

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

**2 JUNE 2021, 9:30 A.M.  
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM  
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	X		
Suzanna Barucco	X		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.		X	
Bruce Laverty	X		
Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.	X		(left 12:10pm)

\* Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Committee members, staff, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III  
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 attended the online meeting:

Jenn Patrino  
Steve Peitzman  
Marjorie Russell  
Nina Curlett  
Donna Rilling  
Cheryl L. Ford  
Tim Kerner  
Dr. Gregory Nelson  
Jay Farrell  
Chloe Mohr  
Jewell Newton  
Deborah Gary  
Bob Elfant  
Penchita Perry

Brenda Merrill  
Eric Marshall  
Mary Genertte  
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society  
Sherman Aronson  
Ken Weinstein, Philly Office Retail  
Dart Sageser  
Allison Weiss  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance  
Adrian Trevisan  
Lorraine Rocci  
George Poulin  
Carolyn Campbell  
Dorothy Morton  
Kelly O'Day  
Paula O'Day  
Susan Wetherill  
J.M. Duffin  
Sharon Harvey, Esq., Harper & Paul  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
Hal Schirmer, Esq.  
Joy Morton  
Linda Lukiewski  
Janet Sturdivant  
Janice Woodcock  
William Morton Jr.  
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Zarwin Baum  
Bradley Maule  
Kevin Block  
Rev. Mark Tyler  
Sheila Jones  
Tom Lamar  
Tim Lux  
Dennis Carlisle  
David Fellner  
Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law  
Abdul-Rahim Muhammad  
Harrison Haas, Esq.  
Jeffery Hays  
Dana Fedeli  
Celeste Morello

**ADDRESS: 1016-18 SOUTH ST**

Name of Resource: Waters Memorial AME Church/Engine 11 Firehouse

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Waters Memorial AME Church

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1016-18 South Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the building has significant value as part of the heritage of the City, being the home of Engine Company 11, which from 1919 to 1952 was one of only two African American fire companies in the segregated Philadelphia Fire Department. Under Criterion B, the nomination contends that the building is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, being the desegregation of the Philadelphia Fire Department in 1953. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the building, constructed in 1902, is significant for its architect, Philip H. Johnson, who designed numerous public buildings for the City.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1016-18 South Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and E.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:08:45

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Steinke summarized the historic significance of the building. He stated that the property owner, Waters Memorial AME Church, is in support of the designation.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone was in attendance to represent the property owner.
  - No one indicated a desire to speak by using the raise hand feature in Zoom.
- Ms. Barucco expressed support for the designation.
  - All Committee members agreed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.
- Deborah Gary supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building housed Engine Company 11 from 1919 to 1952.
- The current property owner, Waters Memorial AME Church, reportedly supports the designation.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building has significant value as part of the heritage of the City, being the home of Engine Company 11, which from 1919 to 1952 was one of only two African American fire companies in the segregated Philadelphia Fire Department, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, being the desegregation of the Philadelphia Fire Department in 1953, satisfying Criterion B.
- The building is significant for its architect, Philip H. Johnson, who designed numerous public buildings for the City, satisfying Criterion E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1016-18 South Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, and E.

**ITEM: 1016-18 South St.**

**MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, B, and E**

**MOVED BY: Lavery**

**SECONDED BY: Barucco**

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4				1

**ADDRESS: 404 FOUNTAIN ST**

Name of Resource: Wright Cottage

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 404 Fountain LLC

Nominator: Marlene Schleifer, Ridge Park Civic Association

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 404 Fountain Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Wright Cottage satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the building, completed in 1856, reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Gothic and Italianate styles of architecture. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the “bracketed cottage” motif popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing’s *Cottage Residences* (1842) and *The Architecture of Country Houses* (1850).

A development project for the site was underway when the Historical Commission notified the property owner on 8 April 2021 that it would consider a nomination proposing to designate the property. A zoning permit application for a five-story multifamily building with 65 apartments (ZP-2020-010120) was filed with the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 16 December

2020. The permit has not been issued yet because the Civic Design Review process is not completed. A zoning permit application for complete demolition of the existing building (ZP-2021-003855) was filed with the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 14 April 2021 and the permit was issued on 20 April 2021. A building permit application for complete demolition (DP-2021-000563) was started in eclipse, the City's online permitting system, on 1 April 2021, but was not completed. That application was superseded by a second building permit application for complete demolition (DP-2021-000615), which was filed with the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 13 April 2021 and will be reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 25 May 2021 and the Historical Commission on 11 June 2021.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 404 Fountain Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. In light of the ongoing development project for the site, the staff suggests a compromise to save the historic building: limiting the designated area to the building and site wall with a narrow buffer at sides and rear.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:18:50

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco and developer Eric Marshall represented the property.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Beisert summarized the historic significance of the building.
- Mr. DeMarco explained that he and his client are working with the staff on a compromise proposal which would retain the main block of the historic house and the schist retaining wall at the front, while allowing for the construction of an apartment building behind the house. The proposal was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its May 2021 meeting. He stated that they consent to designation, conditional upon receiving approval for the compromise development proposal, and reserve their rights in regards to the legal issues regarding the timing of the nomination occurring after the developer purchased the property, in reliance of being able to demolish the building and construct an as-of-right project for which zoning approval was received. He noted that significant funds were expended already in the development process. He stated that plans are currently being prepared to address comments from the Architectural Committee.
- Mr. Marshall explained that, once they learned there was interest from the community to preserve the house, they worked quickly to develop the compromise proposal and hired Janice Woodcock as their architect to help incorporate the historic home into the larger development.
- Ms. Barucco asked about the staff's recommendation that the boundary of the designation include only the historic house with a buffer at the side and rear.
  - Ms. Chantry responded that a proposed boundary has not been defined and that the Committee can opine on that during this review. She noted that, when the building permit application was reviewed by the Architectural Committee one week earlier, the Architectural Committee suggested approximately 20 feet at the rear and 15 feet at the side as a potential buffer, but offered no firm recommendation.
- Ms. Chantry explained that the development proposal retains the main block of the house but demolishes the secondary volumes at the rear. She stated that the

- Architectural Committee asked that the Committee on Historic Designation opine on the significance of the secondary volumes, noting that the nomination calls out the one-story volume as non-contributing.
- Ms. Milroy asked about the date of construction of the one-story volume at the rear, noting that it appears on a 1902 map, but the proposed period of significance ends in 1856 with the completion of the main house. She asked if the nominator had information regarding when the one-story volume was added. She asked if the two-story volume was part of the original construction.
    - Mr. Beisert responded that he did not have an opportunity to extensively research the one-story volume, but assumed that the two-story volume dates to the original construction. He stated that he is not confident that the one-story volume is original.
    - Ms. Milroy responded that he was confident enough to call it non-contributing.
    - Mr. Beisert responded that he believed a large part of it is altered, perhaps being a side porch that was enclosed.
  - Ms. Milroy asked for a document that shows how much space would be left between the rear of the house and the new construction in the development proposal.
  - Ms. Cooperman commented that the period of significance is problematic because the front porch is not an 1850s porch, and it is highly unlikely that the schist retaining wall dates to the 1850s. She concurred that the two-story rear volume is typical of the Downing Cottage design. She stated that a frame-shed-roof, rear kitchen is also typical of this style. She noted that a map in the nomination clearly shows a side porch, which is what has been enclosed.
    - Ms. Barucco agreed, and pointed to the historic photographs of similar examples in the nomination, which show rear ells with porches. She agreed with the concern about the proposed period of significance. She stated that she assumes that the original one-story frame kitchen addition and side porch are all contained within the existing one-story portion.
  - Ms. Barucco applauded the developer for being responsive to community concerns, but stated that the context is being lost by not giving the historic building enough room at the side and rear. She stated that the entire building is historic and should be designated as such.
    - Ms. Milroy agreed, noting that the examples in the nomination indicate that this building is entirely consistent with the Downing designs. She echoed concerns about context and breathing room, but applauded the developer for working to find a solution. She noted that the Wright family was important in Manayunk and Roxborough.
  - Mr. Lavery stated that the schist retaining wall is later than the construction of the house, perhaps owing to a grade change on the street.
    - Mr. Farnham confirmed that the nomination contains a plan for the street grade change from 1902, which is likely the date of the schist retaining wall.
  - Mr. Lavery asked if it is typical for a design proposal to be considered before the designation of a property is considered.
    - Mr. Farnham responded that once the Historical Commission sends a letter to a property owner informing them of a proposed designation, the property is under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, meaning that the Commission is obligated to review all building permit applications for the property. He stated that it is somewhat unusual for a property to appear before the Architectural Committee before it is officially designated, but it does happen and has happened more frequently owing to these kinds of reactive nominations. He

stated that reviewing a permit application before a designation is completed complies with the ordinance and Rules & Regulations.

