposed to the length of the continuance request.
 - Ms. Patterson replied that she would prefer the continuance be less than three months, because she does not believe that amount of time is necessary. Ms. Patterson speculated that the owner is allowing time for a settlement to some buyer, though not necessarily the developer whose plan received no support from the community organization. She added that the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, an adjacent property owner, may be interested in purchasing the property. She suggested that the sale would be completed sooner than three months.
 - The Committee noted that could recommend that the Historical Commission continue the nomination to the Committee's April meeting, and another continuance request could be made at that time, if necessary.
 - Mr. Cohen stated that the continuance procedure is getting out of control, adding that a cogent case has been made for the property's significance. He noted that he came to the meeting prepared to discuss that matter and suggested that the nomination be reviewed at the Committee's next meeting. Others noted that properties are protected as though they were designated when property owners request continuances. Granting continuances requested by property owners reinforces ultimate designations because they limit claims that can be made on appeal.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that he has no opinion on the zoning issue, adding that he does not object to the continuance request.
- Neighbor Georgette Bartell stated that the house has been vacant for six or seven months and that she would like to see the designation process resolved more quickly.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- A one-month rather than three-month continuance would be preferable, though the property owner may request a second continuance, if necessary.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend continuing the review of the nomination of 156 W. School House Lane to the April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and the May 2019 meeting of the Historical Commission, not the June and July 2019 meetings as requested by the property owner's attorney.

ITEM: 156 W. School House Lane					
MOTION: Recommend continuing the review to the April CHD meeting					
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	0	2

322-40 RACE ST, AKA 153 N 4TH ST

Proposed Action: Reclassification

Property Owner: Elders + Deacons, the Minister Trustees

Applicant: Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the building at 153 N. 4th Street as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. It is currently listed as contributing to the district.

The lot at 153 N. 4th Street is not a tax parcel; it is part of the larger tax parcel known as 322-40 Race Street, which includes the Old First Reformed United Church of Christ building facing Race Street and two rowhouses facing N. 4th Street. Despite being a single tax parcel, the property has three entries in the historic district’s inventory. The church building is classified as significant. The rowhouse at 151 N. 4th Street, which was constructed about 1760, is classified as significant. The rowhouse in question at 153 N. 4th Street, which was constructed in 1974, is classified as contributing. The rowhouse in question is Neo-Georgian in style, but is not a reconstruction of a building that stood on the site. The history of the building is fully documented in the applicant’s submission.

When the Historical Commission designated the Old City Historic District on 12 December 2003, it debated the endpoint of the period of significance, ultimately setting it 1929. At the end of the review, the Historical Commission voted “to approve the Committee on Historic Designation’s recommendation to designate the Old City Historic District with the following two amendments: that the boundary between Front and S. 2nd Streets be extended south from Ionic to Walnut Street; and that date of significance be established at 1676 to 1929 with the stipulation that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as ‘non-contributing’ unless already individually designated.” The building at 153 N. 4th Street was constructed in 1974, 45 years after the end of the period of significance, and has never been individually designated. According to the Historical Commission’s decision to designate the district, the building at 153 N. 4th Street should have been listed as non-contributing, but was instead wrongly classified as contributing. The Historical Commission made a clerical error when it failed to classify 153 N. 4th Street as non-contributing in the district inventory, as required by the Commission’s designation action.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission correct the Old City Historic District inventory entry for 153 N. 4th Street and reclassify the building as non-contributing to the district, pursuant to the rule established by the Historical Commission when

designating the district on 12 December 2003, “that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as ‘non-contributing’ unless already individually designated.”

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

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the reclassification request to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Nick Kraus of Heritage Consulting Group represented the reclassification request.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee suggested that the demolition date for the earlier building, and the construction date for the existing building, could have been narrowed down using historic aerials.
 - Mr. Kraus explained that the demolition permit was from 1966, but there was no definitive information found to show that the building was demolished right away, hence the inclusion of the “circa” with the 1966 demolition date.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sights, requested photographs of the building and asked questions, requiring the staff and Committee to explain the application for a second time. Several suggested that Mr. Traub preview the meeting materials provided to all interested parties in advance of the meeting to avoid misusing the Committee’s time. Mr. Traub referred to the building as a “reconstruction.”

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The existing building is not a “reconstruction” of the historic building which once stood at this site, but rather is a Colonial Revival style building constructed in 1973 or 1974.
- The Historical Commission established a firm rule while designating the Old City Historic District that all buildings that were not previously individually designated and that were constructed after 1929 would be classified as non-contributing. This building was not previously individually designated and was constructed after 1929 and therefore should have been classified as non-contributing.
- The reclassification from contributing to non-contributing would correct a clerical error in the Old City Historic District inventory.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission correct the Old City Historic District inventory entry for 153 N. 4th Street and reclassify the building as non-contributing to the district, pursuant to the rule established by the Historical Commission when designating the district on 12 December 2003, “that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as ‘non-contributing’ unless already individually designated.”

