COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

ADDRESS: 201 Leverington Avenue, Keystone Mill

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of 201 Leverington Avenue located in the Manayunk neighborhood of Northwest Philadelphia and historically known as the Keystone Mill. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission’s meetings.

The Keystone Mill, built in 1887, is a three-story industrial building with exterior walls of Wissahickon schist that are currently covered by stucco. The Keystone Mill is significant at the local level under Criterion A in the area of industry as one of the largest and best-equipped shoddy mills in Philadelphia operating between 1887 and 1906. During this economically tumultuous period, the use of shoddy, a form of recycled wool that was far less expensive than new or virgin wool, helped the city’s textile industry to remain profitable and continue to grow despite restrictive tariffs on foreign wool and a general economic depression. The Keystone Mill is also significant under Criterion C at the local level in the area of architecture as a highly characteristic example of the work of S. S. Keely, the well-known manufacturer and builder who designed and constructed at least 15 mills in Manayunk from the 1840s through the 1890s. In his mill buildings, Keely developed an industrial architecture unique in its appearance in Philadelphia. The period of significance of the Keystone Mill begins with its construction in 1887, and ends in 1906, when the mill’s ownership declared bankruptcy following the decline of the shoddy industry.
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6. **Function or Use**

**Historic Functions**  
(Enter categories from instructions.)

INDUSTRY/PROCESSING/EXTRACTION / Manufacturing Facility

**Current Functions**  
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Vacant/Not in Use
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7. **Description**

**Architectural Classification**  
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Other – Timber Framing

**Materials:** (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: **STONE/Schist and STUCCO**
Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

The Keystone Mill is a three-story industrial building with exterior walls of Wissahickon schist that are currently covered by stucco. Designed and built by Manayunk builder S. S. Keely in 1887, the mill was originally owned and occupied by William Johnston & Sons, a woolen shoddy producer. The approximately 40’ by 180’ building, which has a gabled roof, occupies the central portion of a wedge-shaped site on Leverington Avenue just east of Wilde Street in the Manayunk neighborhood of Northwest Philadelphia. East and west of the building, there are asphalt parking areas, which are enclosed by non-historic chain-link metal fences. Built into a hill that slopes up from west to east, all three stories of the mill (as well as part of the basement level) are visible on the west elevation, but only the upper two stories are visible on the east elevation. The surrounding area is urban, primarily consisting of two- and three-story rowhouses from the late-nineteenth century and from a more recent early-twenty-first century building boom. To the west, across Wilde Street, is another mill that was built by S. S. Keely in the 1880s for a different company, and to the south there is a grouping of small, twentieth-century commercial buildings. The Keystone Mill, which was actively used for manufacturing until just a few years ago, is in fair condition and retains integrity. Despite the replacement of the original windows and the application of stucco to the facade in the early to mid-twentieth century, the essential nineteenth-century exterior form of the mill has not changed, and many of the original interior finishes, such as the wood floors, parged walls, and heavy timber structure remain intact.

Figure 1: Aerial view showing the Keystone Mill in 2023 (Pictometry).
Figure 2: Site plan showing the proposed National Register boundary in red. The boundary conforms to the historic parcel, which is the same as the current parcel.

Narrative Description

Exterior: All elevations of the building feature regularly sized and spaced original window openings with mid-twentieth century steel replacement windows, nearly all of which have six lights and a central, operable four-light awning sash. All of the windows have painted stone sills. One of the building’s characteristic features is the detailing of the window lintels and eaves lines in red brick, an original treatment that contrasts with the neutral color of the stucco walls. The lintels, which have a segmental arched profile, consist of soldier coursed bricks. At the eaves line on all four elevations, there are several courses of corbeled bricks that form a simple cornice. On the long north and south elevations, one of the courses of brick within the cornice is dogtoothed, with the corners projecting out slightly from the face of the wall. The roof of the building has a low, gabled profile and is currently covered in asphalt. Historically, the roof was tin. Along the center ridge line of the roof, there is a small rectangular monitor which is covered by asphalt on all sides and is currently not visible within the interior. East and west of the monitor, there are several mid-twentieth century metal exhaust fans. Along the south side of the roof near the boiler house, there are remnants of the historic brick chimney, which was square in shape.

The west elevation, which is five bays wide, faces the parking area at the western end of the site (Photos 1 and 2). The northernmost bay (the one closest to Leverington Avenue) consists of a stair tower that extends out in front of the remainder of the west elevation. On the south elevation of the stair tower, there is a late-twentieth century hollow metal door within an original door opening that has a segmental arched brick lintel. The southernmost bay on the west elevation contains a basement-level entrance with mid-twentieth century steel double doors, which open to a driveway that leads out to Wilde Street. An early-twentieth century schist retaining wall with
buttresses and topped by a non-historic chain-link fence separates the driveway from the parking area above. The exact date of the wall is unknown, but it was likely built before 1934 (it does not appear in any zoning permits, which only started to be required that year).

