

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

**19 FEBRUARY 2020, 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 9:34 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	X		
Suzanna Barucco	X		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.	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 II
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- David Brownlee
- Ross E. Hagsroz
- Jeff Barsky
- Roberto Pup
- Howard Katz
- Jeff Nugent
- George Thomas, Civic Visions
- Hercules Grigos, Esq., Klehr Harrison
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Steven Peitzman, Drexel University
- Vern Anastasio, Esq.
- Katherine Missimer, Esq., Klehr Harrison
- Nick Kusturies
- Oscar Beisert
- Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer
- Emaleigh Doley, Germantown United CDC
- Kathy Dowdell
- Nir Alun

Ray Rola, Ray Rola Architect
Janice Woodcock
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Tom Hagstuz
George N. Bottos
Carl Gansky
Antonio Rinaldi, University of Pennsylvania
Paranyit Singh
Daniel Torgeman
Gabor Antalics
Jay Farrell
Tim Kerner, CCRA
Katie Low
Gabriel Gottlieb

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1813-53 N HOWARD ST

Name of Resource: Clifton Mills

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1813 N HOWARD LLC

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1813-53 N. Howard Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Clifton Mills complex satisfies Criteria for Designation G and J. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the subject property is “part of and related to a distinctive industrial area and block which should be preserved for its ties to Philadelphia’s manufacturing history, exemplifying the economic heritage of Kensington and Philadelphia.” Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the subject property is part of “an exemplary surviving textile mill complex that rose in Kensington’s textile district during an important period of economic and technological advancement,” when small-to-medium sized manufacturers were requiring larger spaces to accommodate new machinery in the production of their goods.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1813-53 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, but not G. Criterion G is intended to facilitate the designation of groups of discrete buildings that together form an ensemble, like rowhouses around a city square; it is not intended to facilitate the designation of sites related to broader neighborhood themes like textiles in Kensington or banking in Center City.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:06:20 (Recording 1)

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society represented the nominator.
- Attorney Hercules Grigos represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Beisert informed the members of the Committee on Historic Designation that he supported the owners' request to remove Parcel B from the nomination based on several factors that were presented to him after he nominated the property.
- Mr. Grigos explained that his clients' property had previously been subdivided and they were requesting that the parcel identified as Parcel B in their supplemental information be excluded from the nomination.
- Mr. Grigos said that his clients intended to rehabilitate the remainder of the building using historic preservation standards. Rather than request that the nomination be withdrawn, the owners decided not to oppose the designation of what they referred to as Parcel A in their supplemental information but request that Parcel B be excluded from the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen requested clarification about which buildings within the Physical Description (Section 6) of the nomination corresponded with Parcel B.
 - Several members of the Committee on Historic Designation confirmed that the buildings numbered three, nine and eleven corresponded with Parcel B.
- Ms. Milroy asked about the status of the building numbered four in the Physical Description (Section 6) of the nomination.
 - Mr. Grigos responded that the building was under separate ownership.
 - Mr. Beisert replied that this building had just been designated by the Historical Commission at their most recent meeting.
- Ms. Milroy remarked that while she agreed with the staff's recommendation for Criterion G in this specific case, she also believed that this criterion could be applied to tracts of land and parkland. Ms. Milroy added that she did not believe that Criterion G had to be predicated on the existence of built structures.
 - Ms. Cooperman responded that in their previous discussion about the adjacent property, they raised the difference between thematic historic districts and contiguous-property districts.
- Mr. Cohen said that he was very impressed with the depth of the research in the nomination. He added that he had never heard the term "tenanted-mill" before. Mr. Cohen wondered whether the owner of the mill offered a source of power and the work space to the tenants who would bring their own materials and create the finished products.
 - Mr. Beisert replied that he did not find enough detail in his research to confirm if this was how the subject property functioned when it was operating as a mill.
- Ms. Barucco commented that she thought it was a good nomination and agreed with Mr. Cohen that it was well researched. She remarked that she was in favor of designation under Criterion J but agreed with the staff's recommendation for Criterion G. Ms. Barucco said that the nomination could have been strengthened with more examples of other tenanted mills.
- Mr. Laverty commended the nominator for his effective use of the Hexamer maps in allowing the history to unfold.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Though Criterion G it is not intended to facilitate the designation of sites related to broader neighborhood themes, neither does it preclude its application to areas without built structures such as tracts of land or parkland.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The subject property is an example of a tenanted-mill complex that rose in Kensington’s textile district during an important period of economic and technological advancement, satisfying Criterion J.
- The nomination fails to demonstrate that subject property relates to a distinctive industrial area and therefore fails to satisfy Criterion G.
- The parcel identified by the owners as Parcel B no longer possesses sufficient significance to be included in the nomination and should therefore be excluded.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1813-53 N. Howard Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J; and that the boundary of the area proposed for designation should be revised so that the parcel named 1833 N. Howard Street, also identified as Parcel B in the supplemental information provided by the owners, is excluded from that area.

ITEM: 1813-53 N Howard St					
MOTION: Designate, Criterion J; with conditions					
MOVED BY: Milroy					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Douglas Mooney	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 5901-13 AND 5915-41 GERMANTOWN AVE & 61-71 AND 73 E HAINES ST

Name of Resource: Germantown High School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 5301 Germantown Avenue Investment Partners; 5901 Germantown Ave In.

Nominator: Germantown United CDC, 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 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street, four individual parcels that comprise the former Germantown High School, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the buildings satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, H, I, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that Germantown High School represents a pivotal moment in the history of public education in Philadelphia in response to Pennsylvania’s

1914 passing of the Cox Child Labor Law, which restricted work hours for children and allowed them to enroll in secondary schools. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the original building is a monumental example of Georgian Revival public school architecture and is reflective of the style of other Philadelphia school buildings constructed in the same period. Under Criterion G, the nomination argues that the open space separating the school buildings from Germantown Avenue was intentionally developed into a park-like setting to serve the high school. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that the open space embodies “an important visual continuum along Germantown Avenue, a singular place that has offered the public a window to architectural and landscape beauty and grandeur since the 1850s.” Under Criterion I, the nomination contends that portions of the property that comprise the open space along Germantown Avenue potentially contain archaeological resources related to seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and early nineteenth-century structures. Under Criterion J, the nomination asserts that Germantown High School was inextricably tied to the Germantown community and its students were reflective of the local population and lingering inequalities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, H, I, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:18:18 (Recording 1)