ITEM: 322-40 Race Street, AKA 153 N. 4th Street					
MOTION: Reclassify building as non-contributing to Old City Historic District					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Lavery					
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	0	0	0	0	2

1018-20 AND 1032 N FRONT ST

Name of Resource: Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church and Rectory
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia
 Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
 Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front Street as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The proposed designation includes both the Church of the Immaculate Conception, constructed in 1870-71, and its rectory, the northwestern portion of which was constructed in the early 1880s, and the southeastern portion of which was constructed in 1909. The proposed designation includes two parcels, but the nominated buildings do not fully conform to the boundaries of the parcels. Portions of the rectory stand on both parcels. The nomination contends that the properties satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. The nomination argues that the church, designed by significant ecclesiastical architect Edwin Forrest Durang, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Lombard Romanesque style, satisfying Criteria D and E. The rectory addition was designed by George I. Lovatt, Sr., also a significant architect with a broad Archdiocesan portfolio, satisfying Criterion E. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the properties represent the development of the Northern Liberties community, which expanded in response to a significant influx of Irish immigrants to Philadelphia in the mid-nineteenth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1018-20 and 1032 N. Front Street satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:18:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. DiPasquale noted that she has not been in contact with the property owner, but did email the notice letters to attorney Michael Phillips, who frequently represents the Archdiocese.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. He commented that he has spoken with former parishioners who are in favor of the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee stressed that, regarding revival styles, architects of that period were not looking at the “real thing,” but were looking to an idea of the real thing. Unless a design is a true archaeological copy, showing the source material is not necessarily relevant or helpful.
- The Committee disagreed that the building represented the Lombard Romanesque style, but was instead a contemporary style of the 1870s. In that way, the building embodies the appearance and style of the period.
 - Mr. Beisert asked the Committee to identify the building’s style.
 - The Committee noted that the style is difficult to characterize.
 - Mr. Cohen suggested looking at German architects of the period, and that it may be a derivation of the Rundbogenstil.
 - Ms. Cooperman noted that it is acceptable to not identify a style, and that mid-to-late-nineteenth century buildings are often eclectic and do not perfectly fit one particular stylistic category.
 - The Committee commented that Criterion C may be more applicable than Criterion D.
- The Committee suggested that image captions provide full citations/finding aids, particularly for images from the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. It is not sufficient to cite “HSP.”
- The Committee agreed that both buildings are worthy of preservation.
- Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination contains critical errors that should be fixed.
- Ms. Milroy questioned how much influence Archbishop Wood and the priest at the time would have had over the design and construction over the church. She noted that Durang is a significant Catholic architect. She noted that there are buildings in Ireland that look similar.
 - The Committee discussed whether this was an Irish- or German-Catholic congregation.
 - Ms. Morello weighed in that there were Irish, German, and Slovaks in the neighborhood.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the building was constructed at an important point in Durang’s career.
- Mr. Cohen questioned the dates of the rectory building.
 - Ms. DiPasquale clarified that there was an earlier, smaller rectory constructed in the early 1880s, to which a large addition was added by George I. Lovatt Sr. in 1909.
- Mr. Cohen noted that, while the interior is not under consideration, the interior is remarkable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The properties are significant under Criterion E for their association with Edwin Forrest Durang and George I. Lovatt, Sr.
- The properties represent the history of the community, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J, and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: 1018-20 and 1032 N Front Street					
MOTION: Recommend designation, Criteria E and J.					
MOVED BY: Laverty					
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	0	2

1045-49 SARAH ST

Name of Resource: Otis Elevator Company Boiler and Engine House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Antal Group Inc.

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1045-29 Sarah Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former boiler and engine house of the Otis Elevator Company, built in 1904, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the property is significant in the development of Fishtown/Kensington as part of the Morse Elevator Works and the Otis Elevator Company. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the building is representative of industrial power plant design of the early twentieth century. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the building is part of the earliest, extent, coherent industrial complexes in Fishtown, but does not propose to designate the complex as a district. Many of the other properties associated with the former Morse and Otis Elevator Companies were individually designated in 2015 and 2016.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1045-49 Sarah Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but not Criterion G.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:37:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner during the review. *The owner arrived subsequently, during the review of 3819-31 Chestnut Street (audio recording time: 01:54:00-01:58:00). He stated that he just received notice of the review and requested a continuance of the review. Ms. Cooperman explained that the*

Committee had already reviewed the nomination and offered its advisory recommendation. She advised the owner to attend and participate in the Historical Commission meeting. The owner asked the Committee to re-review the nomination. Mr. Farnham explained that that would not be possible under the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations and reiterated that the recommendation of the Committee is advisory to the Historical Commission itself, which will review the nomination and the Committee's recommendation at a public meeting on Friday, 12 April 2019. Mr. Farnham noted that the Historical Commission could remand the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation for review at a subsequent meeting to provide the owner an opportunity to participate in both meetings.

- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cohen asked why the staff did not feel that the property satisfies Criterion G.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that Criterion G is “part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural, or architectural motif,” but that the nomination does not demonstrate how this individual building does that. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the previously-designated buildings that were part of the historic complex were not designated under Criterion G.
 - Mr. Beisert responded that this block of Fishtown has a strong industrial feeling.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that that might have been applicable were the nominator to propose a district, but this nomination is for an individual building.
- Mr. Cohen opined that Criterion D as an engineering specimen for its may be more applicable than Criterion C.
 - Mr. Beisert responded that he usually thinks of Criterion C as more applicable to a type or pattern of building.
 - Mr. Cohen disagreed.
- Mr. Cohen questioned Criterion A, and how this building is significant at a national or citywide level.
 - Mr. Beisert responded that it was part of Otis Elevator Works, which was a significant elevator company, and that it represents the industrial development of this part of the city.
 - Mr. Cohen opined that the industrial history of this area is more significant to the neighborhood than at the city or nationwide level.
- Mr. Cohen suggested that the history and significance of the Morse Williams Company be contextualized within the broader history of elevator manufacturing in the United States.
 - Ms. Milroy noted that there is a discussion of Morse Williams preceding the section on the history of elevators in the United States.
- Ms. Cooperman explained that “association” and “last surviving” are not necessarily an appropriate basis for significance. Something is not significant simply by virtue of still being there. Significance must be established within a context. If this is an important site for its association with Otis, the nomination should compare how it is significant in relationship to other sites that are associated with Otis.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The argument made in the nomination for the building’s significance as representative of industrial power plant architecture satisfied Criterion D rather than Criterion C.
- The nomination did not satisfactorily demonstrate that the property satisfied Criteria A or G.
- The nomination demonstrated that the property was significant as part of the industrial development of the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

ITEM: 1045-49 Sarah Street					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria for Designation D 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 Lavery	x				
Elizabeth Milroy	x				
Douglas Mooney					x
Total	4	0	0	0	2

10800 KNIGHTS RD

Name of Resources: Saint Michel/Drexel House
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: Frankford Hospital
 Nominator: Celeste Morello
 Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of a larger property at 10800 Knights Road, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the 1870 mansion satisfies Criterion for Designation A. The nomination argues that the Addison Hutton-designed mansion is associated with the Drexel family, including Francis A. Drexel and his daughter, Philadelphia’s only native-born saint, Katharine Mary Drexel. Saint Katharine Drexel founded the first religious order for Roman Catholic nuns here, known as the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament. Several later additions to the main building are included within the proposed boundary but are considered non-contributing for the purposes of the historic designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:53:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Nominator Celeste Morello 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 requested that Ms. Morello greatly improve the legibility of the images used in her nominations, and include figure numbers.
 - Ms. Morello confirmed that she visited the site, took photographs, and then photocopied those photographs for the purposes of the nomination.
 - Ms. Chantry explained that the staff inserted clearer Google Street View images as a means of supplementing the illegible images.
- The Committee commented that Addison Hutton is an architect of historic significance and therefore Criterion E should be included.
- Ms. Morello commented that this is the only existing residence of Saint Katharine Drexel.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building is associated with the Drexel family, including Francis A. Drexel and his daughter, Philadelphia’s only native-born saint, Katharine Mary Drexel, satisfying Criterion A.
- The mansion was designed by Addison Hutton, satisfying Criterion E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that Saint Michel, also known as the Drexel House, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

ITEM: 10800 Knights Road, Saint Michel/Drexel House					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A and E					
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	0	2

10800 KNIGHTS RD

Name of Resources: Chapel of the True Cross

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Frankford Hospital

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Chapel of the True Cross, part of a larger property at 10800 Knights Road, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former shrine, opened in 1933 as part of the Drexel Estate, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the shrine is associated with the Drexel family, as it was commissioned by Louise Drexel Morrell, the daughter of Francis A. Drexel, and was intended as a public pilgrimage site for praying over a sacred relic, a piece of the True Cross upon which Jesus Christ died. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the Chapel of the True Cross is the work of architect George I. Lovatt, Sr., who was commissioned to design numerous Catholic churches in Philadelphia and South Central Pennsylvania and who served as Philadelphia's City Architect under Mayors Joseph S. Clark Jr. and Richardson Dilworth.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Chapel of the True Cross, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:03:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello 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.
- Ms. Morello commented that the Archdiocese and its representatives did not ask her to prepare this nomination, but that she did so as an historian and Roman Catholic.
- The Committee asked Ms. Morello if she knows what happened to the relic.
 - Ms. Morello responded that no one knows what happened to the relic.
- The Committee commented that this is a remarkable work of George Lovatt.
- The Committee suggested the Criterion C be added owing to the impact that Modernism was starting to have in the 1930s and how it affected this design, which is more early Christian than true Romanesque but with a Modernist sympathy.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Peter Lamlein, an expert in northeast Philadelphia history, commented that he was born and raised next to this property. He explained that his family were caretakers for the Morrells and Drexels. He spoke about the history of this area and voiced his support for the designation.
- 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 shrine is associated with the Drexel family, as it was commissioned by Louise Drexel Morrell, the daughter of Francis A. Drexel, and was intended as a public pilgrimage site for praying over a sacred relic, a piece of the True Cross upon which Jesus Christ died, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building is the work of architect George I. Lovatt, Sr., who was commissioned to design numerous Catholic churches in Philadelphia and south-central Pennsylvania, satisfying Criterion E.
- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the emergence of a Modernistic influence on a classical design, satisfying Criterion C.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Chapel of the True Cross, part of the larger property at 10800 Knights Road, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and E.

