

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

**20 OCTOBER 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 9:30 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	X		
Suzanna Barucco	X		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.	X		
Bruce Lavery	X		
Debbie Miller	X		
Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.	X		

* 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:

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Libbie Hawes
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
J. M. Duffin
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Jay Farrell
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Tom Beck
Russell Fulton
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Nancy Pontone
Jimmy Tran

Mike Simone
Susan Wetherill
Steven Peitzman
Francine Tajfel
Sean Sneed
Deborah Gary
Bradley Maule
Kevin Block
David Schwartz
Doug Mooney
Lindsay Bodin
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Amanda Calabrese
Larry Bard
Nick Kraus, Heritage Consulting Group

ADDRESS: 122 S 19TH ST

Name of Resource: Sophy Curson
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Susan J. Schwartz
Nominator: Keeping Society
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 122 S. 19th Street, known as the Sophy Curson building, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Located in the Rittenhouse Square neighborhood, the building was constructed in 1951. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the building, commissioned to serve retailer Sophy Curson's growing clothing business, was a purpose-built shop that personified Mid-twentieth century Modernism and stood out among more traditional architecture of the Rittenhouse Square neighborhood. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends the Sophy Curson building is a significant local example of a Mid-century Modern commercial building, which exhibits "sleek new materials" and "glassy open storefronts." The period of significance focuses on the building's design and construction phases, 1950 to 1951.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 122 S. 19th Street satisfies Criteria C and D.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:41

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- David Schwartz represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Schwartz said he was at the meeting to speak on behalf of his mother Susan Schwartz who owns the property at 122 S. 19th Street and the extended Sophy Curson family. He stated he has worked at Sophy Curson since 1988 and, prior to that, one of his after-school jobs was helping at the office of his great uncle, architect Beryl Price. Mr. Schwartz continued that he is among the third generation of family members to work at the Sophy Curson and currently manages the shop and building. He explained that back in November 2019, when they received notice of the nomination, they were surprised and concerned because they had not been contacted by the nominator prior to receiving the letter. He said that after quickly learning more about the ins and outs of historical designation, he and his family had come to terms with the nomination and accept the process, particularly in light of the recent in concept review that was presented to the Commission for a potential future overbuild at the site. He noted this would safeguard the essence of Sophy Curson while allowing for future compatible development with the high-rise building around the property. Mr. Schwartz thanked the Committee for hearing from the Sophy Curson family and requested that his comments be placed into the record.
- Ms. Barucco said that she thought it was a great nomination. She commented that anyone who has lived in Philadelphia knows Sophy Curson and that it is an iconic shop in the Rittenhouse neighborhood. Ms. Barucco said she enjoyed reading about it and thinks it is wonderful that the building is up for nomination and that it continues to be a legacy business for Sophy Curson's family. She agreed the stewardship of the building is outstanding. Ms. Barucco said she supports the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen agreed with Ms. Barucco's comments. He said he is glad to see this building appreciated for the aesthetic that is quite distinctive. Mr. Cohen continued that he was really struck not only by the great overhang and asymmetries but even the vestige of a different universe in the heavily molded doorway. He pointed out that the nomination uses the word "vernacular" to describe the building, but he does not believe it fits, as this is an ambitious, high-style design. Ms. Cooperman agreed with his assessment of the word vernacular.
- Mr. Cohen pointed out that the birth year of architect Beryl Price was documented as both 1910 and 1921 in the nomination. He commented that he would have liked to have seen more about Beryl Price's life and career in the nomination for additional context. Mr. Cohen said Price was probably one of those individuals who was trained in the Beaux Arts and, when he got out of school, styles had changed.
- Mr. Laverty stated that one of the benefits of this building not only surviving but thriving, in terms of its integrity, is the fact that it has been in the care of a single family since its construction. He said that in addition to this, Sophy Curson did not just hire an architect, this was a family business, and she chose her brother-in-law who worked closely with her on the design to get a signature design that that worked for the retail business. He said that Price's wife Rosemond was Sophy Curson's sister, and this family was very engaged in architectural design. Mr. Laverty agreed with Mr. Cohen that it is not a vernacular building but an extraordinarily special one. He said the nomination does a great job of placing this in context with other Philadelphia Mid-century Modern commercial structures. Mr. Laverty pointed out that this building essentially has had a single owner which is a rare occurrence and noted that when retail buildings are sold, they are often altered. He stated that the building was a great design to begin with and then had caretakers who understood that and were very involved with it.