- The Committee returned to the discussion about the one-story volume, which is classified as non-contributing in the nomination.
  - Ms. Cooperman stated that the one-story side volume has been changed over time, but the two-story rear volume and the shed roof kitchen volume are historic.
  - Ms. Barucco agreed, noting that the Committee appears to be unanimous that the two-story rear volume is original to the construction of the building.
  - Mr. Lavery stated that he believes the two-story volume to be original to the house, but has reservations about the one-story volume being original.
- The Committee discussed the staff recommendation that the designation should be limited to the historic house with a buffer.
  - Ms. Cooperman stated that it is important that the Committee recognize that this was a suburban house sited on a large lot, and that butting new construction up against the historic building destroys the context. She reiterated that the historic building needs some breathing room. She suggested that the Commission could determine how much space it should have at the side and rear.
  - Ms. Barucco noted that a site plan is needed to opine on an appropriate amount of space between the historic building and the new construction.
  - Mr. Lavery suggested that the Committee vote to designate the entire property.
  - Ms. Chantry stated that the Historical Commission will consider both the nomination and the construction proposal at its 11 June 2021 meeting, and could consider an appropriate buffer at that time. She added that the applicant is preparing a site plan for review by the Commission.
- Mr. Beisert opined that upper portions of the porch posts are original or very early. He stated that the Wrights owned the property until 1937.
- Mr. DeMarco stated that the Architectural Committee asked that this Committee offer comment on the significance of the rear volumes.
  - Ms. Chantry confirmed this, and stated that the Architectural Committee made this request in an effort to assist the Historical Commission with its review of the building permit application.
  - Ms. Milroy reiterated that the Committee has determined that the rear volumes are contributing.
  - Ms. Barucco stated that she is confident about the two-story volume, but that the one-story volume would have to be confirmed by inspecting the interior. She stated that the one-story volume has lost integrity.
  - Ms. Cooperman stated that she disagrees with considering the one-story volume as non-contributing. She stated that the section with the shed roof that is visible from the side is characteristic of rear kitchen ells, although it may postdate the two-story rear volume. She agreed that the section that was once an open porch has been heavily altered.
  - Ms. Milroy stated that the entire building should be considered contributing, including the one-story volume.
  - All Committee members eventually agreed that the entire building should be considered contributing to the property's historical significance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the nomination.

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, supported the nomination and the compromise proposal that preserves the main block of the historic building and allows for new construction on the remainder of the site.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination and the compromise proposal.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The front schist wall dates to 1902.
- The main building and two-story rear volume date to the original 1856 construction.
- The one-story rear kitchen shed volume is likely original or was constructed soon thereafter, and the historic open porch at the side has been altered and infilled.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Gothic and Italianate styles of architecture, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the “bracketed cottage” motif popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing, satisfying Criterion D.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 404 Fountain Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, the period of significance should be amended to 1850 to 1902, and the entire building including the one-story volume should be considered contributing to the property’s significance.

**ITEM: 404 Fountain St.**

**MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C and D, with amendments**

**MOVED BY: Laverty**

**SECONDED BY: Milroy**

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4				1

**ADDRESS: 5001 BALTIMORE AVE**

Name of Resource: Hickman Temple AME Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Philadelphia Annual Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5001 Baltimore Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that



Hickman Temple African Methodist Episcopal Church, formerly known as St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H, and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the church embodies distinguishing characteristics of Late Gothic Revival architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the church and chapel addition are examples of the work of Isaac Pursell, a prolific church designer in Philadelphia and the surrounding areas. Under Criterion H, the nomination claims that the church represents an established and familiar visual feature in the heart of the Cedar Park neighborhood of West Philadelphia. Lastly, under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the church exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Cedar Park community.

The church building is suffering from some structural problems. The Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the property as Unsafe on 1 May 2017 (Case 581330). The structural defects were remedied in 2018 with the installation of large steel bracing system on the east façade and the violation was complied. The Department again cited the property as Unsafe on 15 October 2020 (CF-2020-072245). This violation involves structural defects in the bell tower. As of the writing of this overview, the violation is open and unresolved.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5001 Baltimore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, H, and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:09:25

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- George Poulin of the University City Historical Society represented the nomination.
- Attorney Sharon Harvey, the Reverend Gregory Nelson, and the Reverend Mark Tyler represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Poulin summarized the historic significance of the church.
- Ms. Harvey stated that the property owner, the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the AME Church, and Hickman Temple AME Church oppose the designation of the property. She stated that the address listed on the nomination form for the property owner is incorrect, as the Philadelphia Annual Conference sold the Pelham Road property in 1977. She stated that the Philadelphia Annual Conference did not receive notice of the proposed designation, and that her clients were informed of the proposed designation by a prospective buyer. She stated that the University City Historical Society has not bothered to contact anyone at Hickman Temple or the Philadelphia Annual Conference to let them know of their plans to submit the nomination. She stated that the nominators were aware that her client is in the process of negotiating a sale of the property. She called attention to the façade bracing owing to structural concerns. She stated that she submitted a letter from the Presbyterian Historical Society which stated that this is an average church building with no historical significance. She stated that the property does not satisfy any Criteria for Designation, is suffering from deferred maintenance, and has been altered over the years so that the character of the building has changed. She stated that the nomination was submitted after the property was listed for sale, and a historic designation of the property will restrict the ability to sell the property. She noted that someone has been at the church most days even during the pandemic, so