On the first through third stories of the west elevation, the center bay contains non-historic metal loading and loft doors on each story. Despite the historic doors having been replaced, the openings on the first and second stories in the center bay are original. The opening on the third story, however, was enlarged sometime in the late twentieth century; historically, it would have matched those below. Above the third-story opening, a late twentieth-century hoist beam extends out several feet from the exterior wall. Historically, the hoist beam was wood. Between the hoist beam and the apex of the gabled roof, there is a semi-circular brick lintel where a large, multi-light arched wood window used to be (see the historic photo in Figure 7). This opening was infilled during the late twentieth century, likely at the same time that the third-story door opening was enlarged.

The north elevation, which is located along Leverington Avenue, is nineteen bays wide (Photos 2-4). On the first story, the westernmost bay has an infilled window opening that has been covered with stucco, although the historic segmental brick lintel remains visible. Moving east, the next nine openings have full-sized windows matching those on the second and third stories. Due to the change in grade, the next seven openings have half-sized windows, and the three easternmost bays have no windows at all. The second and third stories both contain full-size windows (the same steel replacement windows described above) in all bays, although the third-story windows are slightly shorter than those below.
The east elevation is five bays wide and faces the asphalt parking area at the eastern end of the site (Photos 4 and 5). Like the west elevation, the center bay contains altered loft door openings on each floor, and, with some minor exceptions as explained below, the bays to the north and south contain standard window openings. The parking area is level with the second story of the building, but only touches the building in the first two bays south of Leverington Avenue. In the other three bays, all three stories of the building are visible because here the site slopes down, creating a ravine between the parking area and the building. On the first story, the center bay contains a pair of late-twentieth century metal doors within an original opening topped by a segmental arched brick lintel, although the upper portion of the opening is infilled with stucco. The other two openings contain windows matching the full-size first-story windows on the other
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On the second story, the bay closest to the street has a late-twentieth century painted metal door under a pitched metal awning dating to the same period. Just south of this entrance, a mid-twentieth century concrete block wall extends out from the east elevation. The next bay to the south contains an infilled window opening. The center bay on the second story has late-twentieth century glazed metal doors. Like the center opening on the first story, this opening, which is topped by a segmental arched brick lintel, is original but the upper part of it has been infilled with stucco. The other two openings contain windows matching the full-size second-story windows on the other elevations. On the third story, the center loft door opening is entirely infilled with stucco, as is the window opening immediately to the north. The other three openings contain full-size windows matching those elsewhere. As on the west elevation, there is a large semi-circular brick lintel just below the apex of the gabled roof where a large, multi-light arched wood window was historically located.

Photo 4: East and north elevations, looking southwest.

On the second story, the center bay contains mid-twentieth century metal double doors within an original door opening, although the arched upper portion of the opening is infilled with stucco. An opening of identical size in the center bay on the third story is entirely infilled with stucco. In the bay just north of the center bay, both original window openings are also infilled with stucco. The other bays contain the steel replacement windows described above, the exception being the northernmost bay on the second story, which has a late-twentieth century metal door. A concrete block wall extends out from the east elevation between the door, which is sheltered with a metal awning, and the adjacent infilled window opening.
The south elevation is nineteen bays wide, and all three stories and the basement level are visible on this side (Photos 6 and 7). On the first through third stories, all bays contain the same steel replacement windows described above, although some have been altered to accommodate air conditioning units and metal exhaust louvers. Although there are no basement windows, the south elevation features two small appendages at this level, including an original one-story boiler house at the eastern end, and a one-story, dilapidated storage shed dating to the late-twentieth century at the western end. The boiler house has brick walls and a slightly pitched asphalt roof. The west elevation of the boiler house has two window openings and one door opening that have been infilled.
Interior: The interior of the building retains much of its nineteenth-century industrial character. The spaces are largely open in plan and the building’s heavy timber structure is exposed. In the basement, there are concrete floors, parged perimeter walls with no windows, and three rows of square timber columns that support the exposed heavy timber beams and floor joists above (Photo 8). The first and second floors are similar in treatment, both containing original wood floors, parged perimeter walls, a single row of painted, square wood columns along the center east-west axis, and exposed heavy timber beams and floor decking above (Photos 9 and 10). The three easternmost bays on these floors (and on the third floor) are separated from the remainder by a solid, parged masonry wall, which is original. On each floor, this wall contains a single door opening with historic metal-clad, sliding fire doors. The third floor has carpeted floors, parged perimeter walls, and exposed heavy timber roof trusses and wood plank roof decking at the ceilings (Photos 11 and 12). At the northwest corner of the building, there is a U-return wood stair, which wraps around a small water closet on each floor (Photo 13).