- Ms. Cooperman agreed that the word “vernacular” is not the correct word to use for the Sophy Curson building because she thinks it is very high style. She added that scale should not be mistaken for style. Ms. Cooperman wondered if they should contemplate adding Criterion E, because Beryl Price is someone who has not been recognized as widely as he should have been. She suggested the terms Regional Modernism or Philadelphia Modernism.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that it would have been appropriate but does not think there is enough material in the nomination to support it.
 - o Ms. Milroy said she agreed and was disappointed that Price’s biography in the nomination was a limited summary. She inquired if Mr. Schwartz knows if there are family papers that survive. Ms. Milroy stated that a study of Price is worthy of more work including a compilation of the buildings he designed in Philadelphia and beyond.
- Mr. Laverty stated that Rosemond Price gave the Athenaeum a collection of her own student drawings, as well as her husband’s student drawings. He noted there has not been a lot written about her.
 - o Mr. Schwartz said that Rosemond Price was not an architect but went to Moore College of Art. He noted that Beryl Price was the only architect in the family.
 - o Mr. Laverty acknowledged that her student drawings then were likely from her time at Moore, and he commented that the student drawings were more heavily weighted to interiors.
 - o Ms. Milroy commented that this is interesting given the history of interior design training and practitioners in the city of Philadelphia. She asked Mr. Schwartz if there are any other drawings or archives pertaining to the Beryl and Rosemond Price.
 - o Mr. Schwartz said he believed Rosemond Price gave everything she had to the Athenaeum.
 - o Ms. Barucco asked if Rosemond Price worked as an interior designer or contributed to her husband’s projects.
 - o Mr. Schwartz replied that she worked in the store and was one of the three sisters who ran Sophy Curson. He explained that the sisters included his grandmother, Pearl Goldner, Sophy Curson, and Rosemond Price. Mr. Schwartz added that Rosemond Price went by the name “Bobby.”
- Ms. Barucco thanked Mr. Schwartz for joining and contributing to the meeting discussion.
- Mr. Beisert responded to comments about the use of the word vernacular. He said that he is fine with the word being struck from the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, said his organization has successfully nominated multiple Mid-century Modern buildings in the past several years, and few if any, possess the integrity of Sophy Curson. He said that this is a credit to the Sophy Curson family. Mr. Steinke explained that the Preservation Alliance had made efforts to work with the family to protect the property outside of the designation process, but nothing worked in the end. He stated that it is a distinctive Mid-century Modern building in the Rittenhouse Square neighborhood and does deserve to be protected and the Preservation Alliance supports this nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination is well researched and written, and successfully argues for both Criteria C and D.
- Although they would have supported the inclusion of Criterion E for architect Beryl Price, the Committee members agreed the nomination did not include enough documentation for them to recommend this additional Criterion.
- The building cannot be categorized as “vernacular” as it is a high style design. The word “vernacular” should be removed from the nomination and replaced with a more appropriate style term such as Regional Modernism or Philadelphia Modernism.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building, commissioned to serve retailer Sophy Curson’s growing clothing business, was a purpose-built shop that personified Mid Twentieth-century Modernism and stood out among more traditional architecture of the Rittenhouse Square neighborhood, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building is a significant local example of a Mid-century Modern commercial building, which at the time of construction in 1951 exhibited “sleek new materials” and “glassy open storefronts,” satisfying Criterion D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that property at 122 S. 19th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The Committee recommended removing the word “vernacular” from the nomination and replacing it with a more appropriate style term such as Regional Modernism or Philadelphia Modernism.

ITEM: 122 S 19th St.					
MOTION: Designate under Criteria C and D					
MOVED BY: Milroy					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 915-23 N BROAD ST

Proposed Action: Remove property from Historic District

Property Owner: Z Realty LLC

Applicant: Jeff Scafaria, Esq., Arangio & George, LLP

District Designation: Automobile Row Thematic Historic District, Contributing, 7/9/2021

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend the inventory of the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District and remove the entry for the property at 915-23 N. Broad Street. At the time that the district was nominated, three buildings stood on the property, all of which were classified as contributing to the district. However, all three buildings have since been demolished pursuant to a valid demolition permit over which the Historical Commission had no authority to approve or deny.

The property owner's attorney has submitted a cover letter requesting the removal of the property from the historic district, a current photograph showing that the buildings have been demolished and the site has been cleared, and a copy of the demolition permit.