- the nominator could have reached out. She asked that the Committee recommend to the Commission that it decline to designate the property as historic.
- Mr. Farnham clarified that the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance obligates the Historical Commission to notify the owner of a property before it considers a designation. The Ordinance obligates the Historical Commission to use the records that are maintained by the property tax officials in the City at the Office of Property Assessment. The Office of Property Assessment considers the owner's address to be the Pelham Road address mentioned earlier by Ms. Harvey. There could be a mistake within the addressing system, but when a property changes hands, it is the property owner's obligation to update the records with the City. The City still lists the Pelham Road address as the mailing address for this property owner, and therefore a letter was sent to the Pelham Road address. A second letter is sent in every case to the property itself. He noted that it was good to hear that someone has been on site most days of the week so that the letter could be received. He suggested that, if there is a concern regarding notice, this Committee and the Historical Commission could wait to consider the nomination, to give the property owner an opportunity to review the nomination and better understand the implications of designation.
  - The Rev. Nelson, Pastor of Hickman Temple AME Church, stated that they are opposed to the historic designation. He stated that Hickman Temple has occupied this building for 47 years, during which time there was no interest from the Historical Commission or the University City Historical Society, until now, when the congregation wishes to sell the property. He stated that the Historical Commission wants to block the process by having it designated as historic without owner consent. He stated that it is borderline unethical, unconstitutional, and maybe even borderline racist. He stated that it is disingenuous and not neighborly. He stated that he has spoken to the nominator, Mr. Poulin, on several prior occasions, but Mr. Poulin did not attempt to reach out and talk to the congregation prior to submitting the nomination. He stated that the congregation has been neighborly to this community for 47 years, but it is not neighborly to push this designation forward without a conversation. He stated that, when he received the notice letter in the mail, he felt bad that he was hearing about it for the first time. He stated that he knows both Mr. Poulin and Mr. Steinke and they could have reached out to him but did not. He stated that the nomination includes information regarding St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, but that congregation dissolved, and Hickman Temple should not live in the shadow of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church. He stated that St. Paul's Presbyterian Church had a beautiful history in the building, but that is no longer the history today. Now it is Hickman Temple's history. He stated that the congregation is hurt because this came as a surprise, and they have given their time and energy to the property and feel as if it has not been reciprocated by the Historical Commission and the nominators. He stated that the congregation should not have had to hear about the proposed designation from a potential buyer who alerted the congregation's real estate agent. He stated that that is not neighborly. He asked if anyone on the Committee has been inside of the church, stating that he does not believe anyone has during his time as pastor. He stated that the congregation deserved to find out about the proposed designation in a way other than his receipt of the notice letter addressed to "owner."
  - The Rev. Tyler, Pastor of Mother Bethel AME Church and Vice Chairperson for the Philadelphia Annual Conference Trustee Board, agreed with the comments made by the congregation. He explained that all AME Church property is deeded in the name of the Annual Conference, held in trust by the local congregation. He explained that

before any AME church is sold or purchased, it must first receive permission of the Philadelphia Annual Conference. He explained that this property belongs to the Philadelphia Annual Conference in trust to Hickman Temple, and that the Philadelphia Annual Conference will typically stand behind the wishes and desires of the local congregation. In this case, the local congregation does not want to have the property designated as historic, and so the Philadelphia Annual Conference stands behind the congregation, which is why Ms. Harvey, the attorney for the Conference, is in attendance and is paid for by the Philadelphia Annual Conference. He stated that this congregation is actively trying to find a new place to worship, and historic designation will deter a sale of the property. He agreed with the Rev. Nelson's comments, and explained that the congregation has gotten smaller, and the church is quite large and difficult to maintain. He explained that the congregation has a tremendous opportunity now because of the interest in real estate to find a buyer and move to another location. He stated that it is unfair for people to do something that would impact the sale and restrict what the congregation is able to receive and therefore what they will be able to build. He stated that we are so concerned about the past that we have no concern about the present and the future of an active congregation. He expressed support for continuing the review of the nomination until a later date.

- Mr. Farnham apologized to the Rev. Nelson that the notification process is impersonal. He explained that it is codified in the City's historic preservation ordinance, but he observed that the notification could have included more than the requisite letters in the mail. He offered to meet with the Rev. Nelson at his convenience to discuss the matter. He stated that while the preservation of historic buildings is incredibly important and is the goal of the Historical Commission, historic organizations like the Hickman Temple AME congregation are also worthy of preservation and there needs to be a balance so that the congregation is not placed at risk to save the bricks and mortar. He acknowledged that it is a difficult situation. He noted that there was a prospective buyer who was looking to take advantage of the new zoning incentives for historically designated buildings, but unfortunately there was a stumbling block. He offered his assistance if there is a way to work through those incentives and to find a buyer willing to adaptively reuse the building.
- The Committee discussed the option of continuing the review of the nomination.
  - Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee could offer a recommendation on the Criteria for Designation, which would not prevent the Historical Commission from being able to continue its review to a later date, or the Committee could make no recommendation regarding the Criteria for Designation and simply recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the review of the nomination to a future meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.
  - Mr. Lavery suggested that, in the spirit of neighborliness, the Committee should recommend a continuance and remand of the review of the nomination, which would provide time for the owners and interested parties to get together for discussions.
  - Ms. Barucco agreed with Mr. Lavery, but stated that she is in favor of the designation of the church building based on the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman acknowledged that the issue of dwindling congregations having to maintain historic buildings is a big problem, not just locally but throughout the United States.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that Isaac Pursell is a nationally significant architect.
- Ms. Harvey confirmed that her clients would like to request a continuance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, supported the nomination. He commented that the community assisted the congregation with the bracing structure that allowed for the congregation to worship inside the building again. He commented that the property has been on and off the market in recent years, contributing to concern that the building could be lost. He commented that the Preservation Alliance supports the nomination because of the worry that the building will be demolished absent this type of protection.
- Hal Schirmer, an attorney from upper Bucks County, supported the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, supported the nomination. He commented that he understands the complications this may cause for the Philadelphia Annual Conference and Hickman Temple AME Church. He commented that the building is a neighborhood landmark and, if it is not protected, it will likely be demolished if sold. He noted that there are zoning exemptions to allow for easier reuse of these types of historic buildings.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property would remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- A continuance of the review of the nomination will provide time for the property owner and interested parties to have a discussion.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue and remand the review of the nomination of 5001 Baltimore Avenue to a future meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

<b>ITEM: 5001 Baltimore Ave.</b>					
<b>MOTION: Continue and remand to future Committee on Historic Designation meeting</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	<b>Recuse</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4				1

**ADDRESS: 6625 LINCOLN DR**

Name of Resource: Nichols-Goehring House

Proposed Action: Amend boundary of individual designation

Property Owner: 6625 Lincoln Dr LLC

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to amend the boundary of the designated property at 6625 Lincoln Drive to exclude the subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive. The Historical Commission would retain jurisdiction over the smaller subdivided property at 6625 Lincoln Drive, where the Nichols-Goehring House is located. The Historical Commission designated the Nichols-Goehring House property at 6625 Lincoln Drive on 11 January 2019. The designated parcel is shown on a site plan from the nomination in Figure 1. The property owner subdivided the property that was known as 6625 Lincoln Drive into the five parcels with a deed that is dated 9 January 2019 and recorded on 11 January 2019, the very same day that the property was designated. A zoning permit for the subdivision had been issued on 17 September 2018, prior to the issuance of the Historical Commission's notice. The Historical Commission notified the property owner that it would consider designating the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive on 12 November 2018, thereby initiating its jurisdiction over the entirety of the property originally known as 6625 Lincoln Drive, which was later subdivided into five properties.

In May 2020, the Historical Commission was notified that three houses were under construction at 6625 Lincoln Drive, presumably without permits. The staff visited the site and photographed three houses under construction as well as one foundation being excavated. The staff contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections about the construction that was underway without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The Department responded that the houses had been permitted under the addresses 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive. The permits had been applied for on 26 April 2019 and issued on 10 September 2019. A Google Streetview photograph shows that site work and the construction of the foundations was underway in November 2019. The Department of Licenses & Inspections did not refer the new construction permit applications to the Historical Commission because they had been issued under 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive, addresses that did not exist at the time of designation; only 6625 Lincoln Drive was identified as historic. The permit referral system was designed to catch subdivisions and carry the historic designation marker from the parent to the child property, but it did not in this case. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declined to revoke the permits because the mistake had been made within the City system and revoking the permits would open the City to liability.

The fourth house contemplated for the site was not permitted with the other three in 2019. The new house was planned for the subdivided parcel at 6627 Lincoln Drive, situated in front of the historic house. The property owner submitted an application for new construction for review by the Historical Commission at its 9 April 2021 meeting. The Historical Commission approved the new construction application, which proposed to locate the house to the side of the subdivided lot to maximize views of the Nichols-Goehring House.