ITEM: 10800 Knights Road, Chapel of the True Cross					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A, C, and E					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Lavery					
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	4	0	0	0	2

4619-25 LONGSHORE AVE

Name of Resource: Tacony Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Tacony Club

Nominator: Alexander Balloon

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4619-25 Longshore Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the purpose-built Tacony Club building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the clubhouse, constructed in 1908, reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Italian Renaissance Revival style of architecture. The nomination further argues that the clubhouse, commissioned by the Tacony Club, a social and political organization founded in 1887, exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of Northeast Philadelphia and the Tacony neighborhood, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4619-25 Longshore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:15:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Alex Balloon represented the nomination.
- Daniel Saidel, attorney, and Claudia Lyles, Chief Executive Officer of Keystone Foundation and Keystone Academy Charter School, represented the equitable owner, Keystone Foundation, a subsidiary nonprofit for the Keystone Academy Charter School, currently under agreement of sale to purchase the property.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Saidel explained that he only learned of the proposed designation the night prior because an employee of the school read about it on Facebook. He stated that the Tacony Club, the owner of the property, did not inform him of the meeting. He explained that the Keystone Academy Charter School has an agreement of sale on the property and has been under agreement since 10 December 2018. He stated that he attempted to contact the owner's representative last night but learned that he is currently out of the state. Mr. Saidel asked for a 90-day continuance to allow time to review the nomination and understand the implications of designation. He explained that they intend to repurpose the building as a school.
- Mr. Balloon asked if the property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.
 - The Committee confirmed that the property would remain under the Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.
 - Mr. Balloon responded that he sees no reason to not grant a 90-day continuance, given this information.
- Mr. Saidel asked the Committee to clarify what is meant by the Historical Commission maintaining jurisdiction during a continuance.
 - Ms. Chantry explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections would require that the Commission review all building permit applications submitted during this period of continuance. She noted that the Commission has no jurisdiction over interiors, or over building use.
 - The Committee commented that designation does not mean that a property owner is forced to restore a building upon designation. Rather, it means that the existing historic fabric on the building's exterior should be maintained, and other work, when proposed by the property owner, is reviewed to ensure it satisfies historic preservation standards.
- Mr. Saidel observed that the building's exterior has been altered over the years, resulting in numerous infilled window openings and a capped cornice. He explained that they are on a tight timeframe to open the school in September. He asked if the historic significance is referring to 1905 or to the building as it exists today, with boarded-up windows.
 - The Committee responded that the boarded windows are not historic.
 - Mr. Balloon commented that there is an intact Italianate cornice under the capping.
 - The Committee suggested that Mr. Saidel speak with the staff regarding specific questions of rehabilitation and to obtain a copy of the nomination.
- Mr. Saidel asked if community members should plan to attend the next meeting to offer comments on how they feel about the building.

- The Committee explained that it is an advisory body, and that the Commission will take a vote on this item at its next meeting on 12 April 2019.
- The Committee questioned a continuance of 90 days, given the school's timeline to open in September.
 - Mr. Saidel explained that there are numerous parties involved, which will take time to coordinate with.
 - The Committee suggested a shorter continuance period. It encouraged Mr. Saidel to attend the Commission meeting on 12 April 2019, at which time he could request a longer continuance if desired. The Committee suggested it recommend a 30-day continuance, which would place the item on its meeting of 17 April 2019.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- It typically supports continuance requests proffered by property owners.
- The equitable owner only learned of the proposed designation less than 24 hours prior to the Committee meeting and should be afforded time to review both the nomination and the historic designation process.
- The Commission may vote to allow for a longer continuance if requested by the equitable owner.
- The property 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 4619-25 Longshore Avenue to the April 2019 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ITEM: 4619-25 Longshore Avenue					
MOTION: Continue to April 2019 CHD meeting					
MOVED BY: Laverty					
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	0	2

173 W BERKS STREET

Name of Resource: Peter Woll & Sons

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Brett S. Freedman and Joanne E. Freedman

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 173 W. Berks Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation G, H, and J.

Under Criteria G and H, the nomination argues the building is part of a significant group of buildings that served as the industrial complex of Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company. Under Criterion J, the nomination that Peter Woll & Sons Manufacturing Company exemplified the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the industrial age in Kensington in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 173 W. Berks Street satisfies Criteria for Designation H and J, but not Criterion G.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:29:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- The property owner or representative was not present.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman inquired if the staff had communicated with the owner.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the property owner contacted the staff after receiving the first notice letter. She stated that the owner inquired about a copy of the nomination and was directed to the Historical Commission's website to access the document. Ms. Mehley noted that, although one notice letter had been returned, the other appeared to have been successfully delivered.
- Mr. Cohen stated that he liked the application of Criteria H and J for this nomination. He commented that the building is a landmark and one that speaks to an industrial past of which he was not aware.
- Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Beisert an informational question about one of his nomination's sources. He inquired where the Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co. surveys are located.
 - Mr. Beisert responded that they can be found at University of Pennsylvania and he believes that high-quality scans are available through the Ford Foundation.
- Mr. Cohen commented that the historic image in the nomination that shows the original pyramidal tower makes it clear how much this was a neighborhood landmark and is a shame it was lost. Mr. Laverty added for clarification that that it is true that the pyramidal roof was lost but the tower remains.
- Mr. Beisert inquired if the Committee could characterize the style of the building.