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Architects Janice Woodcock and Ray Rola, and Daniel Torgeman represented the property owner.
- Emaleigh Doley of Germantown United CDC and Oscar Beisert of The Keeping Society represented the nominator.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Farnham explained that the nominator has requested that the Historical Commission allow for the withdrawal of the nomination, and that the property owner opposes the withdrawal of the nomination and would like to proceed. Mr. Farnham advised that the Committee continue with the review of the merits of the nomination and provide a recommendation, given that the Committee does not have the authority to withdraw the nomination. Only the Historical Commission has that prerogative, he continued, and it can make the decision at its 13 March 2020 meeting.
 - The Committee asked Mr. Farnham to confirm that the nominator wishes to withdraw and the owner would like the nomination to move forward, and Mr. Farnham confirmed that that is the case.
- Ms. Cooperman asked the Committee keep in mind it does not have the authority to grant a withdrawal.
- Ms. Doley, acting executive director of Germantown United Community Development Corporation, stated that she is the co-nominator and requested the withdrawal of the nomination. She added that she reviewed the developer’s letter opposing the withdrawal and that she understands the Committee does not decide whether a nomination can be withdrawn. She commented that she appreciates the sensitivity to the property and the plans for reuse and the intent to deliver on a community benefits agreement. She then asserted that it is a community that has continually been treaded on by city agencies, nonprofits, and developers and that withdrawing the

- nomination was not her preference. She contended that she needs to put the larger community interest before all else. She then requested that the review of the nomination be continued to a future meeting, which she contended is in the Committee's purview, until the community benefits process is complete.
- Ms. Barucco asked Ms. Doley if her interest in not having the nomination go forward is because she feels it will endanger the community negotiations.
 - Ms. Doley responded that when the nomination was submitted, there was no direct engagement with the property owner. Since then, she continued, a neighborhood coalition that includes her organization and over 25 organizations serving the Germantown community has formed, and the property owner has entered discussions. She stated that the property owner and coalition have been working on a plan for the nominated property and an adjacent site, the former Fulton Elementary School. She opined that the Philadelphia City Planning Commission is considering rezoning areas of Germantown and specifically chose not to rezone the nominated properties and the Fulton Elementary School site. She contended that it was because other processes were already in place and that the Planning Commission did not want to interfere.
 - Ms. Cooperman stated that Ms. Doley's comments are beyond the Committee's scope.
 - Ms. Doley interrupted and asked that the Committee continue the matter now that the developer is interested in seeing the property designated. She commented that it is something she would like to discuss further with the owner and that this is the first time the owner has acknowledged the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that a continuance request can be made to the Historical Commission, noting that it is difficult for the Committee to consider a request made at the last minute. She suggested that the Committee proceed with the review and that questions concerning a continuance or withdrawal can be addressed by the Commission.
 - Ms. Doley responded that she had sought a continuance in November 2019 and questioned whether there is harm in the Committee recommending that a second continuance be granted and allowing the Commission to make the decision, as was done in November.
 - Mr. Beisert asked whether a representative of the property owner is present and if that individual would agree to a continuance.
 - Ms. Cooperman asked whether a representative of the property owner is present.
 - The representatives of the property owner introduced themselves. Ms. Woodcock contended that the community's position is maintained regardless of the Committee's action today. She added that the project includes a property across the street not subject to the nomination process and that the developer has continuously sought to work with the community to create an agreement that is separate and distinct from any Historical Commission decision. She requested that the process move forward and stated that the zoning provision that is now causing the nominator to withdraw the nomination was passed to balance the ability of an owner to develop his or her property. She then remarked that the building is experiencing fundamental deterioration and that it is difficult to secure. She noted that the roof has holes and people are lighting fires inside. She cautioned that every month the process is delayed adds more cost at the detriment of preserving the buildings.

- Mr. Rola stated that the staff’s recommendations regarding the nomination are compelling and that he agrees with them. He stated that Building 4, the small gymnasium, was not addressed in the recommendations and asked that the building be included as contributing in the designation.
- Ms. Doley stated that she maintains her request for a continuance, even if the Committee moves forward with the review.
 - Ms. Cooperman reiterated that the request can be made to the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee’s recommendations are advisory only and are non-binding. He added that, if the Committee to moved forward and made a recommendation based on the merits of the nomination, it would in no way bind the Commission to any particular decision. He noted that the Commission could continue the matter, accept the withdrawal, or reject the withdrawal request and designate the property. He again advised the Committee to move forward with the review of the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee would move forward with the review. She added that the nominator’s request to withdraw or continue the matter could be addressed at the Commission meeting by way of the staff. She asked that the nominator make a continuance request sooner rather than later if that is the desired path.
- Ms. Keller read the overview and staff recommendation.
- Mr. Cohen asked whether there was staff opposition to Criterion H.
 - Ms. Keller explained that the original staff recommendation was more nuanced and stated that the staff was not opposed to the inclusion of Criterion H but that it disagreed with the argument presented in the nomination. She explained that the argument for Criterion H, that the original school building, 1959-60 addition, and grounds form a familiar and visual feature from Germantown Avenue does not accurately reflect the original design intent. She stated that the staff finds that the open space along Germantown Avenue was established to create a buffer and to disguise the mass of the school from Germantown Avenue.
- Mr. Cohen asked for clarification on the staff’s original recommendation for Criterion J.
 - Ms. Keller stated that the staff found contradictory information in the argument for Criterion J. Because of the contradictory information, the staff questioned the validity of the argument.
- Ms. Barucco asserted that the property is significant under Criterion H, adding that the green space created by setting the building back with the primary elevation on Haines Street was clearly a design decision. The green space, she continued, is certainly an established visual feature that, if lost, would impact the view along Germantown Avenue.
- Mr. Mooney commended the nominator on the research of the site, including the history of the open space. He added that there was an excellent argument for including Criterion I regarding the preservation of archaeological resources. He explained that the goal for site should not be to excavate the archaeological resources but to leave them preserved in place. He contended that the inclusion of Criterion I allows the Commission to review any future work proposed to the site’s open space and to assess whether it could potentially impact important archaeological resources buried underground. He asserted that if the Commission determines that the work would have no potential impact on those resources, then no