Integrity: The Keystone Mill retains integrity. In particular, the design and materials of the complex remain largely intact and are expressed in a consistent vernacular industrial form in a way that is unique to Manayunk. Unlike in Kensington and most other parts of Philadelphia, where nineteenth-century mills were built of red brick, the Keystone Mill and the vast majority of other Manayunk mills built between 1850 and 1900 have exterior walls of Wissahickon schist, which sometimes is covered in stucco. The exterior walls also have details, such as segmental arched window heads, semi-circular brick lintels above the attic-level windows on the narrow elevations, and cornices, in contrasting red brick. This palate of materials, which clearly mark the building as a one belonging in Manayunk, remains intact at the Keystone Mill. While the building’s original double-hung windows were replaced by the current metal windows sometime after 1942, nearly all of the original openings themselves remain unaltered, allowing the viewer to understand the historic fenestration pattern. Although some of the window and door openings have been infilled.
with stucco, primarily on the east elevation and to a limited extent on other elevations, the outline of the openings is apparent and the red brick lintels remain intact, making it clear where the openings historically existed.

On the interior, the building’s original wood floors, parged walls, and heavy timber columns, beams, and trusses remain almost entirely intact, representing the workmanship that went into its construction and allowing the historic manufacturing use to be clearly conveyed. On all levels, the open, unobstructed historic spaces remain intact.

The building’s location has not changed, and despite the construction of new houses in the vicinity, the historic setting has not been compromised. Many of the mills and houses that were built near the Keystone Mill during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries still stand, providing valuable context.

Lastly, the building retains its integrity of association and feeling, and still conveys its historical use as a nineteenth-century mill.

Photo 8: Basement, looking northeast.
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Photo 9: 1st floor, looking southwest.

Photo 10: 2nd story, looking east.
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Photo 11: 3rd floor, looking north.

Photo 12: 3rd floor, looking west.
Photo 13: Stair tower interior, looking southwest on the 1st floor.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

☐ A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

☐ B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

☒ C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

☐ D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

☐ A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

☐ B. Removed from its original location

☐ C. A birthplace or grave

☐ D. A cemetery

☐ E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure

☐ F. A commemorative property

☐ G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
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Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

INDUSTRY
ARCHITECTURE

Period of Significance

Criterion A: 1887-1906
Criterion C: 1887

Significant Dates

1887, 1906

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

N/A

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder

S. S. Keely, builder
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Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

The Keystone Mill, built in 1887 by S. S. Keeley for William Johnston & Sons, is significant at the local level under Criterion A in the area of industry as one of the largest and best-equipped shoddy mills in Philadelphia between 1887 and 1906. During this economically tumultuous period, the use of shoddy, a form of recycled wool that was far less expensive than new or virgin wool, helped the city’s textile industry to remain profitable and continue to grow despite restrictive tariffs on foreign wool and a general economic depression. After about 1905, as greater prosperity and changing tastes led to an increase in the popularity of higher-grade worsted fabrics, the U.S. shoddy industry faced its first ever decline, which was precipitous. Although the Johnston Brothers, successors to William Johnston & Sons in 1899, kept the Keystone Shoddy Mill open for several more years, the company declared bankruptcy in 1906. The Johnstons reopened the mill between 1907 and 1919, but, with fewer employees and a smaller operation, it was not as productive as it was prior to 1906.

The Keystone Mill is also significant under Criterion C at the local level in the area of architecture as a highly characteristic example of the work of S. S. Keely, the well-known manufacturer and builder who designed and erected at least fifteen mills in Manayunk from the 1840s through the 1890s. In his mill buildings, Keely developed an industrial architecture unique in its appearance in Philadelphia. Unlike the ubiquitous all-brick mills found in Kensington, the textile district located about six miles east of Manayunk, Keely’s mills employed locally quarried Wissahickon schist in the construction of exterior walls and contrasting red brick for details like window heads and cornices. Influenced by Manayunk’s particular topographic and geological conditions, Keely used this palate of materials to create a hyper local form of mill construction that continues to help define the neighborhood’s character over a century later.

The period of significance of the Keystone Mill begins in 1887, when it was built, and ends in 1906, when the Johnston Brothers declared bankruptcy following the decline of the shoddy industry.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

William Johnston & Sons, Shoddy Manufacturers
The Keystone Mill was built in 1887 for William Johnston, a manufacturer of woolen shoddy. Born in Ireland in 1844, Johnston arrived in Philadelphia with his family in 1850, presumably fleeing the Great Famine. Little else is known of Johnston’s early years. According to the 1867 edition of a local directory, Johnston was working as a spinner and living with his family at 20th and Catharine Streets in South Philadelphia.1 Around 1869, Johnston set up a shoddy mill, one of the first in the city, in an existing building at the southeast corner of 20th Street and Washington

---

Avenue, just a few blocks south of his family home (the mill likely did not open later than early 1870, when Johnston and his new wife moved to the Manayunk neighborhood, several miles to the north). Shoddy, an often-overlooked product, was the raw material produced by recycling old rags and other byproducts of textile manufacturing. Shoddy could be spun into yarn for use in a wide range of finished textile goods. Due to their low cost, yarns made from shoddy became essential to the survival and growth of Philadelphia’s textile industry through the end of the nineteenth century and beyond.