The property owner contends that the subdivision of 6625 Lincoln Drive into five parcels had already been initiated prior to the date the Historical Commission staff sent notice of the nomination and that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the properties at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.

At the time of designation, the Historical Commission found that the property satisfied Criteria for Designation C and D, both of which relate to architectural style. The Historical Commission

made no findings about the significance of the grounds. The designation was predicated on the architectural style of the house itself and not on landscaping, archaeology, or other features or aspects of the site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends amending the boundary of the individual designation of the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive to exclude the subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:14:50

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Sean Whalen represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Whalen stated that this is a legal matter that has played itself out in front of the Historical Commission at its April 2021 meeting. He noted that he is attempting to realign the boundaries according to city records and the reality of the site at this time. He contended that there was no error made but that the issue arises from multiple processes occurring simultaneously with no central database to capture all the changes. In addition to the dates outlined in the staff overview, Mr. Whalen stated that the Office of Property Assessment issued notice of the new addresses in October 2018, which formerly created the addresses at 6619, 6621, 6623, 6625, and 6627 Lincoln Drive. He noted that the formal creation does not happen in real time. What happened in this case, he continued, is that the new lots were created and the following month the Historical Commission staff sent notice of the nomination for 6625 Lincoln Drive. He contended that his client understood 6625 Lincoln Drive to be the historic house and did not dispute the designation, because he was willing to maintain it as historic and rehabilitate it accordingly. Mr. Whalen explained that Mr. Beisert could not have known about the subdivision, because it had not yet been reflected on the Office of Property Assessment website. He argued that not one made a mistake, but rather everyone acted in good faith moving forward in their ordinary course and the issue resulted from the City not having fully updated information for all participants. He concluded that his client made a full and legal subdivision before the nomination and that the nomination was submitted with the former boundaries of the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive. He asked that the Committee recommend that the boundary at 6625 Lincoln Drive be amended to match the city's documentation on the subdivided parcel.
- Ms. Cooperman asked the staff for clarification on why the boundary amendment is being reviewed by the Committee on Historic Designation after the Historical Commission opined on the design of the building at 6627 Lincoln Drive. She stated she was unclear on what the Committee would be recommending.
  - Mr. Whalen responded that he understood the Commission approved the new construction application but that the boundary amendment would need to be reviewed by this Committee as a matter of procedure, as he was advised by Mr. Farnham and Ms. Keller. The preservation ordinance states that the process for amending and rescinding designations shall be the same as the process for initially establishing designations.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that, owing to the timing of the subdivision and notification processes, the subdivision is beyond the Committee's authority.

- Ms. Milroy opined that the Historical Commission's ordinance includes advocacy and that similar properties need to be advocated for through the City Planning Commission. She argued that large lots along Lincoln Drive available to subdivision should raise flags, though she acknowledged that the Historical Commission has no authority to change the outcome in this case.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the historic building's windows have been left open over several seasons and asked that the owner address the issue.
- Ms. Barucco commented that the situation is unfortunate but that the Historical Commission has no authority over the subdivision. She stated her appreciation that the historic building is being saved and that an effort has been made to preserve the views from Lincoln Drive. She added that when subdivisions are made, she hopes more attention will be paid to providing some context to historic buildings that sit on large lots. Given the circumstances, she argued that this is the best possible outcome.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Nominator Oscar Beisert stated that he agrees with compromise and sensitive redevelopment of sites and buildings and acknowledges that the property was subject to a complicated series of events. He commented this is not an estate with grounds but is a house with a large front yard. He remarked that it would be silly if nominators need to start nominating front yards and street frontage as part of the contributing features of the property. He argued that it defies all logic, adding that the intent of the nomination was to designate the building and surrounding yard. He further contended that the Commission should maintain oversight over the new properties, because they may deteriorate and be demolished in the future.
- Carolyn Campbell commented that she is a landscape architect and disapproved of the property's subdivision.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Historical Commission designated the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive, the Nichols-Goehring House, on 11 January 2019. At the same time, but preceding the mailing of notice of the nomination, the owner formally subdivided the property into five parcels. The historic building remains on the parcel identified as 6625 Lincoln Drive.
- The nomination identified the boundary of 6625 Lincoln Drive in its former state prior to subdivision, and the Historical Commission designated the property according to that boundary, because the Office of Property Assessment's records did not indicate that a subdivision had occurred until after the property was designated.
- Four additional properties were created and include 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.
- New construction was legally permitted and is nearly completed at 6619, 6621, and 6623 Lincoln Drive.
- The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application for new construction at 6627 Lincoln Drive at its 9 April 2021 meeting.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The parcel on which the historic resource is located is 6625 Lincoln Drive; however the boundary as designated by the Historical Commission did not reflect the actual boundary of the property at the time of designation.

- Because the subdivision predates the mailing of notice of the nomination, the boundary should be amended to reflect the actual boundary of the property at 6625 Lincoln Drive. The subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive should be excluded from the designated boundary.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the boundary of 6625 Lincoln Drive be amended to exclude the subdivided parcels at 6619, 6621, 6623, and 6627 Lincoln Drive.

<b>ITEM: 6625 Lincoln Dr</b>					
<b>MOTION: Amend boundary</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4				1

**ADDRESS: 1716 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Wall and Ochs Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Tuscan Realty of PA, LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents Association

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1716 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the subject property is a “notable example of a Renaissance Revival-style commercial building of the turn of the twentieth century.” Under Criterion E the nomination argues that the 1716 Chestnut Street was designed “by the architectural firm of Addison Hutton, a designer that greatly influenced the City of Philadelphia and the larger region in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.” Under Criterion J, the nomination suggests that the subject property is significant because it was constructed for and housed opticians Wall & Ochs, whose business was representative of “the economic, social, and historical heritage of optometry in Philadelphia, as the field and industry evolved in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to become a recognized health care profession nationwide.”

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1716 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:38:00



**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Tim Kerner represented the nomination on behalf of the Center City Residents Association. Oscar Beisert authored the nomination and was available for questions.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Barucco remarked that she enjoyed learning about Philadelphia's important role in the history of optometry.
- Mr. Lavery thanked the Center City Residents Association for nominating this property.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in support of the nomination.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance spoke in support of the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman spoke in support of the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Philadelphia played an important role in the history of optometry.
- The building was designed by the firm of Addison Hutton and is a rare survivor of his work.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building at 1716 Chestnut Street is a fine example of the Renaissance-revival style, satisfying Criterion for Designation D.
- The building was designed by the firm of renowned architect Addison Hutton, satisfying Criterion for Designation E.
- The building was constructed for the offices of Wall & Ochs, opticians who played an important role in the evolution of the field of optometry, satisfying Criterion for Designation J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1716 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J.

<b>ITEM: 1716 Chestnut St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D, E &amp; J</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	3				2

**ADDRESS: 721 W GRANGE AVE**

Name of Resource: Fox Motor Car Company/Thomas M. Royal & Co.

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Edmund M. Dunn

Nominator: Adrian Trevisan

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 721 W. Grange Avenue, located in the Olney neighborhood of Philadelphia, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Historically known as the Fox Motor Car Company, the building completed construction in 1921. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that it is valuable as a rare surviving automotive manufacturing plant in Philadelphia that dates to the early years of the United States' automotive industry. The nomination further contends that the building qualifies under Criterion D, as the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen, C.A.P. Turner's flat-slab, or, as it was better known, the "mushroom system" factory building, which combining poured concrete with steel reinforcement to produce well-lit, fireproof buildings with abundant floor space. Finally, the nomination asserts that the building is significant under Criterion J because it exemplifies the changing industrial character of the city during the twentieth century.