- archaeological investigation would be required. He clarified that an investigation would only be required if an impact to those archaeological resources cannot be avoided. In that case, he continued, the only way to preserve the information contained underground would be through controlled archaeological investigations.
- Mr. Cohen stated that this is a complicated place and applauded the nominator on the amount of research needed to unravel the site's history.
 - Ms. Barucco stated that if the Committee accepts Criterion H, which addresses the lawn as a familiar visual feature, she would question the inclusion of Criterion G as it relates to the intentional development of the property into a park-like setting. She stated that she did not find the nomination supported that supposition.
 - Mr. Laverty countered that it is the first open space along Germantown Avenue after Market Square or Vernon Park. He also noted that in 1914, the other high schools included Central High School, built right to the property line, Northeast High School, and Roman Catholic High School on the corner of Broad and Vine Streets. He contended that no student would meet a blade of grass or tree before entering those school buildings, and the green space at Germantown High School is very intentional and is positioned along an archaeologically significant street in the city.
 - Mr. Beisert responded that, in researching the site, he discovered that there was community opposition to the demolition of a mansion when the high school was first conceived, and the community wanted to preserve the trees. He noted that he could not verify the claims but that the period of significance extends to 1965, because at some point the green space became a lawn that was enlarged over time. He contended that the later addition could have intruded into the space. Instead, he continued, the city purchased properties behind the high school and extended the building onto those parcels. He further noted that parcels along Germantown Avenue were purchased, and the green space was expanded. He argued that at that time, it was a planned park, even if that was not the initial intent.
 - Ms. Cooperman asserted that Criterion G states that a property "is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area" and that this property would need to relate to other properties, though she agreed that the landscaped area is significant to the property itself.
 - Ms. Milroy stated that the opportunistic preservation of green space and trees is consistent with how park builders were thinking at that time.
 - Mr. Cohen contended that there is a difference between Germantown High School and the other urban high schools, noting that this is not downtown. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman agreed that the discussion points about the landscaped area's significance could be incorporated under Criteria H and J, regardless of whether Criterion G is included.
 - All Committee members agreed that the open space is a significant feature to the property.
 - Mr. Cohen stated that he agrees with the staff recommendation, adding that the arguments for Criteria H and J are not explicitly made, though there are qualities of the property that satisfy the criteria.
 - Ms. Cooperman agreed that Criterion H speaks directly to the landscaped area more than the main elevation of the building, which is located on Haines Street. She contended that the landscaped portion is a setting for the building, which is set back from Germantown Avenue.

- The Committee agreed that the gymnasium, identified as Building 4 in the nomination, should be considered contributing.
- Ms. Barucco noted that the architectural style, Georgian Revival, was an intentional and significant choice for the building.
 - Mr. Lavery agreed, calling it “assertively American” and noting its proximity to significant events of the colonial era, such as the Battle of Germantown.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nominator has requested to withdraw the nomination. The property owner is opposed to the withdrawal request and is asking that the property be designated.
- The nominator has requested that the review of the nomination be continued to a future meeting.
- If designated under Criterion I, the Historical Commission would have the authority to assess whether any future work would impact archaeological resources; however, those resources are best preserved by remaining undisturbed in their current environment underground.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- Germantown High School represents the state-wide codification of a child labor law that allowed children to enroll in secondary schools, satisfying Criterion A.
- The main building represents Georgian Revival public school architecture and reflects the environment of the Germantown community, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The landscaped area along Germantown Avenue presents an intentional design element that creates a buffer between the main school building and the street, and the green space is a significant established feature of the community, satisfying Criterion H.
- The open space along Germantown Avenue is likely to yield important archaeological resources related to the seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and early nineteenth-century structures that have been demolished over time, satisfying Criterion I.
- Germantown High School represents the community it served for nearly one hundred years and is reflective of the Philadelphia school system in the early twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.
- The school building and landscaped area are not part of or related to any adjacent property, park, square, or distinctive area and do not satisfy Criterion G.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Avenue and 61-71 and 73 E. Haines Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, H, I, and J.

ITEM: 5901-13 and 5915-41 Germantown Ave & 61-71 and 73 E Haines St					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, D, H, I, J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Mooney					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Douglas Mooney	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1132 MARLBOROUGH ST

Name of Resource: Jacob Souder House
 Proposed Action: Designation
 Property Owner: Adam and Jeremy Margent
 Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia
 Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1132 Marlborough Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criterion for Designation J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the Jacob Souder house, a two-and-a-half-story wooden house constructed c. 1810, represents one of the few surviving frame buildings typical of Fishtown’s foundational development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:16 (Recording 2)

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Vern Anastasio represented the property owner.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Anastasio stated that prior to notice of the nomination, a zoning application was made for the demolition of the building and the construction of two single dwellings, one at the front of the parcel and one at the rear. He noted that he is currently going through the zoning process for that application. He commented that the designation would allow the owner to have an ancillary dwelling unit. He stated that his concern is that the interior of the existing front structure has six-foot ceilings and it would prevent many individuals from inhabiting the space. He asked whether the process would inhibit the owner’s ability to remove the floor joists and raise the ceilings.

- Ms. Cooperman responded that designation does not apply to the interiors of buildings, unless a nomination has specifically been made to designate a public interior.
- Mr. Beisert asked whether the floor joists are considered part of the structure and if the Commission's staff has approved their removal in the past.
- Mr. Farnham replied that moving the floor joists could be approved by the staff administratively, as long as there is evidence that the building's structural stability would not be threatened during that work. He added that the staff has approved similar work many times in the past without reference to the full Historical Commission.
- Mr. Mooney stated that the nomination should include Criterion I due to the archaeological potential of this particular site. The work ongoing for the I-95 and Girard Avenue project through the Fishtown neighborhood, he continued, has demonstrated time and time again that the backyard spaces of these sites have tremendous archaeological value and can provide insights into what life was like in this part of town. He noted that the preservation of archaeological resources here could be astounding. Mr. Mooney further contended that the area has significant evidence of Native American sites.
- Ms. Barucco asked whether the back building was constructed at the same time as the frame building fronting Marlborough Street.
 - Mr. Beisert answered that it seemed that it was built later but that he did not have sufficient evidence to include it in the nomination.
- Ms. Barucco stated that she finds it disturbing that nominations cut back buildings from front buildings in the boundaries of the designation, especially when buildings are constantly being torn down. She contended that something that may not be visible now may be visible in two years.
 - Mr. Cohen argued that it depends on what is visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Ms. Cooperman asserted that visibility has not always been the sole basis on which the Commission has made a decision. Other factors, she continued, can be whether a feature or structure is an integral part of a building.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination was elegantly researched and the argument for the building's significance was well made. He called the building a classic type and described commonalities of rowhouses in which one side includes the door and the other side holds the chimney. In this structure, he continued, the ell is on the side of the chimney, though the typical configuration is for the ell to be on the side of the door. He questioned whether it is more characteristic of wooden structures. He noted that the other illustrations in the nomination make clear that there were many other examples of this building type and that this is a wonderful case of this type of building.
 - Mr. Beisert commented that the building is also completely detached, adding that local lore suggests that the side entrances were used for work purposes.
 - Mr. Cohen agreed, adding that in Center City, there are alley entrances for the same reason.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:
The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination proposes only to designate the front structure located on the property at 1132 Marlborough Street.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Fishtown neighborhood has proven to contain high archaeological potential, and there is potential that archaeological resources remain underground at the property, satisfying Criterion I.
- The building represents the foundational development of Fishtown and is typical of the early-nineteenth-century wooden houses constructed for the area’s residents, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132 Marlborough Street satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