In the spring of 2021, the property owner applied to the Historical Commission requesting the removal of the property from the pending historic district, which the Historical Commission reviewed and denied at its 14 May 2021 meeting. At that time, the Historical Commission was aware of the valid demolition permit but decided that it should not remove the property from the district while the buildings were still standing and the district nomination was still pending. The Historical Commission designated the district on 9 July 2021. The buildings were demolished under the valid demolition permit in August 2021.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission amend the inventory of the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District and remove the entry for the property at 915-23 N. Broad Street, pursuant to Section 5.14.a of the Rules and Regulations. The historical significance of the site was derived solely from the buildings, not the site or any site or landscape features or subsurface resources. The district is a thematic, not a geographic district. With the legal demolition of the buildings, there is no longer a basis for including the property in the district.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:27:55

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke noted that the Preservation Alliance nominated the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District. He lamented the loss of the buildings, which he noted were not as large or impressive as other buildings in the district. He acknowledged that, with the demolitions of the buildings, the property no longer qualifies for inclusion in the historic district. He stated that the demolitions of the buildings resulted in a lost opportunity to incorporate historic buildings into a new development.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The buildings at 915-23 N. Broad Street were demolished completely pursuant to a valid demolition permit.
- The site has been cleared of all above-ground structures.
- The Automobile Row Thematic Historic District is a thematic district, not a geographic district.
- The Historical Commission designated the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, all of which related to the structures and the activities that took place in the structures. The property was not included in the historic district because of the site itself or any subsurface resources.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- With the legal demolition of the buildings, there is no basis for maintaining the inclusion of the property at 915-23 N. Broad Street in the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission amend the inventory of the Automobile Row Thematic Historic District and remove the entry for the property at 915-23 N. Broad Street, pursuant to Section 5.14.a of the Rules and Regulations.

ITEM: 915-23 N Broad St.					
MOTION: Remove 915-23 N Broad St from the Automobile Row Thematic District					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Lavery					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

FRENCH VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Historical Commission staff

Number of properties: 24

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a historic district comprised of 24 properties along Emlen and Huron Streets and Gate, Elbow, and E. Allens Lanes in the West Mount Airy section of Philadelphia. The district also includes six gas street lights, three masonry gates, and a stone plaque. All 24 properties are classified as contributing. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district is significant for its connection to the Henry Houston estate and for George S. Woodward's Philadelphia contribution to the national trend in developing utopian

planned suburbs. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the development of French Village reflects the environment of the 1920s and '30s era of suburban planning and European Revival architecture and, more specifically, the French Normal Revival style. Under Criterion E, the nomination notes that significant Philadelphia architects, including Robert Rhodes McGoodwin, H. Louis Duhring, Willing, Sims & Talbutt, Mellor & Meigs, and Tilden, Register & Pepper, designed the district's buildings. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the French Village suburban plan intersects with the wider developing Mount Airy community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:43:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Ms. Keller and Libbie Hawes represented the nomination.
- No one represented a property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Hawes thanked the Historical Commission staff for updating the nomination and moving it forward through the designation process. She stated that French Village is an exceptional example of suburban development led by Henry Houston and George Woodward and numerous significant Philadelphia architects. The neighborhood's French Norman Revival design is a distinctive and important contributor to European Revival buildings that characterize this trend of development.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee needs to address Mr. Langer's objections to including portions of the proposed district. Mr. Langer requested that the properties on Emlen Street and Huron Lane were not part of the original plan. He noted that Emlen Street is a main thoroughfare and that multiple property owners have constructed tall fences not consistent with the district's design. He asked that the buildings on Emlen Street and Huron Lane, constructed during a second phase of development, be excluded from the district. Mr. Langer also noted an error in the inventory that describes the roofing material on his building at 7303 Emlen Street.
 - o Ms. Keller stated that she met with Mr. Langer in the district and noted that the staff can correct the entry for his building regarding the roofing material. She then explained that she visited the George Woodward Company to view the original French Village model, which included the original boundaries of the district. She commented that the staff decided to increase the district boundaries from what is reflected in the model because the properties along Emlen Street and Huron Lane were also developed by George Woodward and had the same deed restrictions as the properties within the original boundary. Those restrictions, she continued, limited the building style to French Norman and required one of several architects selected by Woodward. She explained that the period of significance was extended to include the construction of the last of those buildings.
 - o Ms. Milroy remarked that the original nomination supports the inclusion of those additional properties.
- Ms. Milroy questioned whether the nomination proposes to designate only the buildings or also includes the landscaping.