The staff notes that the nomination is unclear regarding whether the building was constructed with C.A.P. Turner's reinforced concrete system specifically, or with a system akin to Turner's. Turner obtained a patent for his system in 1908, but the patent was invalidated a few years before this building was constructed in 1921. The nominator should clarify whether Turner was directly involved in the construction of this building.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 721 W. Grange Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Additional information is needed regarding Criterion D.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:47:20

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Adrian Trevisan represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Trevisan responded to the staff's comment about Criterion D. He said that he did not find that C.A.P. Turner was directly involved in the design of this building. Mr. Trevisan continued that he thought of the mushroom system as a modern system of building factories and 721 W. Grange Avenue was representative of this system with its expansive windows and mushroom columns.
- Ms. Barucco inquired about the invalidation of C.A.P. Turner's 1907 patent.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that he understood that the Turner's patent was successfully challenged by another engineer who claimed he developed the system first.
- Ms. Cooperman said that she agrees that by the time of the construction of this building in 1921, the mushroom column structural system was well established and accepted, and Criterion D would likely not apply in this case as a result.

- Ms. Barucco stated that a strong case was made for Criteria A and J.
- Mr. Lavery pointed out this is the last industrial building along the North Penn branch of the Reading Railroad in Philadelphia. He also noted this is a good example of what used to be called “red and white” architecture, industrial buildings with red brick infill and concrete or terra cotta trim.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The mushroom structural system was developed at least 15 years before this building’s construction in 1921.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building is a valuable as a rare surviving automotive manufacturing plant in Philadelphia that dates to the early years of the United States’ automotive industry, satisfying Criterion A.
- The argument for Criterion D in the nomination related to C.A.P Turner’s mushroom system was not sufficient.
- The building is representative of “red and white” architecture, a factory building with red brick infill and concrete trim, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building exemplifies the changing industrial character of the city during 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 721 W. Grange Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J.

<b>ITEM: 721 W Grange Avenue</b>					
<b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Lavery</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Barucco</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	3				2

**ADDRESS: 3568 FRANKFORD AVE**

Name of Resource: St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 3568 Frankford Partners LLC

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3568 Frankford Avenue in Harrowgate as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic School, designed by George Audsley and constructed in 1921 and originally used as both a church and school, is significant under Criterion for Designation A because it is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past, St. Joan of Arc and Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, the founding pastor and supervisor of the design and construction. After serving as a Captain and Chaplain in the English army during World War I, Monsignor Hawks' first assignment as a pastor was at St. Joan of Arc in Harrowgate. He named the new parish one week after Joan was canonized and began the parish tradition of the "military mass" in honor of St. Joan, the soldier, to preserve her historical role. Hawks, who converted from Anglican Church to Roman Catholicism, was appointed by Pope Pius XI as a Domestic Prelate and sent as a Vatican Observer to witness and report on the Spanish Civil War. He wrote extensively and gained attention for writings and speeches in converting people to Catholicism. The nomination asserts that the combination church and school was the first church in the United States dedicated to St. Joan of Arc after her canonization in 1920.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3568 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion A for its association with Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, but not St. Joan of Arc. The life of Joan of Arc, who was born about 1412 and reportedly burned at the stake in 1431, is not associated with this property in Philadelphia. This property does represent the modern interest in the story of Joan of Arc that resulted in her canonization in 1920 and therefore may satisfy Criterion J by exemplifying the heritage of the community, but it is not associated with the life of Joan of Arc, which occurred 500 years before this building was constructed.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:57:03

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Morello asked why the staff does not think the property satisfies Criterion A for its association with St. Joan of Arc.
- Ms. Cooperman responded and agreed with the staff that St. Joan of Arc herself is not associated with the property. The property is associated with the twentieth-century veneration of St. Joan of Arc, but not with the person.
- Mr. Lavery agreed, noting that he understands the point of view of the spiritual inspiration that St. Joan and other saints have on congregations of many denominations, but that as a person, she was not explicitly involved with the property. He noted that in the earlier discussion of St. Paul's church, St. Paul was not

invoked as a significant person. With that said, Mr. Lavery opined that the nomination stands on its own for its relationship between the priest, the architect, and the neighborhood.

- Ms. Barucco agreed that St. Joan of Arc was an important person in history, but opined that the person was not directly connected with this building.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Carolyn Campbell questioned the boundary of the property and whether it could be subdivided.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that the building occupies the majority of the tax parcel.
  - Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over the subsequent subdivision of the property.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination. He noted that the building is a neighborhood landmark. He suggested that he would not rule out designating the property on the basis of its association with St. Joan of Arc.
- Tom Lamar, business manager for Holy Innocents which manages St. Joan of Arc church, questioned the significance of the building's association with Joan of Arc and Monsignor Hawks. He noted that it is common for churches to be named after saints, and questioned whether any church named after a saint would automatically be designated as historic.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination. He noted that it is a neighborhood where few resources are protected. He also noted that the Historical Commission can exercise leniency in how it regulates properties once they are designated.
- Sister Linda Lukiewski questioned whether the owners had received notice of the nomination.
  - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission sent letters to the property itself as well as to the owner and address listed with the Office of Property Assessment.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The former St. Joan of Arc School was constructed in 1921 as a combination church and school building.
- The combination church and school was the first church in the United States dedicated to St. Joan of Arc after her canonization in 1920.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks was a Captain and Chaplain in the British army during World War I, after which he was assigned as a pastor at St. Joan of Arc church, which he named as such one week after her canonization. He received numerous honors and commendations from Pope Pious XI and gained attention for his writings and speeches in converting others to Catholicism.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- Joan of Arc was a person significant in the past, but naming the parish after a saint that lived centuries earlier on a different continent does not create a significant association between the person and the construction of the building.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, the founding pastor and supervisor of the design and construction, was a person significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3568 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation A for its association with Monsignor Hawks, not St. Joan of Arc.

<b>ITEM: 3568 Frankford Ave</b> <b>MOTION: Satisfies Criterion A</b> <b>MOVED BY: Lavery</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Barucco</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				X
Jeff Cohen					
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	3				2

**ADDRESS: 3558 FRANKFORD AVE**

Name of Resource: St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3558 Frankford Avenue in Harrowgate as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the St. Joan of Arc Roman Catholic Church, constructed in 1946, when the congregation outgrew the church in the school building, on a design by architect Frank J. Ricker, is significant under Criteria for Designation A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the church is significant for its association with St. Joan of Arc and Monsignor Edward F. Hawks. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church embodies distinguishing characteristics of Early Christian revival style.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3558 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion D for its architecture and Criterion A for its association with Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, but not St. Joan of Arc. The life of Joan of Arc, who was born about 1412 and reportedly burned at the stake in 1431, is not associated with this property in Philadelphia. This property does represent the modern interest in the story of Joan of Arc that resulted in her canonization in 1920 and therefore may satisfy Criterion J by exemplifying the heritage of the community, but it is not associated with the life of Joan of Arc, which occurred 500 years before this building was constructed.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 03:17:22

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

- Father Thomas Higgins, Sister Linda Lukiewski, and Tom Lamar represented the property owner.

#### DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Morello explained that it was an architectural trend between the 1920s and 1940s to design churches in the Romanesque Revival style. She opined that the property is well planned and constructed, and noted that Father Hawks is buried adjacent to the building.
- Father Higgins, pastor of Holy Innocents, opposed the designation. He noted that eight years ago, five parishes in Harrowgate, Kensington, and Juniata, merged into Holy Innocents parish, with St. Joan of Arc becoming a worship center. He explained that Sister Linda Lukiewski runs the worship center at St. Joan of Arc, with 10 to 12 other kinds of ministries at the church. He explained that they are trying to maintain various ministries with limited financial capital, noting that although the Archdiocese holds the deeds for the church, the parish is responsible for maintaining it. He noted that there are two buildings adjacent to the church, the mission center where they run retreats, and the rectory where Sister Linda lives. They have plans to sell the buildings to make improvements to the church property. He explained that they are honored to be nominated, but are opposed to designation because they need to do interior repairs and maybe some exterior work.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that financial matters are beyond the purview of the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Mr. Lamar argued against designation, opining that the nomination does not satisfy any of the Criteria for Designation cited in the nomination. Regarding Criterion D, he argued that he does not understand the references to early Christian churches for a twentieth-century building. Regarding Criterion A, he argued that no one has ever heard of Monsignor Hawks. He noted that the parish still honors Father Hawks, and that he learned a lot about him from the nomination, but questioned whether that really make him a historical person. He opined that nothing is known about the architect, so the nomination does not include Criterion E. He noted that he would like more input from the Archdiocese, and recommended delaying or rejecting the nomination.
- Sister Linda reiterated what Mr. Higgins and Mr. Lamar said. He asked what the requirements are for construction in a building that has been designated as historic.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over the interior of the church and would certainly not interfere with work related to religious worship.
  - Mr. Lamar questioned whether the installation of an ADA ramp would be approved.
  - Mr. Farnham responded that the staff could likely approve a ramp, depending on its impact to the historic building.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that Romanesque Revival architecture was an important twentieth-century architectural trend, not a medieval trend, and that this building is a very typical design for its period of construction.
- Mr. Laverty commented that both buildings, the church and school, are not just great survivors, but great examples of religious properties that are thriving in the community. He noted that it is clear that the owners have been good stewards of the buildings, and commended Holy Innocents parish. He opined that it is a strong nomination, and that the building is an excellent example of post-war church building in a time when more churches were built to accommodate a growing population and

growing faith. He opined that it is also an excellent example of Romanesque Revival architecture.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- St. Joan of Arc church was constructed in 1946 during a period of population growth and time in which many churches were constructed in the Romanesque Revival style.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks was a Captain and Chaplain in the British army during World War I, after which he was assigned as a pastor at St. Joan of Arc church, which he named as such one week after her canonization. He received numerous honors and commendations from Pope Pious XI and gained attention for his writings and speeches in converting others to Catholicism.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- Joan of Arc was a person significant in the past, but naming the parish after her does not create a significant association between her and the construction of the building.
- Monsignor Edward F. Hawks, the founding pastor and supervisor of the design and construction, was a person significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A.
- The church embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Romanesque Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3558 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D.

<b>ITEM: 3558 Frankford Avenue</b>					
<b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A and D</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	3				2



## **CARNEGIE LIBRARY THEMATIC HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Number of properties: 20

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate a thematic historic district composed of the remaining 20 of the original 25 Carnegie branch libraries constructed throughout Philadelphia between 1905 and 1930. Of those properties, 16 remain branch libraries, and 11 are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district has significant interest or value as part of the City's development, the history of public libraries in the United States and its association with Pittsburgh industrialist Andrew Carnegie. The branch libraries, constructed between 1905 and 1930, were the first purpose-built public libraries in the city of Philadelphia. While each of the libraries is unique, they all embody distinguishing characteristics common of Carnegie-funded libraries, satisfying Criterion D, and were designed by a veritable "who's who" of renowned local architects, including Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day & Brother, John T. Windrim, David Knickerbacker Boyd, Hewitt & Hewitt, and Philip H. Johnson, satisfying Criterion E.

The nomination also contends that one property, the McPherson Square Branch library, is additionally significant under Criteria for Designation G and I for its historic and current relationship to McPherson Square, which has never been developed and holds archaeological potential as the early homestead of the Webster family.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Carnegie Libraries Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and that the McPherson Square branch at 601 E. Indiana Avenue additionally satisfies Criteria G and I.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 03:44:13

### **PRESENTERS:**

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

### **DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Laverty mused that he got his first library card in 1961 at the Logan branch library. He noted that he has been waiting for a nomination for all of the Carnegie libraries for years, explaining that 20 or more years ago, the Historic American Buildings Survey did a survey of Philadelphia's remaining Carnegie libraries. He remarked that they are an impressive group of buildings, and represent perhaps the single greatest act of philanthropy in the nation's history in terms of cultural impact on people of all classes. He noted that the construction of the Carnegie libraries demonstrated that the general public deserves both good books and good buildings, and that it is a great badge of honor that Philadelphia built more Carnegie libraries than any other city.
- Ms. Barucco and Ms. Cooperman echoed Mr. Laverty's sentiments. Ms. Cooperman noted that it is a great collection of buildings by very significant architects.

- Ms. Barucco questioned whether the boundaries of the proposed designations would be confusing.
  - Ms. DiPasquale responded that she created the boundaries. She explained that the orange outlines represent the tax parcels, but that some libraries sit on much larger parcels that were not explicitly historically associated with the libraries, so those are shown with smaller yellow boundaries within the larger orange tax parcel boundaries.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination
- Deborah Gary supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Twenty of the original 25 Carnegie libraries constructed in Philadelphia between 1905 and 1930 still exist, 11 of which are already designated as historic, and 16 of which remain branch libraries.
- The libraries were the first purpose-built public libraries in Philadelphia.
- The construction of Carnegie libraries was one of the greatest acts of philanthropy in United States' history, with libraries constructed throughout the city, allowing equal access to good books and good architecture to people of all economic and social statuses.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The district is significant under Criterion A for its significant interest or value as part of the City's development, the history of public libraries in the United States, and its association with Pittsburgh industrialist Andrew Carnegie.
- While each of the libraries is unique, they all embody distinguishing characteristics common of Carnegie-funded libraries, satisfying Criterion D.
- The libraries were designed by a veritable "who's who" of renowned local architects, including Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day & Brother, John T. Windrim, David Knickerbacker Boyd, Hewitt & Hewitt, and Philip H. Johnson, satisfying Criterion E.
- The McPherson Square Branch library at 601 E. Indiana Avenue is additionally significant for its historic and current relationship to McPherson Square, which has never been developed and holds archaeological potential as an early homestead, satisfying Criteria G and I.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that Carnegie Library Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and that the McPherson Square branch at 601 E. Indiana Avenue additionally satisfies Criteria G and I.

<b>ITEM: Carnegie Libraries Thematic Historic District</b> <b>MOTION: Satisfy Criteria A, D, E, and 601 E Indiana, additionally G and I</b> <b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b> <b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Lavery	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	3				2

### **CENTRAL MT. AIRY HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Philadelphia City Planning Commission

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

**OVERVIEW:** This proposed historic district, located along the 7100 and 7200 blocks of Germantown Avenue in Northwest Philadelphia, is comprised of 47 properties, largely constructed between 1885 and 1933. Five properties are classified as significant, 38 properties are considered contributing, and 4 properties are classified as non-contributing. An additional two properties are already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The proposed Central Mt. Airy Historic District extends just past Nippon Street at the north and is bounded by Mt. Pleasant Avenue at the south. The west boundary is defined by properties fronting Germantown Avenue, with one additional property on W. Durham Street. The east boundary is similarly bounded by properties fronting Germantown Avenue, with several additional properties on E. Mt. Airy Avenue.