ITEM: 1132 Marlborough St					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria I, J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Barucco					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Douglas Mooney	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 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.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed this nomination on March 12th and recommended that the property satisfies Criteria D and J. The owner, who did not attend the Committee's review, requested that the Historical Commission remand the nomination to the Committee to provide him with an opportunity to participate in the review. The Commission granted the request, sending the nomination back to the Committee.

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.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION, MARCH 2019: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:12:07 (Recording 2)

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Gabor Antalics represented the property owner.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Antalics requested an additional continuance. He explained that his attorney, Jordan Rushie, cannot be found, and has his file for the property and argument against designation. He noted that he is in the process of retaining new counsel, Andrew Ross, but he is not yet prepared to attend the meeting. He noted that the building is not for sale and there are no current redevelopment plans for it.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the Committee on Historic Designation has already reviewed the nomination once.
 - Mr. Antalics responded that the file Mr. Rushie has contains a rebuttal to the Committee's previous review. He noted that he has physically gone to Mr. Rushie's house and cannot find him. He asked that if anyone knows where he is or sees him on the street, to contact him. He suggested that there is a lively discussion on Northern Liberties message boards about Mr. Rushie's disappearance.
- Ms. DiPasquale asked if Mr. Antalics would like to request a continuance to a specific future meeting.
 - Mr. Antalics responded that all he needs from Mr. Rushie is the paperwork. He reiterated that he has been speaking with Mr. Ross, who is moving to a new law firm, and is not comfortable representing him until he is settled there.
- Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission ought to be receptive to continuance requests from property owners, particularly when they are requesting to have their attorneys present, as not doing so could make a designation susceptible to appeal. He noted that when a party other than the owner requests a continuance, the Committee should look at it with skepticism. Third parties do not enjoy the same rights as the property owner themselves.
- Ms. Cooperman reiterated that the Committee has already reviewed the nomination and provided a recommendation.

- Mr. Antalics responded that he does not understand how that is relevant, since he was not there to rebut the nomination. He opined that the Committee's previous recommendation has no standing.
- Ms. Cooperman opined that it is redundant to re-review the nomination and that any argument that could be made before the Committee against designation could also be made to the Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Antalics disagreed, opining that the Commission will not get all the facts and that to deny him the opportunity to make his case to the Committee denies him due process.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Steven Peitzman opposed the continuance request, questioning what value there is in remanding the nomination to a future Committee meeting, given that the Committee has already offered a recommendation. He opined that the Historical Commission itself is typically the body where arguments against designation are most relevant.
 - Mr. Antalics responded that the request is none of Mr. Peitzman's business.
 - Ms. Cooperman noted that the Historical Commission can make the determination as to whether the remand is necessary or whether the nomination should move forward with the Committee's previous recommendation.
 - Mr. Antalics responded that it would be unfair to deny him the opportunity to appear before the Committee without counsel and to enter his objections into the record at both steps in the process.
- Katie Lowe, who was in the audience on another matter, opposed the continuance request.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- It typically supports continuance requests proffered by property owners.
- The property would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the nomination to the next available meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ITEM: 1045-49 Sarah St					
MOTION: Continue and remand to next available CHD meeting					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Mooney					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Douglas Mooney	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1513 WALNUT ST

Name of Resource: The Stock Brokerage House of Hano, Wasserman & Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: The Business Known As 1513 Walnut LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1513 Walnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Built in 1929, the former Stock Brokerage House of Hano, Wasserman & Company is a two-story, limestone-faced building that extends from Walnut Street to Moravian Street. Under Criterion D and E, the nomination contends that the subject building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Modern Classical Style as designed by noted Philadelphia architect Grant M. Simon. The nomination asserts that 1513 Walnut Street exemplifies the economic and social heritage of Jewish Americans working to enter the realm of Philadelphia finance in the first half of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1513 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:24:22 (Recording 2)

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Jeff Nugent represented the property owner.
- Timothy Kerner of the Center City Residents' Association and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kerner said he believes the nomination text stands for itself and the board of the Center City Residents' Association supports the nomination. He continued that the general reaction is surprise that the building is not already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Kerner noted that it is designated as a "Significant" resource on the National Register of Historic Places and this is not common among

- buildings listed in Center City West Commercial Historic District. He concluded stating that the building is worthy of designation on the local historic register.
- Mr. Nugent said he has more of a question than a comment. He noted that the building is in a commercial district and is owned by an entity that owns it for profit with a current tenant, Brooks Brothers. Mr. Nugent noted that what they have found with buildings that they own around the country is when a building has been designated historic, there are certain obligations placed upon the owner going forward for maintenance and development, and generally there is compensation for that. He inquired if the Historical Commission had considered compensation for buildings such as this. Mr. Nugent said that they own a building in Austin, Texas on Congress Street and on this building they received a \$25,000 annual deduction on their real estate taxes. He added that in other towns there are FAR bonuses and tax credits. Mr. Nugent asked if this is something that would be considered for a building such as this in the future in Philadelphia or is something that is being discussed.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that there are no monetary incentives at this point in time for preserving historic buildings listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He continued that recently there were a handful of zoning bills passed by City Council and approved by the Mayor that were designed to provide some relief to owners of historic properties. Mr. Farnham added that these include some by-right uses, additional dwelling units, and reductions in parking. He said that he does not think any of these would be applicable in this circumstance but the same group that devised those set of incentives are working today on developing other potential incentives. Mr. Farnham continued that the committee met as recently as last week to discuss possible financial incentives for historic buildings and the mayoral administration are very much committed to finding incentives for historic preservation. He said that he would expect over the next year or two you will see additional incentives rolled out but as of this moment the incentives are limited.
 - Mr. Nugent inquired if these incentives would be retrospective to those already designated.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that the recently passed incentives were applicable to all designated properties and his expectation is that this would be true for all future incentives, including property tax relief or other type of incentives put in place.
 - Mr. Nugent thanked Mr. Farnham for the explanation. He said that this is a striking building and his company never considered changing it. Mr. Nugent said obviously there is an economic effect. He inquired if there was some organization that they could join or a way he could get additional information.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that he could provide additional information offline.
 - Ms. Cooperman pointed out that the Historical Commission reviews all building permits but not regular maintenance is not included in this and does not require review. She added that the preservation ordinance focuses on the exterior not the interior.
 - Mr. Cohen said this is a handsome building and a well written nomination telling us a lot about the building. He noted that kudos to Mr. Beisert for finding the 1928 photograph showing right before the change and also finding the 1798 watercolor of that site of the single house that is remarkably detailed for a modest house.
 - Mr. Cohen inquires about the reference to “cast limestone.”
 - Mr. Beisert said he may have used a reference that used that term.
 - Mr. Cohen asked if this was cast stone or real limestone.