By 1875, Johnston had moved his shoddy mill to the Kensington neighborhood, which was then quickly becoming the greatest textile manufacturing district in the United States. For several years, Johnston’s shoddy mill occupied a portion of the Globe Mills at 1142-48 St. John Street in Kensington, and by 1881 he had moved into another tenant mill at the southwest corner of 5th Street and Columbia Avenue, just a few blocks away. As Philadelphia’s textile industry grew, so did Johnston’s business. In 1882, Johnston built his own mill on property he had recently acquired at the corner of Allegheny and Kensington Avenues. In this three-story building, which no longer stands, Johnston occupied the first floor and rented the second and third floors to other textile firms. Within a few years, Johnston brought two of his sons, William, Jr. and Arthur, into the business, which became known as William Johnston & Sons. By 1887, as the company continued to grow, the Johnstons found they once again needed more space. Johnston found the solution in Manayunk, where he had continued to live even while his mill was in Kensington. That year, Johnston built the Keystone Mill on Leverington Street, establishing his company as one of the major producers in what was the center of Philadelphia’s shoddy industry (Figures 3-4).3

---

3 Biographical information has been compiled from a variety of sources, including period directories, census records, and Hexamer General Surveys (fire insurance surveys at the Free Library of Philadelphia).

Figure 3: Axonometric view of the Keystone Mill from the Hexamer General Survey #2715, done in 1893 (Free Library of Philadelphia).
Although by the late 1880s the Kensington neighborhood had a far greater concentration of textile manufacturers than Manayunk, the latter had developed as a textile center earlier than its neighbor to the east. Textile mills were first built in Manayunk during the late eighteenth century, and the industry rapidly expanded over the next few decades as it harnessed the Schuylkill River as a power source. For many years, the Manayunk textile industry operated as an independent enclave rather than as a centralized hub of manufacturing. However, by the time William Johnston built the Keystone Mill in 1887, Manayunk mills, which were primarily known for spinning woolen yarns, had become intimately connected to the Kensington textile district. During the late nineteenth century, Manayunk spinning mills produced much of the woolen yarns that were used to weave carpets in Kensington.4

The Early History of the Shoddy Industry
The manufacture of shoddy first took place in Britain during the early-nineteenth century when the woolen and worsted industries of northern England were rapidly growing. With the expansion of the textile industry came a dramatic increase in the volume of textile waste, which included old rags, cut threads, linings, and the scraps or “tailors’ clippings” that resulted from the cutting of a fabric into patterns. In smaller cottage industry settings, these byproducts could easily be discarded or used as garden fertilizer. But in a dense urban environment, in places like Manchester, which had many large mills, the sheer volume of waste was far too great to simply toss out. At a time of high demand for woolen goods – due in large part to the Napoleonic Wars, which required vast amounts of fabrics for uniforms and other war materiel – manufacturers

solved the problem and created a new commercial opportunity by developing a process to recycle the scraps into what became known as shoddy.5

The process by which woolen rags and scraps were transformed into shoddy is as follows (also see Figure 5): Once delivered to the mill, the material was first manually sorted by color and grade and then cleaned or “scoured” using soap and alkalis to remove any dirt or grease. If the rags had cotton mixed in, they were also dipped in a bath of acid to dissolve the cotton fibers, leaving only wool. From this point, the material was processed in one of two ways. Loosely woven rags and scraps were fed into a picking machine, which would shred and break down the material into fibers in preparation for spinning. More tightly woven, higher-grade types of cloth, such as worsted, would be fed into a garnetting machine, which performed a similar function as the picking machine, but with the more vigorous action necessary to return worsteds and similar materials back to their fibrous state. Not all shoddy mills had garnetting machines, which were associated with a higher quality product. The final step in the shoddy manufacturing process was carding, in which a carding machine brushed and smoothed the fibers, which would then be bundled into “slivers,” which were about a half-inch in diameter. Slivers could then be spun into yarn either in-house if the mill had that capability or sold to an outside spinning mill. The resultant yarns were significantly less expensive than those made with so-called “new” or “virgin” wool.6

In the United States, the rise of the shoddy industry followed a path similar to Britain’s, only several decades later. As the American textile industry started to grow in the mid-nineteenth century, especially in places like Philadelphia and Lowell, manufacturers faced the same problem of waste that their English counterparts did. And, like the Napoleonic Wars, the American Civil War created a huge demand for woolen fabrics for uniforms and blankets, not to mention for clothing the general population after northern mills were cut off from their supply of southern cotton. Building on the accomplishments of mills in Britain, textile manufacturers in the United States began to produce shoddy for the first time. It was during the early 1860s that the word shoddy attained its negative connotation. Many of the earliest shoddy manufacturers were demonized as war profiteers for supplying the Union Army with uniforms of notoriously poor quality made from low-grade shoddy rather than the higher quality woolen fabrics the government thought it was buying.7

Despite the inauspicious beginnings of shoddy manufacturing in the United States, the industry expanded following the Civil War, especially in Philadelphia. Although there was no longer a pressing need for military uniforms, rapid population growth demanded increased textile production, and the use of shoddy in the manufacture of lower-priced garments became essential to properly clothing working-class people. Writing in the journal Fibre & Fabric in 1903, one observer noted that “Shoddy occupies a very important position in fabrics for men’s wear. There are shoddies and shoddies, and the good as well as the poor are so manipulated nowadays that it is as pure as virgin wool by the time it is again ready for fabrication,” continuing, “Shoddy
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clothes the masses, the employees of the factories in all manufacturing districts, at prices which enable them to dress well and comfortably.”