- Mr. Cohen responded that unless an industrial building is highly decorative it is hard to call it an architectural style. Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Cohen on this point. He noted that although the top of the building is adorned with numerous circles and squares, there is nothing that jumps out in a stylistic language. He added that the building clearly communicates a sense of its public face.
- Several Committee members requested that for future nominations that the nominator writes, if Mr. Beisert could clearly mark the location of the building on a map at the beginning of the nomination with the surrounding streets labeled. Committee members also requested that the number of buildings and locations spelled out clearly at the beginning of the nomination.
- Ms. Milroy asked the Committee and staff about Criterion H as it relates to the building's ghost signage and its familiarity. She wondered if the signage would be considered that a singular physical characteristic that represents an established and familiar visual feature? She noted that it seems to be.
 - Mr. Laverty responded that he thinks the Committee should include as it would be sad to see the building saved and the signage painted over. He added that it is an important part of the designation.
- Ms. Milroy inquired if the term "physical characteristic" referred to the actual structure and not something that was applied to the building like the ghost sign.
 - Ms. Cooperman responded no. She then added that it was a good question.
- Mr. Beisert stated that he has observed that people really respond to historic painted signage, ghost signage, on buildings and this was part of the reason he was compelled to complete the nominations. He noted that it is a piece of historic fabric that can be educational as people may see the signage on the Peter Woll & Sons buildings and be curious to do their own research about the buildings' history.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- There was no public comment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination meets the Criteria for H and J but not Criterion G.
- The property at 173 W. Berks Street represents an important industry of its time that is relatively forgotten today.
- The building's painted sign or "ghost sign" on the tower's west elevation is a key part of the proposed designation as it relates directly to Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 173 W. Berks Street satisfies Criteria for Designation H and J.

ITEM: 173 W. Berks Street					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria H and J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Lavery					
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	4	0	0	0	2

3819-31 CHESTNUT STREET

Name of Resource: St. Leonard’s Court

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3819-31 Chestnut Street, known as St. Leonard’s Court, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. According to the nomination, “the former St. Leonard’s Academy is a complex of historic structures constructed and/or annexed by the Society of the Holy Child Jesus between 1867 and 1924 for use as a Catholic convent and parochial school.” Originally from a prominent Philadelphia family, Cornelia (Peacock) Connelly converted to Catholicism and helped found a new religious order called the Society of the Holy Child Jesus in Derby, England. An American mission was eventually opened in Philadelphia, where Mother Connelly ultimately selected a site at 39th and Chestnut. The nomination suggests that, “As the Academy campus expanded into the twentieth century, it incorporated and preserved a small slice of a Chestnut Street corridor once lined with large and generously-spaced homes constructed in the first decades after the Civil War.”

The nomination contends that the campus satisfies Criterion A, owing to its “close association with Connelly and her highly significant educational mission.” The nomination also argues that the buildings reflect the post-Civil War environment of West Philadelphia as an intact collection of stately nineteenth-century brownstones, therefore satisfying Criterion C. Finally, under Criterion J, the nomination suggests that the St. Leonard’s campus possesses a long history as a “noteworthy civic institution in the community.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 3819-31 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 001:40:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Patrick Grossi and Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if there had been any response from the property owner.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that two of the letters that had been sent had been returned, but one that had been sent to the University of Pennsylvania's attorney had not been.
- Mr. Grossi said that he did not have anything further to add to the staff's overview, and that Mr. Leech, who had prepared the nomination, was available to answer any questions.
- The Committee commented that the journey of Cornelia (Peacock) Connelly had been an extraordinary one.
- Mr. Cohen remarked that he had long been fascinated by the twin at 3825-27 Chestnut Street.
 - Mr. Leech responded that the street numbers had changed over time, which made preparing the nomination challenging at times. He explained that as far as he could tell, the owner had resided in one half, and rented out the other half.
- Mr. Cohen asked whether, in terms of developmental increments, had the buildings closer to 39th Street been built together, and the other structures were built separately.
 - Mr. Leech responded that the building at the corner was under construction at the time it was purchased by Connelly. He believed that the rear of this structure would have been altered then to lend itself to a more ecclesiastical use. Mr. Leech further commented that his sense was, since the other building was so different stylistically, it was from a different, later building campaign.
- The Committee said that the nomination was very well written and researched, and that the graphics were particularly helpful.
- The Committee asked if the reference to Connelly's first mission in the United States in Sharon, was Sharon Hill.
 - Mr. Leech responded that he assumed so but could not confirm.
- The Committee commented that it was worth noting who designed the non-contributing 1986 infill on the site.
 - Mr. Leech said that it was an oversight on his part not to have included the name of the firm, which was Sheward-Henderson Architects.
- The Committee asked if Criterion A had been included due to the international scope of the mission.
 - Mr. Leech confirmed that was correct, owing to the fact that the importance of the mission exceeded the neighborhood.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David S. Traub of Save Our Sites commented that in this section of University City, with so many new buildings under construction, this site remained a vestige the neighborhood's Victorian past and served as a good reminder of its history. He said that these buildings were definitely worthy of designation.
- Mary McGettigan from West Philadelphians for Progressive Planning and Preservation commented that she was a graduate of St. Leonard's Academy. She said she was grateful to Mr. Leech and the Preservation Alliance for recognizing its importance and for preparing the nomination. Ms. McGettigan remarked that she