- Ms. Cooperman said it is real limestone.
- Mr. Beisert said the reference to “cast limestone” may have been an error on his part.
- Mr. Cohen said this is remarkably well documented of a firm that was about to assimilate into the mainstream and then boom, the stock market crashed in 1929.
- Mr. Cohen said that Grant Simon is a really intriguing figure. He continued that he is one of those Beaux Arts guys who see French architects signing their buildings and imitates this. Mr. Cohen added that as architectural historians we love it when the name of the architect and the date are on the building.
- Mr. Cohen reiterated that it is really good nomination and hits the right criteria.
- Mr. Farnham pointed out that Grant Simon was the first chair of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.
- Mr. Cohen remarked that Grant Simon also made maps of colonial Philadelphia.
- Ms. Milroy said this building reminds her of a building by architect Kevin Roche, of all things. She added that it is a building that looks forward to future generations. Ms. Milroy noted that it is a wonderful nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the nomination. He seconded the call for more incentives for historically designated properties.
- Kathy Dowdell of Farragut Street Architects and preservation architect said that one of the real advantages is that one can get free consulting advice from the Historical Commission staff who all have advanced degrees in preservation. She said that even if you are not contemplating work or have a building permit application that triggers review, you can still go to them to talk to them about pointing, maintenance, and windows. Ms. Dowdell pointed out that this is an important incentive that does not get mentioned enough.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia spoke in support of the nomination. He stated that the building was sensitively adapted over the years for retail purposes and that the changes do not take away from its historical significance. He noted that it still very much reads as the original building despite the changes to the ground floor of the building. Mr. Steinke pointed out that the recent change to the 10-year tax abatement did not change for rehabilitation of existing buildings. He noted that this means if you did a gut rehab and restored the façade of this building, the owner would be eligible for the full 10-year tax abatement whereas new construction of residential buildings was cut back to a five-year tax abatement. He stressed that City Council did just enact a pretty substantial incentive for historic preservation that would apply to this building if it is designated.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination is well written and documented.
- The nomination addresses the appropriate criteria.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Modern Classical Style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building was designed by noted Philadelphia architect Grant M. Simon, satisfying Criterion E.

- The building exemplifies the economic and social heritage of Jewish Americans working to enter the realm of Philadelphia finance in the first half of the twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1513 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

ITEM: 1513 Walnut St					
MOTION: Designate, D, E, J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Laverty					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Douglas Mooney	X				
Total	6				

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.

Since the Historical Commission notified property owners of its intent to consider the historic district, five buildings in the proposed district have been completely demolished. The property owners of 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street submitted demolition permit applications to the Department of Licenses & Inspections prior to the start of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, vesting their rights in the permits. The Historical Commission did not have the authority to review the demolition permit applications. The demolition permits were issued and the buildings were demolished in accordance with the law. The properties are now vacant lots.

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 recommends updating 113-15 S. 8th Street as a non-contributing addition to 731 Sansom Street. The staff recommends categorizing all buildings as Significant, Contributing or Non-Contributing without separate determinations for façades and storefronts. The staff recommends classifying 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street as non-contributing because they are vacant lots.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:41:25 (Recording 2)

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented a majority of property owners in the proposed district.
- Paul Steinke and Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and David Brownlee, architectural historian and professor, represented the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman inquired about the recent decision concerning the individual nominations for 704 and 706 Sansom Street and the new construction proposal for 708 Sansom Street.
 - Mr. Farnham replied that the Historical Commission rejected the nominations for 704 and 706 Sansom Street at its 14 February 2020 meeting because the buildings at those sites had been legally demolished and the nominations' claim of significance was predicated solely on the buildings on the sites and not on the sites themselves. He continued that the Commission also reviewed the new construction application for the Toll Brothers tower project and determined that its level of jurisdiction is review and comment only because the site is a vacant lot within a proposed historic district. Mr. Farnham said the Commission offered comments on the design of the tower.
- Ms. Cooperman inquired if there were any owners in attendance that were not represented by Mr. Phillips. She said she wanted to make sure their voices were heard.
 - Mr. Phillips introduced himself and stated that he represented a majority of the building owners in the proposed district. He requested that those owners in attendance raise their hands; about 12 people responded. Mr. Phillips then

requested that owners not represented by him raise their hands. The Committee members noted that no one raised a hand and confirmed that all property owners in attendance were represented by Mr. Phillips. Mr. Phillips noted some individual property owner may like to speak directly to the Committee later in the meeting.