By 1870, Philadelphia was home to at least five shoddy mills, and this number continued to grow over the next decade.

Although shoddy had been produced in Philadelphia since about 1860, in every case its early manufacture occurred in mills that used the material in-house for spinning and weaving, not for sale to outside spinning mills. One of the most prominent examples during the Civil War era was Sevill Schofield’s Economy Mills in Manayunk. This enormous complex, one of the largest textile mills in Philadelphia, straddled the Schuylkill River Canal north of Lock Street, with buildings situated both on the mainland and on the adjacent island, today known as Venice Island. Only the mainland portion of the complex survives today. During the 1860s, Schofield, who was awarded contracts to supply the Union Army with woolen blankets, was one of those accused of defrauding the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps for supplying blankets made from

---

poor quality shoddy. Another well-known early producer of shoddy, in this case for the weaving of flannels, was A. Campbell & Company. Campbell’s Blantyre Mills was also found in Manayunk, just north of Schofield’s Economy Mills (Schofield later acquired the Blantyre Mills for his own use). Blantyre Mills remains standing today at the southeast corner of Main and Cotton Streets.

It was not until after the Civil War that the first companies exclusively devoted to the manufacture of shoddy were founded in Philadelphia. Among this group were Gill & Hallowell, who opened a mill at 30th and Chestnut Streets in West Philadelphia around 1867; William Johnston himself, who opened his mill at 20th Street and Washington Avenue in South Philadelphia around 1869 or 1870; and Peter Johnson, who established a mill at Cadwalader and Oxford Streets in Kensington around 1872. As shown by these examples, shoddy mills were dispersed across the city. But with Schofield and Campbell both established as large shoddy producers in Manayunk, that neighborhood effectively became the center of the city’s shoddy industry, a position reinforced by the opening of several other new shoddy mills in the area during the 1870s and 1880s. The newcomers included Robert A. Lee, who opened a two-story mill on Terrace Street north of Dawson Street around 1879; Taylor Spink, who occupied Schofield’s three-story Scioto Mills, on Venice Island at the foot of Leverington Street, around 1880; and Charles R. Simister, who established the three-story Picton Mill on Venice Island near Schofield’s Economy Mills in 1884. This group was finally joined in 1887 by William Johnston who built the three-story Keystone Mill on the upper part of Leverington Street that year.10

William Johnston & Sons at the Keystone Mill

Johnston’s move to Manayunk followed over a decade of operation in Kensington, between about 1875 and 1887. Johnston’s reason for moving the mill is not known. Johnston’s home remained in Manayunk even while his mill was in Kensington, and while the distance between the two locales – roughly six miles – was not significant and could easily be traversed by rail in about twenty minutes, Johnston may have wished to give up the commute and bring his business closer to his residence. Johnston may also have wished to be closer to what was then the center of Philadelphia’s shoddy industry; at the time, Manayunk had the largest and best equipped of the city’s approximately ten shoddy mills.

Of the numerous Manayunk mills exclusively producing shoddy, the Keystone Mill was easily the best equipped, particularly in the manufacture of higher-grade forms of shoddy. Prior to moving the operation to Manayunk, Johnston’s mill in Kensington had three pickers, three garnetts, and six double cards, which was about average among Philadelphia shoddy mills in terms of overall number of machines (the use of both garnetts and double cards, however, was rare and marked Johnston as a leader in the production of higher quality shoddy).11 Once in Manayunk, Johnston took advantage of the increased space provided in the new Keystone Mill by acquiring additional machines, adding one garnett and three double cards.12

---

9 Philip Scranton, Proprietary Capitalism, 289.
10 Sources include various period directories, newspaper clippings, and real estate property atlases.
were likely made in Philadelphia by the James A. Smith Woolen Machinery Company, a major supplier of shoddy processing equipment to mills across the country (Figure 6). Smith is known to have built and sold pickers, garnetts, and cards to several other shoddy mills in Manayunk, Germantown, and Kensington around the same time.\(^\text{13}\) But no other shoddy mill in Philadelphia had double cards, and only a small number had more garnetts than the Keystone Mill. James G. Kitchen & Company and the Taylor Brothers, both shoddy mills based in nearby Germantown, each had seven garnetts, for example, but Kitchen had only single cards and Taylor had no cards at all, according to industry directories of the period. By this measure, Johnston’s Keystone Mill was responsible for much of the higher-grade shoddy produced not just in Manayunk, but in Philadelphia overall. Statewide, according to the U.S. Census, there were a total of sixty-two cards in shoddy mills in 1890 although it is not clear if this number includes garnetts. Even if garnetts were excluded, with its nine double cards the Keystone Mill possessed a significant, nearly 15% share of the carding machinery across all Pennsylvania shoddy mills. With garnetts included, this share jumps to 21%.\(^\text{14}\)

Figure 6: Machines made by the James A. Smith Woolen Machinery Company in Philadelphia, as pictured in the company’s circa 1882 Illustrated Catalog (at the Hagley Museum & Library). Clockwise from top: a picker, a double card, and a garnett. The machines in the Keystone Mill would have been similar to those pictured here.