supported Mr. Traub’s comments about the importance of preserving these buildings from the neighborhood’s past.

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that they had shared the nomination with David Hollenberg prior to his retirement as the University Architect for the University of Pennsylvania, who had informed Mr. Steinke that the university would have no objection to the nomination. Mr. Steinke praised the University of Pennsylvania for their stewardship of the property, which was now being used as an office complex called St. Leonard’s Court. Mr. Steinke explained that the Preservation Alliance had originally pursued this nomination both because of the intense development pressure currently faced by this neighborhood, and also due to how clearly the site satisfied Criterion C. He further remarked that once Mr. Leech began researching the history of the site, they realized there was much more to its significance than just its architecture.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination was very well written and that the information was presented in a very effective way.
- The importance of Connelly’s mission was greater than the campus at 3819-31 Chestnut Street.
- The buildings on the campus were reflective of the neighborhood’s Victorian past.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The properties at 3819-31 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 3819-31 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

ITEM: 3819-31 Chestnut Street					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A, C and J					
MOVED BY: Milroy					
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	4	0	0	0	2

4100 CHESTNUT STREET

Name of Resource: Philadelphia Passenger Railway Co. Car House & Stable

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 4100 Chestnut Street Partners LP

Nominator: University City Historical Society

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4100 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that the building, originally constructed as two distinct structures that served the Philadelphia City Passenger Railway Company, represents one of the earliest and most successful passenger railway companies that helped galvanize development in West Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4100 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:03:48

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert and George Poulin of the University City Historical Society represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman asked about the identity of the property owner and whether the owner has contacted the staff.
- Ms. Keller answered that the property owner is listed as 4100 Chestnut Street Partners LP. She explained that two notice letters were mailed to the owner and neither was returned, so the staff assumes the property owner received notice. However; no one has contacted the staff.
- Mr. Poulin commented that the nomination has been in the works for two years and is reflective of the information uncovered with this type of nomination. He stated that he believes many West Philadelphians do not understand the building's significance. He added that West Philadelphia as a streetcar suburb is in many ways tied to this very building, and the Historical Society feels the building should be protected. Mr. Poulin thanked Mr. Beisert and the Keeping Society, Annie Albert, and the staff of the Historical Commission, all of whom left their fingerprints on the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen commented that he was grateful to have learned so much about the complicated transit history behind the nominated property, though he added that the map orientation was not consistent. On page 22, he asked whether the 1923 photograph is correctly identified as the southeast corner of 42nd and Chestnut Streets.
- Mr. Beisert answered that the direction indicated is correct, clarifying that the portion with the cross-gabled section has been demolished, and a parking lot now exists in its location.
- Mr. Beisert and the Committee discussed the orientation of the building, the historic flow of trolleys, and the specific functions of different areas of the building.

- Mr. Cohen opined about whether the Committee wants to preclude any development possibilities by designating all parts of the site. He questioned whether an articulate history is made best by preserving one part or all parts, including those from the early twentieth century. He contended that a balance should be reached between what is historically valuable and the degree to which there is an opportunity cost to society at large.
- Mr. Beisert countered that if the property were to be designated and the owner wishes to develop the site more densely, it would be a matter of applying to the full Historical Commission. In that case, he continued, the existing buildings would be incorporated into the development project. He further suggested that any proposal would not be held to a white glove treatment that would require the reconstruction of missing components.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the nomination proposes to designate the property as a horse car and barn, adding that by 1919 there would not have been any horses in the newly constructed linking structure.
- Mr. Beisert responded that by 1919, the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company (PRT) obtained permits to reconfigure the buildings for use as an auto salesroom, office, and shop that was then leased to an automobile dealer.
- Mr. Cohen argued that the building was constructed in 1919 and is not as thematically attached to horsecars. He contended that most compelling in the story is the surviving portion of the 1866-67 building. He questioned whether the 1919 structure needs to be part of the nomination.
- Ms. Keller explained that after Mr. Beisert submitted the nomination, more research was done to determine the dates of the various buildings. Ms. Keller added that Mr. Beisert located a building permit from 1919 describing work to the site, and the staff inferred that part of the work included the demolition of a portion of the previous building and the construction of the 1919 linking structure, which resulted in the removal of the roof monitor from the rear building and the reroofing of the eastern portion of the complex. The staff, she continued, extended the period of significance because it reasoned that all extant structures should be designated due to their association with the long and continuous history of PRT ownership.
- Mr. Cohen responded that the nomination was done properly but argued that every piece of ground has a story, and it needs to be determined which stories are worth the sacrifice of development potential to preserve. This property, he elaborated, makes him venture into that judgment.
- Ms. Keller countered that, based on applications that go through the Commission, designating the property would not preclude development, noting that there is an empty lot included in the parcel and potential to develop the existing buildings as well.
- Mr. Cohen replied that he finds Building 1 to be the best representation of the transit company's history and the part of the site worth preserving.
- Mr. Poulin argued that the potential value of the site as a development parcel should not be the purview of this Committee.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee needs to determine whether the property holds significance and whether the association with the PRT and its predecessor organizations warrants designation. She contended that the horsecar was essential to the development of West Philadelphia.
- Ms. Milroy observed that, beyond the gabled building that has been demolished, the fenestration on the extant portion looks very different than what exists today. She asked whether the fenestration on Building 1 has been changed.