The nomination argues that the Central Mt. Airy Historic District evolved from an area sparsely populated by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century buildings to a dense commercial corridor by the early twentieth century, accelerated by wholesale commercial development in the 1920s. The nomination contends that, owing to the scale and presence of those early twentieth-century buildings, their Art Deco style defines the district, with colonial buildings interspersed throughout. The nomination further argues that the buildings within the district have undergone little change since the corridor was modernized nearly 100 years ago.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J. However, the staff recommends that some properties be further evaluated to determine whether they merit full jurisdiction by the Historical Commission.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:53:30**

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

- No one represented the nomination; however the Philadelphia City Planning Commission submitted a written statement noting that the proposed historic district strongly supports the Philadelphia 2035 Comprehensive Plan.
- Property owners Ken Weinstein, David Fellner, and Bob Elfant represented numerous properties in the district.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Keller read a statement into the record prepared by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission.
- Ken Weinstein, the owner of 7111-13 Germantown Avenue, requested to remove the rear section of the property from the district boundary, explaining that the front of the property is the Mt. Airy Presbyterian Church sanctuary. He agreed the church building should be designated as part of the district but requested that the rear either be identified as non-contributing or be removed from the district entirely. He noted that the majority of the rear structure was not constructed until 1956, and the nomination identifies the period of significance as extending from 1885 to 1933. He argued that the rear building was constructed more than two decades after the end of the period of significance. The nomination, he continued, makes no mention of the rear of the property. He noted that several years ago he began converting the rear structure into 19 residential condominium units and the project was well underway before notice of the district nomination was received. He remarked that he is now at the end of the construction period and will be closing on the first condominium units this year. He noted that he supported many historic districts in the past, including Wayne Junction, and stated that he would support this district, provided the Historical Commission would accept his request to either classify the rear as non-contributing or remove it from the district, as well as a few other minor requests from other property owners.
- Ms. Cooperman asked whether the exterior of the rear building had been altered.
  - It was noted that a rooftop addition had been constructed and the windows had been replaced.
- Ms. Barucco asked why Mr. Weinstein is requesting to reclassify or remove the rear portion of the property, since it is already under construction.
  - Mr. Weinstein responded that he felt the new condominium owners should not have to comply with Historical Commission requirements when the date of construction of their property is well after the period of significance. He agreed that the church building should remain contributing to the district and would need to comply with historical standards.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Fellner would like to speak.
  - Mr. Fellner stated that he owns many properties on the east side of Germantown Avenue, including the Sedgwick Theatre. He requested that the rear portion of the theater be excluded from the boundary. He acknowledged that the front portion would be included. He explained that the interior of the rear portion, the auditorium box, has been gutted and is no longer structured as a theater, adding that the floor has been leveled and the side walls have been removed. He further noted that the rear is not visible from Germantown Avenue and that his understanding is that the nomination's goal is to preserve the streetscape along Germantown Avenue. He argued that removing the rear of the theater from the district would have no impact on that goal. He commented that he has greatly improved the front of the theater since he purchased it. Mr. Fellner then requested that vacant land be removed from the boundary at the rears of 7151,

7165, and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue. Mr. Fellner expressed appreciation to the staff for answering questions and being responsive to emails while the district has been pending designation.

- Bob Elfant also thanked the staff for assisting with the designation process, noting that their guidance has brought the process along in a successful way. He stated that he owns a number of properties on the west side of Germantown Avenue and that some owners convened a committee to discuss the initiative on the 7100 block of Germantown Avenue. He noted that they have come a long way from their initial position, which was relatively negative and which would have sought many more exclusions. Now, he continued, they have only a few reasonable and minimal requests made by Mr. Weinstein and Mr. Fellner. He remarked that he is present on behalf of the committee to echo its support for the requests made by the two property owners. He noted that Mr. Weinstein has already sold several condominium units and has others on the market and contended that it would be unfair to place the burden of designation on individual unit owners. He argued that the development has been done in an exceptionally sensitive manner to both the neighborhood and adjacent structures. He reiterated his support to remove the rear of Mr. Weinstein's property from the district. He then supported Mr. Fellner's request and agreed that the grounds and rear theater structure do not contribute aesthetically or historically to the streetscape. Mr. Elfant argued that it would be an unfair burden on the property owners to include the grounds and rear of the theater in the district, while the subtraction of those elements would have no negative impact on the district.
- Mr. Farnham thanked Adrian Trevisan for writing the nomination while interning with the City Planning Commission. He then stated that he and Ms. Keller spent a significant amount of time speaking with the planners at the City Planning Commission about their goals for the district. He explained that they were seeking to preserve the streetscape along Germantown Avenue and not looking to prevent but to encourage development on the large, vacant rear lots especially on the east side. The staff, he continued, would support the request made by Mr. Fellner to remove vacant land from the district. He then noted that the theater's auditorium is listed in the nomination as non-contributing and commented that the staff would support its removal from the district. Mr. Farnham further stated that the staff also supports Mr. Weinstein's request to remove the section of the church property from the district or to classify it as non-contributing, arguing that the building was constructed well after the proposed period of significance and has been altered recently.
- Ms. Cooperman asked the Committee to discuss the merits of the nomination, stating that she personally feels more comfortable classifying the portions of the properties under consideration as non-contributing rather than removing them from the district to allow control over future development. Ms. Cooperman argued that, despite alterations to the theater box, it should remain in the district.
  - Ms. Barucco and Mr. Laverty agreed with Ms. Cooperman.
  - Ms. Barucco asked for clarification on the original boundary and how the boundary at 7151 Germantown Avenue was determined.
  - Ms. Keller responded that the boundaries follow the tax parcels. In the case of 7151 Germantown Avenue, she continued, the boundary follows a deeded parcel and does not extend the entirety of the tax parcel. She noted that the entire rear is vacant land.
- The Committee agreed that the vacant land behind 7151 Germantown Avenue could be excluded and the boundary could be amended as proposed.

- Ms. Cooperman asked that the Committee discuss the boundary amendment proposed at the corner of Germantown and E. Mt. Airy Avenues.
  - Ms. Keller asked that Mr. Fellner clarify the request, explaining that she had adjusted the boundary only for 7167-69 Germantown Avenue, but that she believes Mr. Fellner is also requesting a similar adjustment to 7165 Germantown Avenue.
  - Mr. Fellner requested clarification on the difference between contributing and non-contributing and how vacant land and the rear of the theater would be regulated.
  - Mr. Farnham answered that in terms of vacant land, there would be little difference in the way it is regulated and that the Commission would retain full jurisdiction over new construction whether the property is classified as contributing or non-contributing. For the rear of the theater, he continued, it is identified as non-contributing. In that case, he continued, the Historical Commission would not be attempting to save or preserve historic resources at that section of the building when reviewing building permit applications. He continued that it would approve automatically any permit that did not have an adverse impact on the historic district as a whole. He further explained that even the staff could approve an application to demolish the auditorium box if it is classified as non-contributing. He noted that the staff could not approve a thirty-story building on that part of the property that would loom over Germantown Avenue and would have an adverse impact on the historic district. Having it listed as non-contributing, he continued, would mean that there would be almost no regulation, but there would be some to protect the district as a whole.
  - Mr. Fellner responded that zoning code would only allow for a building approximately the same height as the current rear theater box.
  - Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission should have the ability to weigh in on the impact of new construction proposed at the rear of the property, particular if a development is not conforming to existing zoning.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that in considering the exclusion of the vacant land behind 7165 and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue, the concern is to maintain a buffer between the historic buildings and new construction and any impact new construction would have on the district. Ms. Cooperman suggested that the original boundary be used but that the parking lot be identified as non-contributing.
  - Mr. Laverty suggested keeping the original boundary from the nomination and then identifying the rears of the properties under discussion as non-contributing.
- Mr. Elfant, noting that he has been active on the block for 40 years, argued that the commercial district is “a testament to mediocrity,” adding that there are a half dozen good businesses with a lot of businesses that do not contribute to the commercial vitality of the block. He stated he was scared this historic district would stymie any new development of any kind and would negatively impact density and foot traffic. He commented that he still holds those concerns, though he has come to accept and feel comfortable with designation at this point. Mr. Elfant remarked that he hopes there will still be some game-changing development for the historic district that will attract more vital commercial enterprises. He asked that the Committee reconsider their position on the rear of the Sedgwick Theatre and consider removing it from the district, because it sits on such a large parcel that could make a major improvement to the district.
  - Ms. Cooperman countered that the Committee’s position to classify the rear as non-contributing would not eliminate the possibility for a large development.