During the 1890s, the Keystone Mill employed between twenty-five and thirty people, which was commensurate with the types and quantities of machinery they operated and with other mills that exclusively produced shoddy. (Mills that made shoddy in addition to yarns and/or finished textile goods, on the other hand, could have several hundred employees.) In 1890, according to the U.S. Census, the average number of employees in a Pennsylvania shoddy mill was nineteen, meaning the Keystone Mill was well above average.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{13}\) “Some Mill Notes,” Wade’s Fibre and Fabric (November 19, 1887), 95.
\(^{15}\) Ibid.
The names of Johnston’s customers are unknown, but the shoddy produced at the Keystone Mill would have found a ready market in Philadelphia’s vast textile industry during the late-nineteenth century, especially in Manayunk itself. Although Kensington by now had a far greater concentration of textile mills than its neighbor to the west, Manayunk spinning mills had a long history of supplying yarns to Kensington weaving mills making all manner of goods from carpeting to blankets to woolen fabrics for clothing. This relationship continued through the 1890s and into the twentieth century, now with the addition of shoddy, which the Keystone Mill supplied to spinning mills in Manayunk and elsewhere. In 1899, the *North American* reported, the “trade controlled [by Keystone Mill] is one of large and annually increasing volume with local mills.”\(^\text{16}\)

\[\text{Figure 7: The Keystone Mill pictured in the late 1930s or early 1940s (from the private collection of the owner).}\]

The stucco-clad brick bulkhead above the corner was built by the Sheppard Manufacturing Company, which acquired the property from the Johnstons in 1920. The purpose of the bulkhead is unknown, but it may have concealed a water tank. The bulkhead was removed several decades ago.

During the 1890s, shoddy became increasingly important, even essential to the survival of the Philadelphia textile industry. For one, the Tarriff Act of 1890, also known as the McKinley Tariff for its chief proponent, President William McKinley, enacted heavy taxes on the importation of foreign wool, forcing manufacturers to seek cheaper options domestically. Instead of raising prices and losing customers, manufacturers began to make and use yarns that had shoddy mixed in with higher-quality imported virgin wool. Many realized that the resulting woven fabrics were virtually indistinguishable from those with all virgin wool, although their long-term durability was questioned. Secondly, the Panic of 1893, which led to a years-long

\(^{16}\) “As a Textile Centre,” *North American*, January 30, 1899.
depression, demanded lower prices on apparel, hosiery, and carpets, which could be accomplished with the use of shoddy. Despite some periodic, short-term declines, the shoddy industry benefitted greatly from both situations during the 1890s and helped spinning and weaving mills to remain profitable during an economically tumultuous decade.17

The Keystone Mill remained a major manufacturer of shoddy through the turn of the twentieth century. Now run by William, Jr. and Arthur Johnston – the brothers succeeded their father on his retirement at the end of 1899, and they renamed the business Johnston Brothers – Keystone prospered as the shoddy industry continued to boom.18 Between 1899 and 1904 alone, the total product of shoddy mills in the United States grew from 68.7 million pounds (worth $6.7 million) to 102.2 million pounds (worth $8.4 million).19 With upwards of forty employees during these years, the Keystone Mill remained one of the largest in Manayunk, Philadelphia, and in the state of Pennsylvania where the average number of workers in a shoddy mill had actually declined since 1890 to about fifteen (the number of mills and total number of employees had increased during this period, however).20

Despite a promising start to the decade, the Keystone Mill and the shoddy industry as a whole soon faced headwinds from which neither would ever fully recover. While shoddy had helped the textile industry to remain profitable during the difficult economic period of the 1890s, with increasing prosperity Americans began to favor higher-quality woolen clothing, especially worsted. As the worsted industry expanded, the shoddy industry declined precipitously, losing about half of its size between 1904 and 1909, when only 53.6 million pounds of the material were produced in the United States (as explained above, 102.2 million pounds were produced in 1904). Although the decreasing popularity of shoddy in the United States was balanced somewhat by increasing exports to England, where shoddy remained in widespread use, most shoddy manufacturers did not survive this transition.21 As a result of these larger textile industry trends, the Johnston Brothers declared bankruptcy in August 1906, and the Keystone Mill was shut down.22

The Keystone Mill After 1906
Reports indicate that in June 1907 William Johnston had restructured the business and reopened the Keystone Mill, suggesting that there was still some profit to be made in the shoddy industry despite whatever difficulties the Johnston Brothers had faced.23 The new company, which Arthur Johnston also later rejoined, became known as William Johnston’s Sons. With only fourteen employees in 1916, however, it was clear that the business was no longer as prosperous as it

---

18 “Mill Notes,” *TEXTILE COLORIST* (December 1899), 379.
21 Weld, 613-614.
once was and for this reason the period of significance ends in 1906. William, Jr. and Arthur Johnston finally closed the Keystone Mill around 1919.