- Ms. Keller answered that the fenestration was changed, and the evidence exists on the façade.
- Mr. Beisert stated that he maintains that Building 2 has some semblance to its original form, which was a stable.
- Mr. Cohen drew comparison to Harbison’s Dairies and opined that the most significant aspect of the complex was the milk bottle water tower and that a nuanced designation may have been warranted.
- Ms. Cooperman asked that the Committee focus on its purview by offering a technical assessment based on whether the property holds significance.
- Mr. Beisert argued that many similar complexes in West Philadelphia have been lost and that this property is critical in conveying West Philadelphia’s history of development. The horsecar lines, he contended, made the area a viable suburb. He suggested that the surviving components of the property tell the story.
- Mr. Laverty asked for clarification on what Mr. Beisert is nominating.
 - Mr. Beisert answered that only the buildings and not the parking area are proposed for designation.
- Mr. Laverty then asked if the entire block is part of the same tax parcel.
 - Ms. Keller answered that the entire block is considered 4100 Chestnut Street.
- Mr. Poulin stated that the buildings show how flexible they have been despite their modifications. He noted that they were originally constructed as a horse barn and stable for transportation purposes, then becoming an automobile showroom, grocery store, and Amazon distribution center. Those uses, he continued, prove that over 150 years, the buildings have stood the test of time. He argued that though they have been modified, most buildings in the city have been modified, and those modifications do not diminish their significance or the nomination as a whole.
- Mr. Laverty stated that, to steal a phrase from his friend Nathaniel Popkin, this is a perfect example of the “hidden city.” Right in front of our eyes, he continued, where thousands of people pass every day is a nondescript building that played a very important role in the development of West Philadelphia in particular, but also of greater Philadelphia in the period between 1858 and 1958. Whether by horsecar, trolley, or Willys Jeep, he added, it is important to recognize the history of this very viable, though nondescript, building and its story. He drew comparison to the redevelopment of Lincoln Square at Broad Street and Washington Avenue where a historic trainshed was successfully incorporated into a larger project.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mary McGettigan claimed that she is certain that Campus Apartments is the property owner and that the building is currently occupied by Amazon. She then stated that the buildings, whether associated with horsecars or not, hold great significance to the city’s transportation history, which encompasses ferries, horsecars, electrified trolleys, and the el, among others. She argued against excluding certain buildings, adding that each holds significance in the history of transportation. She contended that considering how designation will impact the future development of a property is not the purview of the Committee.
- Annie Albert stated that she wrote portions of the nomination several years ago and that she had always wondered what the building was or had been. She observed that even the newest part of the building, which dates to 1919, was built in a similar style with a similar form, height, and materials to the historic portions of the site. She noted that the northwest corner also shows the ghost marks of the previous building.

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance expressed surprise over the content of the discussion, noting that he is sensitive to development issues due to his work. He commented that approximately half the property is a surface parking lot that could easily accommodate development. The property, he added, has already been consolidated into a “superblock,” with fairly permissive zoning at CMX4 along the Chestnut Street side and CMX3 along the Sansom Street side. The floor area for development, he continued, is massive and, though it may not appease neighbors, the owner could propose a very large building contained within the undeveloped portions of the site. He contended that development of the 41st Street side would not be an encumbrance but is really an opportunity to incorporate preservation into the development. Mr. Grossi commented that he is not familiar enough with the history of the low-slung portion to judge its significance, but in the abstract, he argued that the building is absolutely part of the assemblage, and it is the assemblage that is nominated. Under those circumstances, he concluded, it would be appropriate to designate all extant structures. He reiterated that he does not believe designation would encumber a future development project.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The site is inextricably linked to West Philadelphia’s transportation history and is worth preserving.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- Though relatively nondescript, the building played a crucial role in the development of both West Philadelphia and the larger city by serving as a transportation hub for the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company and its predecessor companies, allowing for the establishment and growth of the West Philadelphia streetcar suburb, satisfying Criteria A and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4100 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