- Ms. Cooperman invited the nominator to make its presentation.
- Mr. Grossi presented the key points of the nomination. He reviewed the history of the area, noting the transitions of use and the evolution of its architecture. He spoke about the Criteria for Designation selected for the proposed district and how it specifically was applied by the nominator. Mr. Grossi said that Mr. Brownlee had prepared remarks on the nomination, which he will present to the Committee.
- Mr. Steinke stated that Mr. Brownlee would offer prepared remarks in response to the report prepared CivicVisions and Mr. Thomas for Mr. Phillips on behalf of the owners. He noted that the nominator received the report on 14 February 2020. Mr. Steinke stated that hearing Mr. Brownlee's comments before Mr. Thomas' presentation would lessen the impact of the comments. Mr. Phillips questioned this request and noted that Mr. Steinke is asking to have the last word. He asked that the Committee follow its normal process with nominator presenting first and then the owner.
- The Committee members discussed Mr. Steinke's request and Mr. Phillips' concerns. The Committee members agreed to let both the nominator and the owner representative give their initial presentations and then allow each party to follow with another round of comments. Mr. Phillips said they have no objection to that.
- Mr. Phillips spoke about the recently demolished buildings and noted that they now have to look at the remaining buildings in the propose district. He argued that the proposed district does not meet any of the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Phillips said that Mr. Thomas will explain that the buildings remaining are lacking in the qualities that would enable them to meet the Criteria for Designation. He argued that the goal and intent of the nomination was to stop and prevent future development, not to preserve and protect Jewelers' Row in this area. Mr. Phillips said that when the Society Hill Historic District was created, the boundaries did not include the buildings of Jewelers' Row. He stated that the goal of historic preservation is not to impede progress or the natural evolution of the city nor should it be to artificially try to recreate the past. He contended that the goal is to recognize and protect buildings and areas that are superlative and as Mr. Thomas will attest and as his report opines, these buildings as a whole, as a district of 57 buildings, do not reach the threshold criteria necessary for designation.
- Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Thomas if he had had the opportunity to review the nomination presented by the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia. He then asked Mr. Thomas if he has prepared a report that has been submitted to the Committee on Historic Designation.
 - Mr. Thomas confirmed he had reviewed the nomination and prepared the report.
 - Mr. Phillips asked if, in his professional expert opinion, Jewelers' Row meets Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, G, H, or J.
 - Mr. Thomas confirmed that, in his opinion, it does not satisfy any of the Criteria.
- Mr. Thomas presented a summary of the findings of his evaluation report of the nomination, which was submitted to the Historical Commission on 14 February 2020. He said he assessed all of the buildings in the district and documented the changes.

Mr. Thomas described the district as a collection of buildings of no particular significance, which have lost any significance they may have had by continual alteration. Mr. Thomas presented illustrations that showed the extent of the changes. He noted that the original Carstairs Row no longer has architectural unity that is implied by a row. Mr. Thomas said that, if the Commission designates this district, it will be essentially creating a district of undistinguishable show facades. He pointed out that he believes it is inappropriate to designate this block on these grounds because of the extent of alterations and changes that have occurred. Mr. Thomas noted that, as part of his evaluation, he observed that the district has no distinctive architectural style or engineering. He pointed the mistake in the nomination that called Carstairs Row the first unified row of buildings in Philadelphia. Mr. Thomas contended that there were rows of buildings, at least three together, since the 1750s and pointed out that Sansom's Row around the corner was constructed at an earlier date. He said that Carstairs Row is largely gone and that the row that is present in its place today is varied with different architectural types, styles, and characteristics. Mr. Thomas questioned the contribution of significant architects to the district and stated that many of the architects were third and fourth-tier designers without consequences to the city and its built fabric. He said that the buildings designed by significant architects on Jewelers' Row either have already been protected or demolished. Mr. Thomas asserted that these buildings are not static but are changing to reflect the changing dynamics of the retail environment; which itself is changing dramatically. He called out the errors in the nomination, stating that it was not the first jewelry district in the United States; rather the first was Maiden Lane in New York, which appeared a century earlier. He also noted that there was an earlier jewelry district in Philadelphia on 2nd Street. Mr. Thomas remarked that the building texts in the nomination are poorly done and have incorrect architectural descriptions. He described the nomination as poorly conceived. Mr. Thomas said that districts and areas based on use come and go. He noted a number of areas in Philadelphia with former concentrations of uses. He cited areas which have completely disappeared or are slowly disappearing as Bankers Row, Insurance Row, Restaurant Supply District, and Fabric Row. He asked the Committee about the consequences if these areas had been designated. Mr. Thomas said that freezing these places in time would be ludicrous as the nature of cities is fluid and dynamic. Mr. Thomas stated that the most critical issue with this nomination is the continuing change in the proposed district. He walked through the different types of research used to study the area, which included census records, directories, and building permits. He discussed how the area has changed over time and the ongoing evolution of the building uses. Mr. Thomas noted that the jewelry business is declining and many businesses are moving on. He described the range of eclectic storefronts on Sansom Street and questioned the goal of preservation when buildings have changed this much. He questioned the value of a designation, noting that you cannot put your arms around a memory. The jewelry businesses are moving to Walnut Street and other areas such as King of Prussia and the Main Line. He added that this area is a dinosaur from the past with more signs than active participants. Mr. Thomas said that the nomination is an attempt to designate a nostalgic use in a block that is in the middle of a dramatic change. The nominator is trying to freeze a part of the city. He asked about the value designation brings to a group of buildings whose uses are trendy and whose architectural character has basically been destroyed. He pointed out that the area, which is mostly three-story buildings, is now zoned for CMX-5, which holds a potential of 16 stories and that designation would represent a significant loss of value for the owners.

- Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Thomas if it made sense to designate an area in a large metropolitan city based upon its one-time use.
 - Mr. Thomas replied that it does not because cities change and zoning cannot stipulate specific uses like a jewelry store.
 - Mr. Phillips stated that the Historical Commission cannot compel owners to maintain a jewelry district. Life will continue to evolve and these owners will be stuck with these buildings.
- Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Thomas if it is his profession opinion that these buildings, taken as a whole, a group of 57 buildings, do not satisfy the Criteria for architectural and historical significance.
 - Mr. Thomas replied that they do not satisfy the Criteria.
- Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Thomas to comment on the 8th Street area of the district and the proposed district boundaries.
 - Mr. Thomas replied that the 700 block of Sansom Street has unity because of the containment of the block. He continued that the buildings on 8th Street and the 800 block of Sansom were originally built for other uses such as food services. Mr. Thomas added that they also have been drastically altered and, like Sansom Street, are transitioning away from the jewelry business. He concluded that the 8th Street buildings and the 800 block of Sansom Street are add-ons to a designation to that should not be done.
 - Mr. Phillips pointed out that the 700 block of Sansom Street includes historic street paving that is already designated and will not change.
- Mr. David Brownlee stated that he teaches architectural history at University of Pennsylvania, is a board member of the Preservation Alliance, and a former member of the Historical Commission, who chaired the Committee on Historical Designation for 16 years. He said it is always fun to talk about architectural history and it is important too. He noted that architectural history is one of the most significant repositories of cultural memories and we are always living in its latest chapter and we should try to get it right. Mr. Brownlee said he trusted their judgment in looking at Jewelers' Row because it really is just what it looks like—a largely intact group of buildings that reflect the interesting and changing history of downtown Philadelphia over about 170 years. He noted that it is important to say this up front because the critical evaluation that you received and just heard is largely an attempt to refute what is plainly seen. Mr. Brownlee continued that the evaluation is deploying some painfully obvious deceptions by misrepresenting the goal of the nomination and saying its effects would be terrible, by misrepresenting the Criteria that the nomination must satisfy, then saying the nomination does not meet them, and throughout disguising the thinness of the argument in a cloud of spurious imperiousness—irrelevant diagrams, charts, and graphs that are intended to show things that are not relevant to the designation. He stated that the nomination does not seek, as Mr. Thomas' evaluation claims, to freeze the district in a past use, noting that the claim is intended to mislead and frighten property owners. Mr. Brownlee said that not only does the nomination not seek to do that, it could not. He noted that past uses may be an interesting part the story and contribute to the historical significance and may be why we call this Jewelers' Row. He stated that the building uses are unregulated by the City's preservation ordinance. Mr. Brownlee added that because of regulation passed last November, owners of historic properties may actually qualify for several breaks if they want to modify the uses of their buildings to serve new functions. He continued that the newly reconfigured tax abatement policy adds tax advantages for the rehabilitation of older buildings. Mr.