In 1920, the Johnstons sold the property to the Sheppard Manufacturing Company who reopened the mill as a yarn spinning operation.24 In 1942, Sheppard sold the property to the Howard E. Trent Company (later known as Trent, Inc.), a manufacturer of industrial heating equipment. Trent continued to occupy and operate the building as an industrial plant until just a few years ago. The building has been vacant since then, although much of Trent’s equipment and machinery remains.

![Image of the Keystone Mill](image)

**Figure 8:** A view of the Keystone Mill during the 1950s after it was acquired by Trent, Inc., looking north to the south elevation (Philadelphia Department of Records).

*The Nineteenth-Century Textile Mill*

In the late-nineteenth century, textile mill architecture in most industrialized parts of the United States, especially in Philadelphia, was based on the concept of slow-burning construction. Following the Civil War, the textile industry in the United States experienced rapid growth, resulting in the construction of hundreds of new mills in places like Philadelphia; Paterson, New Jersey; and Lowell, Massachusetts. With their dangerous combination of combustible stock and numerous sources of ignition, however, textile mills were among the most hazardous types of factories during this period. As the frequency of destructive fires in textile mills increased with the growth of the industry, insurance companies demanded more fire-resistive methods of construction. In response, builders and engineers developed what became known as “slow-burning” construction, which principally relied on large dimension timber framing. Unlike iron framing, which could easily warp when exposed to high heat, heavy timber columns and beams

---

would char only to a certain depth, at which point the charcoal slowed combustion, allowing more time for the fire to be extinguished before the building was destroyed. Apart from its fire-resistant properties, timber framing was also well suited to textile mills because, unlike iron framing, it could withstand the intense vibrations caused by modern textile machinery. Brick walls, too, were an important component of slow-burning construction. When properly made, brick was highly fire resistant, making the material useful in situations where fire prone components of a mill operation had to be compartmentalized to reduce the risk of a fire spreading.  

A typical textile mill built on the principle of slow-burning construction, which became standard across the country by the 1880s, was a long, rectangular building of one to five stories (occasionally more) with exterior walls of red brick, a heavy timber-framed structure with a low, gabled roof, and regularly spaced double-hung windows, the locations of which were determined by the spacing of the interior wood columns. In its outward appearance, the typical textile mill was a purely functional building, with often little but the rhythm of the repetitive window openings and brick corbelling at the eaves lines to provide visual interest. Inside, the largely unobstructed spaces (except for one or two rows of wood columns) gave the mill owner flexibility to arrange the machinery and design the production flow as they saw fit. This type of mill construction became ubiquitous in the United States, with hundreds of examples being built in the Kensington district of Philadelphia alone during the 1880s and 1890s (Figure 9).  

Figure 9: The Franklin Carpet Mill at 2139-45 E. Huntingdon Street in Philadelphia, built between 1879 and 1892. This mill is typical of those built in and around Kensington during the late nineteenth century. Photo from Powers & Company.

The Architecture of the Keystone Mill

The Keystone Mill was designed and built by Samuel S. Keely, more commonly known as S. S. Keely, a manufacturer and contractor who was one of the most prolific builders and most prominent real estate investors in nineteenth century Manayunk. Born in 1822 in nearby Roxborough, which, like Manayunk, became part of Philadelphia in 1854, Keely apprenticed as a carpenter with Manayunk builder John Lewis in 1839. On Lewis’s death in 1845, Keely took over the business and soon after opened a lumber and building supplies warehouse at Leverington Avenue and Umbria Streets and over the following years began to acquire a range of investment properties on which he built houses, stores, and warehouses for rent. By 1878, as historian John C. Manton writes, Keely was “the head of a small local empire of real estate holdings, business investments, and principal supplier to the building trade.”

In addition to his building supplies business and vast real estate operation, Keely became the contractor of choice for many of the area’s largest construction projects during the mid- to late-nineteenth century. Writing about the Keely empire in 1930 – the business flourished well into the twentieth century under the leadership of Keely’s sons and grandsons – the American Lumberman reported that Keely was “instrumental in developing this district of Philadelphia by building many churches, schools, houses and factories,” many of which he designed himself.