ITEM: 4100 Chestnut Street					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A and J					
MOVED BY: Lavery					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
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	4	0	0	0	2

1 N 30TH ST

Name of Resource: 30th Street Station Interior

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: AMTRAK

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate portions of the interior of 30th Street Station, located at 1 N. 30th Street, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building's interior satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the public interiors stand as a landmark in the Pennsylvania Railroad's history and its influence on both the development of Philadelphia and its twentieth-century railroad networks. Under Criteria C, D, and E, the nomination contends that the interiors are a major work of the nationally influential firm of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White and are reflective of the firm's mastery of Beaux Arts and Art Deco design principles in the pivotal early decades of Modernism in the United States. The nomination further suggests that 30th Street Station's interiors offer one of the city's most iconic and trafficked public spaces, satisfying Criterion H.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the identified portions of the public interior of 30th Street Station satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:34:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and consultant Ben Leech represented the nomination.
- Johnette Davies, Lead Historic Preservation Specialist of Amtrak, represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller noted that Amtrak, the property owner, has made revisions to and provided comments on the nomination that were made available to the public in advance of the meeting. She stated that Amtrak asked that those edits become part of the record.
- Ms. Davies explained that Amtrak provided technical comments on the nomination, but that in general the nomination is comprehensive, concise, and states the significance of the property well. She elaborated that there were several corrections to materials and dates. She requested that the period of significance end in 1955 rather than extending to the present, so the period would relate more to the Pennsylvania Railroad's Philadelphia Improvements, which was the major movement and impetus for the creation of the property.
- Mr. Grossi responded that the Preservation Alliance does not have an issue with the revisions submitted by Amtrak, adding that those comments will become part of the record of the nomination. He also noted that the Alliance does not oppose the requested change to the period of significance, but he asked the Committee to provide feedback on whether the revision is appropriate. He added that the extension of the period to the present creates a large and perhaps unwieldy period of

- significance but would like to defer to the Committee on the issue. Mr. Grossi explained that the Alliance has shifted focus to interiors and the organization successfully nominated Wanamaker's Grand Court, also with Mr. Leech's assistance, and 30th Street Station provides another grand interior to be appropriately included on the Philadelphia Register. This interior, he continued, was on the Alliance's shortlist of interiors to nomination along with others. He concluded that it is an interior that all would be particularly proud of if it is designated. He then thanked Amtrak for its cooperation throughout the process.
- Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Leech about the period of significance for Wanamaker's Grand Court.
 - Mr. Leech responded that it ran through the present.
 - Ms. Cooperman asked whether the reasoning behind extending the period of significance to the present is due to the continual use of the public space.
 - Mr. Grossi answered that it is due to its continued use not just as a public space but as the public space for which it was originally intended.
 - Mr. Leech noted that both contributing and non-contributing features within the interior were identified, and those features probably align with the suggested 1955 end date for the period of significance.
 - The Committee offered anecdotal comments about the size of the Main Concourse and the effort to relamp the chandeliers.
 - The Committee discussed how to procedurally handle the revisions and comments provided by Amtrak.
 - Ms. Milroy stated that the nomination is very impressive and was a joy to read. She offered several minor corrections.
 - Mr. Cohen commented that the nomination was well-written and efficiently written. He called Amtrak's revisions friendly amendments and supported their inclusion.
 - Mr. Laverty stated that this nomination is the opposite of the passenger railway station previously discussed, in which the previous building was pedestrian and 30th Street Station is a monumental building. He added that it is great to have both buildings reviewed together.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that one only needs to make a trip from 30th Street Station to Penn Station in New York City and come back to rise from the tracks into this grand space. That experience, he continued, will prove that this interior space is worthy of designation.
- Steven Peitzman asked whether the nomination includes the secondary waiting room with the bus relief.
 - The Committee answered that the room is included.
- Elizabeth Stegner of the University City Historical Society noted that over the last few decades she often passed through 30th Street Station to commute to Lancaster and New York. She suggested that by protecting the interior now, it will save time and money in the future when someone wants to modernize the space and when, about 40 years later, someone else will want to restore it to its historic appearance.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The revisions and comments provided by Amtrak add clarity to the nomination and should be included as part of the final record.

- The period of significance could be shortened to include an end date of 1955, as suggested by the property owner.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Commission should determine how best to integrate the revisions and comments provided by Amtrak.
- The station’s public interior spaces showcase the national influence of the Pennsylvania Railroad and attest to the organization’s history, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The station’s interior was designed by the nationally influential architectural firm of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, satisfying Criterion E.
- The interior spaces are reflective of Beaux Arts and Art Deco design principles as imagined by a nationally significant architectural firm, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The station’s interior offers one of the city’s most iconic and monumental public spaces, satisfying Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination, as amended by Amtrak, demonstrates that portions of 30 Street Station’s public interior, located at 1 N. 30th Street, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

ITEM: 1 N 30th Street					
MOTION: Satisfaction of Criteria A, C, D, E, H, and J, with Amtrak amendments					
MOVED BY: Lavery					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
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	4	0	0	0	2

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:25 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.