Brownlee explained that designation only protects the exterior appearance of a building, only what you see not what goes on behind the facades. He said that examples of buildings that have been adapted to new uses abound, for example PSFS building, once a bank and office building and now the Loews Hotel. He pointed out that the adaptive changes that go on behind the façade can be big, noting that the 45-story St. James apartment building was approved by the Historical Commission to be built behind York Row, the preserved Federal era townhouses in the 700 block of Walnut Street. Mr. Brownlee commented that, if Jewelers' Row had been designated, the Toll Brothers project could have looked like that. Mr. Brownlee said that his second point is that the evaluation misrepresents the Criteria as it does not require a "superlative" level of cultural significance or cultural representation. He stressed this is simply not so for any kind of designation and all the more so in a historic district where designation requires things that are, in the words of the ordinance "distinctive", "established", "familiar", and just plain "significant." He also pointed out that the ordinance also does not require, as the evaluation suggests, that nominated properties only have one significant characteristic in use and architectural style and that they possess it purely and always and everywhere. Mr. Brownlee said that this misapprehension leads the author to point out repeatedly the changing uses, the shifting demographics, and the succession of architectural styles that characterize Jewelers' Row as though these were faults. He continued that they are not faults. Mr. Brownlee said in an effort to discredit the nomination's eligibility under Criterion A for example, the evaluation emphasizes that only three of the original Carstairs Row houses survive and that the purely residential character of the street was changed in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when some houses were altered and others replaced by distinctive buildings of a new type which were erected to serve the printing and then the jewelry trades. He stressed that no one disputes this fact and the nomination acknowledges the fact and it is far from being a disqualifier; it is one of the most significant traits of the district. Mr. Brownlee continued that the attempt to use the changes in uses and demographics as a disqualification is also reflected in the critical analysis of Criteria H and J, in which quantitative data from census reports, directories, and building permits are used to demonstrate conclusively the never challenged fact that Jewelers' Row has changed functions over the years. He said that changelessness is not a requirement for designation and, while intended to cloud the argument, the evaluation's research actually bolsters the presentation of the district as a microcosm of two centuries of Philadelphia's cultural, commercial, and architectural history. Mr. Brownlee stated he wanted to call everyone's attention to the number "38," as this is the number extant buildings in the East Center City Commercial National Register Historic District that were identified as significant or contributing to that district. He added that "38" is the number of buildings that are significant and contributing on a National Register that will gain new protections if Jewelers' Row is designated because they are not presently locally designated. Mr. Brownlee contended that an obsession with architectural purity also skews the evaluation's analysis of architectural styles, under Criterion C, which complains about new storefronts and the continuous rebuilding, which is the norm in commercial districts. He pointed out that the storefronts are one of the most distinctive features and in that context it is notable that there are 18 architecturally significant storefronts among the inventoried buildings of the Jewelers' Row nomination although the evaluation reports notes that many do not match the style of the building. Mr. Brownlee said that in real life we do not see collage of disembodied fragments; he noted that the viewers' experience of a street and a district is shaped by the totality of the buildings. He continued that even though

historical detail is missing or altered in some places at street level, the buildings' size and scale is almost never compromised in this area and even most of the non-contributing buildings play along. He emphasized that it is this totality that we remember when we call this Jewelers' Row. Mr. Brownlee stated that history is after all a record of change and it is peculiar that an evaluation that rails against an imaginary hold on future change should fail to celebrate the evidence of change in the past. He concluded that most of us are used to seeing change and it does not confuse us, noting that many of those in attendance remember him having brown hair but they still recognize him even though he now has gray hair. Mr. Brownlee added that Mr. Thomas used to have a beard and he bets you recognize him too. He said that to go back to the beginning they should trust what they see on Jewelers' Row and what you see is what Criterion G calls "a distinctive area" and Criterion H calls "an established familiar visual feature." Mr. Brownlee said it is the kind of place that famed architect Louis Kahn was thinking of when he called a street "a room by agreement," by which he did not mean that all the buildings looked the same, but they came together to do something. He continued that the buildings of Jewelers' Row come together like that in their differences to exemplify what Criterion J calls "the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community." He noted that heritage is not one thing and the designation does not require that or freeze the way we use designated buildings in the future. Mr. Brownlee concluded that story of Jewelers' Row is like the story of Philadelphia, a story of complexity and change, and it is right for us to care for the places where that narrative is told, as it is told especially well on Jewelers' Row.

- Mr. Phillips spoke in response to Mr. Brownlee's statement. He pointed out the irony of designating a district emblematic of change by stopping further change and by altering the natural evolution that this block has undertaken for a manufactured evolution that is based on the Historical Commission's approval of whether or not there can be alternations to the facades and exteriors of the buildings. Mr. Phillips contended that the buildings do not meet the Criteria for Designation.
- Mr. Thomas responded to Mr. Brownlee's remarks by referencing earlier points of his presentation and his report.
- Mr. Phillips stated that a number of the building owners were in attendance and requested to speak to the Committee. Owners individually spoke to the Committee about their personal experience with the issues raised by Mr. Phillips and Mr. Thomas. They stated their buildings have undergone continual change and they do not believe the proposed district or buildings have architectural merit or hold historical value. Owners spoke about their family's histories of owning the buildings and many noted their long time experiences in the jewelry trade. They expressed concerns about the future and viability of the jewelry business and concerns regarding the financial impact of designation. Owners questioned the Historical Commission's motives for designation and expressed concerns about an overreach on their private property. The following owners spoke to the Committee:
 - Carl Gansky, owner of 718 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Barry Sable, owner of 735 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Paranyit Singh, owner of 720 and 809 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Ross Hagstoz, owner of 709 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Nick Kusturies, owner of 727 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Roberto Pupo, owner of 717 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Howard Katz, owner of 723 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.