- Ms. Cooperman asked to discuss the rear of the church property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue and questioned whether the property consists of one tax parcel or separate tax parcels.
  - Ms. Keller answered that it is one parcel, and Mr. Farnham noted that if the property was converted to condominium units, each would essentially be its own parcel.
  - Ms. Cooperman argued that the work has largely been completed.
  - Ms. Barucco opined that the rear should be considered non-contributing so that if work in the future is undertaken, the Historical Commission would have the opportunity to review that work to determine whether it would have an adverse impact on the district.
  - Mr. Farnham clarified that most building permit applications would be approved automatically. Generally, only demolition of the rear building and new construction would be forwarded to the Historical Commission, he added.
- Ms. Barucco expressed concern over excluding the vacant land behind the properties at 7165 and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue, because the land is very visible from E. Mt. Airy Avenue, which is outside of the historic district. She further contended that whatever happens in the future at Mr. Weinstein's property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue would have a great impact on the district, owing to its highly visible location.
  - Ms. Cooperman suggested that all parcels under consideration for being removed from the district should be retained within the boundary and classified as non-contributing.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Site praised the Planning Commission for nominating the district and supported the district's designation. Mr. Traub then opposed the exclusion of a portion of Mr. Weinstein's property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue.
- Brad Maule of the Mt. Airy CDC and a near neighbor thanked the Planning Commission for preparing the nomination and supported the district's designation.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination and argued that designation of this district would be a great start to protecting the historic properties within the Colonial Germantown National Register Historic District. He contended that because this is largely a commercial district, it would be reasonable to allow the property owners some flexibility on design and material replacement. He opposed the removal of the rear of 7167-69 Germantown Avenue, because it also fronts E. Mt. Airy Avenue, arguing that the Historical Commission should maintain jurisdiction over any new construction at the rear.
- Jim Duffin thanked the Planning Commission for writing the nomination and considering preservation in conjunction with its zoning initiatives. He supported the nomination, adding that the district will preserve the unique quality that Germantown Avenue possesses.
- Jeff Hayes of East Mt. Airy Neighbors stated that the organization supported the nomination and asked that the Commission consider the amendments proposed by the property owners. He then supported Mr. Weinstein's reuse project at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination and agreed that the rear of the Sedgwick Theatre should be removed from the district.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance supports the nomination, adding that the district will preserve the streetscape. He noted that the

general support by property owners was positive, since they are chiefly responsible for maintaining the buildings in the district. He thanked Adrian Trevisan for researching and writing the nomination.

- Mt. Airy resident Dana Fedeli supported the nomination and agreed with the previous comments. She stated her agreement with Mr. Beisert's comment regarding 7167-69 Germantown Avenue. She then commended Mr. Weinstein for his adaptive reuse project at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue.
- Deborah Gary supported the nomination, arguing that the commercial corridors across the city are most visible in representing the city's history.

#### **COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Philadelphia City Planning Commission nominated the district as part of PCPC's Germantown Avenue Growth & Preservation initiative.
- The district includes 47 properties, with four of those properties considered non-contributing.
- The purpose of the district is to regulate properties fronting Germantown Avenue.
- Several property owners have requested amendments to the district boundaries and property classifications. Those properties include 7111-13, 7133-43, 7151, 7165, and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue.
- The property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue has been redeveloped with condominium units at the rear building on the property.
- The property at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue, the Sedgwick Theatre, is considered significant in the district; however, the nomination identifies the rear auditorium box, which has been greatly altered, as non-contributing.
- The property at 7151 Germantown Avenue is considered non-contributing in the nomination. The boundary is based on a deed and does not include the entire tax parcel.
- The properties at 7165 and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue include historic buildings fronting Germantown Avenue with parking lots behind. The property at 7167-69 Germantown Avenue is located on the corner of Germantown and E. Mt. Airy Avenues. Properties fronting on Mt. Airy Avenue are not located within the proposed historic district.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The district developed from an area sparsely populated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to a dense commercial corridor in the early twentieth century, with wholesale commercial development in the 1920s, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- Owing to the scale and presence of the early twentieth-century buildings, their Art Deco style defines the district, satisfying Criteria D.
- The boundary should remain as proposed, and no portion of a property should be excluded from that boundary.
- The rear of the church property at 7111-13 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing. The nomination does not describe the rear building or assign any significance to it. The rear building was constructed after the Period of Significance listed in the nomination. The rear building was recently altered significantly.
- The rear of the Sedgwick Theatre at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue has been highly altered and should remain classified as non-contributing in the district.



- Parking lots and vacant land at 7151, 7165, and 7167-69 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J with the following amendments:

- the rear portion of 7111-13 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing, with the sanctuary fronting Germantown Avenue to remain contributing;
- the entire property at 7151 Germantown Avenue as identified in the nomination's boundary should remain classified as non-contributing;
- the rear auditorium box of the Sedgwick Theatre at 7133-43 Germantown Avenue should remain classified as non-contributing;
- the parking lot at the rear of 7165 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing; and
- the parking lot at the rear of 7167-69 Germantown Avenue should be classified as non-contributing.

<b>ITEM: Central Mt. Airy Commercial Historic District</b>					
<b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, D, and J with amendments</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Barucco</b>					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen					X
Bruce Laverty	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	3				2

### **AUTOMOBILE ROW THEMATIC HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Kevin McMahon and Logan Ferguson, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Number of properties: 29

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. North Broad Street was an early center for the automobile trade in Philadelphia, with numerous small and large showrooms, assembly and distribution plants, and parts and accessories stores on what was known as "Automobile Row" as early as 1906. The thematic district covers an approximately 2.8 mile-long stretch between Cherry Street (at the south end) and Lehigh Avenue (at the north end) and includes 29 properties that are known to have been built by or for the automobile industry between 1909 and 1930.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the district is representative of the burgeoning automobile industry in Philadelphia between 1909 and 1930. Automobile Row was an outgrowth of the general commercial and industrial activity that had flourished on North Philadelphia's "Main Street" for more than half a century. The large number of automobile industry-related businesses that opened on North Broad Street during this period reflect Philadelphia's major role in the early automobile industry. Virtually every major national brand – Buick, Cadillac, Ford, Oldsmobile, Studebaker, among many others – was represented. Not confined to the selling of cars, many of Automobile Row's facilities operated as major assembly plants and/or distribution centers, serving networks of dealerships in Philadelphia and throughout the region. Under Criteria C, D, and E, the nomination asserts that the district includes major works of Beaux-Arts, Classical Revival, and Commercial Style buildings by many of Philadelphia's and some of the country's best known architects of the early twentieth century. Many of the buildings are faced in glazed white architectural terra cotta, comprising one of the finest collections of this popular and highly adaptable building material in the city.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 04:58:45

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owners.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Barucco commended the nomination and the efforts made to bring it before the Committee.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Celeste Morello supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- N. Broad Street was the center of the automobile industry and related businesses in Philadelphia and the region during the period 1909 to 1930.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The proposed Automobile Row Historic District represents the burgeoning automobile industry in Philadelphia between 1909 and 1930, thereby satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The historic district includes major works of Beaux-Arts, Classical Revival, and Commercial Style buildings by many of Philadelphia's and some of the country's best known architects of the early twentieth century, thereby satisfying Criteria C, D, and E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that Automobile Row Thematic Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

**ITEM: Automobile Row Thematic Historic District****MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, C, D, E, and J.****MOVED BY: Laverty****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
Total	3				2

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Committee on Historic Designation are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video 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.