Textile mills, in particular, were one of Keely’s specialties and remain one of his most visible and lasting contributions to the historic landscape of Manayunk and surrounding neighborhoods. Between about 1845 and his death in 1899, Keely is known to have designed and built over a dozen mills in Manayunk alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR(S)</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>EXTANT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845-93</td>
<td>Blantyre Mills</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4250 Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Lincoln Mill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4100 Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864-76</td>
<td>Canton Mill</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>123 Leverington Ave</td>
<td>*Keely portion does not survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866-82</td>
<td>Economy Mills</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>4212-16 Main Street</td>
<td>*Partially survives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-71</td>
<td>Little Falls Mill</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>228 Krams Ave</td>
<td>*Heavily altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-73</td>
<td>Star Mill</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-77</td>
<td>Excelsior Mill*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4 Leverington Ave</td>
<td>*S. S. Keely’s own mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-82</td>
<td>Kenworthy’s Mill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>410 Shurs Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Harmony Mill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>116 Shurs Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-84</td>
<td>Roxborough Mills</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>374 Shurs Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-89</td>
<td>Freeland Mill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4105 Freeland Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Rob’t Wilde’s Mill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>161 Leverington Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Fidelity Machine Works</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4050 Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>John Wilde’s Mill*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3737 Main Street</td>
<td>*NR listed (#13000258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Keystone Mill</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>201 Leverington Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 “Firm is Old in Years but Young in Ideas,” American Lumberman, August 30, 1930, 37.
The earliest of Keely’s mill projects was the Blantyre Mills at 4250 Main Street, built in 1845 for A. Campbell & Company, a manufacturer of flannels (Figure 10). The mill was later acquired and expanded several times through the early 1890s by Sevill Schofield, whose own Economy Mills, situated on adjacent Venice Island in the Schuylkill River, was built by Keely in 1866 (and later expanded through the early 1880s). Between 1845 and his death in 1899, Keely is known to have designed and built over a dozen other mills for an impressive array of textile manufacturers. Remarkably, the mills built by Keely toward the end of his long, nearly half-century career vary little in appearance from those built between the 1840s and 1860s, which speaks to the enduring appeal of the vernacular building tradition that he established with the Blantyre Mill in 1845.

Figure 10: Other Manayunk Mills designed and built by S. S. Keely. Clockwise from top left: Blantyre Mills, Kenworthy’s Mill, Roxborough Mills, and Robert Wilde’s Mill. All images are from Google Street View.

In their basic form, Keely’s mill buildings were much like those being built elsewhere in Philadelphia at this time, especially in Kensington. They were typically long, rectangular buildings of between two and four stories with load-bearing exterior walls; repetitive, double-hung wood windows, often in a nine-over-nine or twelve-over-twelve; an interior structure of heavy timber columns, beams, and trusses; and gabled roofs. As explained above, this type of industrial architecture varied little from city to city. Keely’s mills, however, employed locally quarried Wissahickon schist in the construction of the exterior walls, giving them a distinctive appearance much different from the ubiquitous red brick mills of Kensington (Figure 10). By exploiting a local material – schist quarries were found throughout the nearby Wissahickon...
Valley – Keely not only avoided the expense of setting up a brickworks, but also imbued the mills he designed and built with an appearance and character that reflected the unique topographic and geologic conditions of Northwest Philadelphia. This kind of environmental awareness made Keely’s mill buildings unique across Philadelphia’s nineteenth century industrial landscape. Although stone walls were prone to failure when exposed to fire – brick walls were much more resistant to extreme heat – the interior side of Keely’s schist walls were often parged, providing some measure of protection against the flames. Because textile mills frequently suffered fires, the fact that so many of Keely’s mills survive suggests that the builder’s construction methods were largely successful in withstanding such conditions.29

The Keystone Mill, which Keely designed and built for William Johnston in 1887, exemplifies Keely’s work in Manayunk during the late-nineteenth century. Like virtually every other mill Keely built, the Keystone Mill has a typical rectangular, gabled form with exterior walls of Wissahickon schist. Like some other mills built by Keely, the exterior walls of the building are now coated with stucco, which was likely not original but rather a later solution to eroding mortar joints. Portions of the exterior walls were stuccoed as early as the late 1930s, as shown in a photo from that period (Figure 7). Keely’s own mill was stuccoed as early as the 1910s (Figure 11), and a small number of other examples exist throughout the neighborhood (it is estimated that approximately 25% of remaining Keely-built mills in Manayunk have stucco over the exterior schist walls). Importantly, the Keystone Mill’s segmental arched window heads and cornice, executed in red brick – another key attribute of a Keely-designed mill – have not been covered with stucco. As in the Keely mills that have not been stuccoed, these spare decorative details contrast with the lighter brown and gray stones of the primary wall material.

With the Keystone Mill and the dozen-plus other mills he built throughout the neighborhood between 1845 and his death in 1899, S. S. Keely created a trademark style that helped to shape a cohesive built environment in nineteenth century Manayunk. Defined by the use of local schist, the Keystone Mill and its counterparts reflected a hyper local building tradition that differentiated the neighborhood from other industrial districts, particularly Kensington, during this period.

---

29 Bradley, 135-136.
Figure 11: S. S. Keely’s Excelsior Planing Mill in c. 1915 and 2022. The c. 1915 image is from Manayunk (Images of America) by Thom Nickels. The 2022 photo is a present-day image from Google Street View.
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<td>1st floor, looking southwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Figure 12: USGS Map.
Figure 13: Site plan with photo key.

Figure 14: Basement floor plan with photo key.
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Figure 15: First-floor plan with photo key.

Figure 16: Second-floor plan with photo key.

Figure 17: Third-floor plan with photo key.