- Jeffrey Barsky, owner of 724 Sansom Street and former owner of 706-08 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - George Bottos, owner of 721 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
 - Ean Kao, owner of 725 Sansom Street, spoke against the designation.
- Ms. Milroy thanked the property owners for coming to the meeting and speaking to the Committee about their situations. She said that it has been a long, drawn out conversation and she wished to thank them for speaking. Ms. Milroy said that the name of the district can live beyond the district's use, such as Brewer's Hill in Baltimore. She noted that the brewery is long gone but it still called Brewer's Hill. Ms. Milroy said that another example is Les Halles, which was a central food market in Paris, and there has not been a market there is 100 years but is still called Les Halles. She asked them to keep that in mind as something to think about.
- Ms. Milroy addressed the scope of historic designation and the implications of a historic district. She continued that a number of studies have shown that property values actually increase once districts are designated. She cited a study done in Connecticut where property values increased as much as 15%.
- Ms. Milroy said that this is a block that is in constant change and pointed out that interesting architecture does not have to be high style, elite architecture. She contended that it can be the hardworking, utilitarian architecture that people need to run a business.
- Ms. Cooperman said that one of the characteristics of the East Center City Historic District, a National Register Historic District, is that it is defined by its mixture of scale, periods, types, and styles. She said that many of these buildings are contributing resources in that district.
- Mr. Cohen said there is a lot on the table and a lot that he agreed with. He pointed out that there are some structural forces at play here and one of them was when the zoning became CMX-5, which placed a target on the area because it promised an increased value for each lot. Mr. Cohen said this is the unspoken reason everyone is here today. He noted that Mr. Phillips has posed the question: Are we here because we want to save buildings or want to prevent development? Mr. Cohen commented that this has become charged because of the zoning issue.
- Mr. Cohen said that another structural issue is the demise of the jewelry business at this location and he said that he cannot help but feel great compassion for those who spent multiple generations in a business that is changing dramatically. He pointed out there is a fundamental issue with the word "superlative" that was really a part of the Historical Commission's dossier. He contended that the idea of "superlative" and casting off third and fourth tier architects misses the point of where we are with our historical understanding of landscapes today. Something can be historical not because it is extraordinarily superlative but because it is characteristic of a theme. Mr. Cohen continued that adhering to the theme of superlative changes the argument from what is really the essential reason that we assign places worthy of preservation. He added that if we only go for superlative or unity across a district versus a range of styles that have some other continuity, in terms of building volume, scale, and purposes that are still legible in the landscape, the superlative standard takes us in the wrong direction in the consideration of this place.
- Mr. Cohen stated that he did not want to repeat the arguments made and there were some excellent arguments made. He continued that he appreciated some of the additional research which added to the understanding of place. He noted that everyone on the Committee on Historic Designation attends the meetings on their own time as volunteers because they want to preserve historically significant places

in Philadelphia. He continued that people can agree on a range of historical significance, but when you add in a financial interest and viability of a business, it makes the discussion charged. Mr. Cohen said that the Committee members must address their base obligation as volunteer experts in architectural history and preservation: Is this place significant and is this place coherent as a district? He added that he has listened to everyone, but ultimately the case has been made for the historical significance and coherence of this district.

- Mr. Lavery said three or four years ago, when the Toll Brothers proposal was first made public, he was shocked to learn that Jewelers' Row was not already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He noted that he has been on the Committee for 20 years. He continued that the whole situation represents a failure of their Committee and the Historical Commission as a whole not to have done this a long time ago. Mr. Lavery commented that we can either say we failed then, so why bother, or we can say let us remediate the situation as best we can in moving forward. Mr. Lavery stated that we tend to stumble over the idea of unity and purity in architecture. He recalled saying in a past meeting that Jewelers' Row has the very DNA of Philadelphia architecture, building, and commerce and that history is often messy and complicated especially Philadelphia history. He said you may not be able to define it. Mr. Lavery quoted Supreme Court Justice Stewart Potter, who, when asked about pornography, said "Well I can't define it but I know it when I see it." Mr. Lavery concluded that in the case of Jewelers' Row; he may not be able to define it but he knows architectural historic when he sees it. He noted he would be voting in favor of designation.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned the applicability of Criterion G. She pointed out that a district cannot relate to itself and contended this does not apply and should be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, Save Our Sites, spoke in support of designation.
- Gabriel Gottlieb, a former resident of the Jewelers' Row neighborhood, spoke in support of designation.
- Kathy Dowdell, architect, spoke in support of designation.
- Oscar Beisert, the Keeping Society of Philadelphia, spoke in support of designation.
- Katie Low, resident of Jewelers' Row neighborhood, spoke in support of designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The story of Jewelers' Row is one of complexity and change.
- The district is defined by its mixture of scales, periods, types, and styles.
- The buildings in the district have undergone numerous alterations during the 170-year period of significance.
- Changes in use are recognized as an essential part of district's history and the expectation is that this will continue in the future. The Historical Commission does not regulate use.
- The Criteria for Designation does not require a "superlative" level of cultural significance or cultural representation. The words of the preservation ordinance uses are "distinctive," "established," "familiar," and "significant."

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded 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, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The architectural resources of Jewelers' Row span more than 200 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 twentieth-century commercial lofts, and Depression-era and Postwar commercial fronts, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- 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, satisfying Criterion E.
- Owing to its unique location along a block of Sansom Street, which is offset from Center City's otherwise regular grid and distinguished by an iconic and distinctive streetscape, the proposed historic district represents an established and familiar visual feature of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion H.
- The nomination does not demonstrate that the proposed historic district satisfies Criterion G.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Jewelers' Row Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H and J; all buildings should be classified as Significant, Contributing or Non-Contributing, without separate sub-classifications for façades and storefronts; and 113-15 S. 8th Street should be classified as a Non-contributing addition to 731 Sansom Street.

ITEM: Jewelers' Row Historic District					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, D, E, H and J, with revisions					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Douglas Mooney	X				
Total	6				

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 1:43 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.