- o Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission may only regulate work that requires a building permit, adding that changes to the landscape often do not require building permits.
- o Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission cannot regulate the cutting down of a single tree but that significant ground disturbance often requires a building permit and can therefore be regulated. He elaborated that the Commission would be able to regulate large-scale changes and alterations to site features, such as walls and fences. While there is opportunity to regulate those larger changes, he continued, there is no opportunity to regulate minor alterations to trees and shrubs.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that French Village's planned landscape is essential to the planned residential community. She related it to other planned developments and communities in Chestnut Hill, adding that it is more difficult to regulate changes to the landscape than changes to the houses. She then remarked that she has been researching similar developments around New York City and argued that none of those developments meets the level of these French Village properties as the coherent work of George Woodward. She called French Village ground-breaking planning spurred by the atelier of McGoodwin and other significant architects. Though revivalist and historicist, she continued, these buildings were recognized at the time of their construction as being thoroughly modern.
- Mr. Cohen took issue with the use of the word "utopian" to describe French Village. He noted that the French Village was a privileged community and would not be described as a utopian community. Mr. Cohen asked that more information be provided on the architectural model of the community, including when it was created and by whom and what is represented in it. He then stated that there is a modernity about the architecture that is not fully explained by calling it Norman architecture. He contended that the modernity is found in the angularity of the shaping and the rough volumes. He argued that the relationship to Normandy is more complex. He then questioned whether there was contemporary commentary on the development of the community, including commentary by the architects, to help provide a greater understanding of the goals of the community. He noted that there are some properties, including those designed by Mellor & Meigs, that are not as Norman in design but that maintain the district's coherence. The relationship, he continued, is due to the materiality, size, and rambling nature of the building, and the landscape.
- Ms. Milroy commented that the nomination mentions the landscape but does not explain its relationship to the community. She added that the relationship of French Village to the Wissahickon is crucial, which the nomination notes, but she asked that more information be included because it is the landscape that connects these houses. The examples in Normandy provided in the nomination are individual farms or inns rather than a grouping of houses. She contended that Allens Lane provides a clear shift and demarcates a gateway to a very different section of the landscape and community.
- Mr. Lavery compared French Village to a collaborative effort by McGoodwin and Gilchrist three years later in another section of Philadelphia that overlooks a creek. He noted that it had a very different clientele but could be described as a utopian community by making low-cost homes available in an environment that took advantage of the topography. He further elaborated that there were several prominent architects involved in the public housing movement of the 1930s.
- Ms. Miller commented that 13 structures were demolished to create French Village around Emlen Street and Huron Lane. She stated that they were smaller houses and

the residents were displaced to create this community. She asked that Criterion I be considered, given that there were 13 smaller properties along Emlen Street and a larger property at 7307 Elbow Lane.

- Mr. Cohen questioned the argument for Criterion A.
 - o Ms. Barucco contended that French Village's association with George Woodward satisfies Criterion A. Others agreed.
- Ms. Barucco asked to confirm that the walls integrated into the architecture would be part of the designation. She expressed concern that the Historical Commission might not having jurisdiction over these features.
 - o Mr. Farnham confirmed that a building permit would be needed to alter the gate walls and other masonry walls within the district. He reiterated that a building permit would be required for significant changes to the landscape, such as building a berm. He added that there would potentially be further requirements, owing to the district's location within the Wissahickon watershed and those that apply to steep-sloped land.
- Mr. Cohen opined on the uniformity of the wall treatments.
 - o Ms. Cooperman stated that the masonry details are similar to features of other Woodward developments. She specifically noted the joint shape and mortar color as being characteristic to those properties.
 - o Mr. Cohen added that the masonry pointing is very characteristic and cohesive and that the wall treatments are significant.
 - o Ms. Cooperman agreed, adding that roof treatments are also significant. She clarified that the buildings have graduated slate shingles.
- Mr. Farnham thanked Sam Katz, one of the French Village property owners, for serving as the liaison between the Historical Commission staff and the property owners. He noted that Mr. Katz also organized an informational meeting that helped owners understand the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commended Ms. Hawes on the quality of the nomination. He argued that the district strongly satisfies the Criteria for Designation.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The land was part of Henry Houston's estate and was developed into a French Normal Revival suburban community by George S. Woodward in the 1920s and '30s.
- The district's boundary includes the properties originally identified in plans and a model owned by the George Woodward Company; however, the boundary has been increased from the initial development to include several additional Woodward-developed properties east of Emlen Street. These properties include the same deed restrictions, reflect the same Norman Revival style of architecture, and were designed by the same group of prominent architects.
- In addition to the Norman Revival style buildings, the landscape and masonry walls are essential contributors to the district.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The district is associated with Henry Houston's estate and developer George S. Woodward, who contributed significantly to the national trend of developing planned communities. The nomination satisfies Criterion A.
- French Village is a significant representation of 1920s and '30s suburban planning and European Revival architecture, representing the French Normal Revival style. The nomination satisfies Criteria C and D.
- Woodward limited the design of the buildings to several prominent Philadelphia architectural firms, including Robert Rhodes McGoodwin, H. Louis Duhring, Willing, Sims & Talbutt, Mellor & Meigs, and Tilden, Register & Pepper. The nomination satisfies Criterion E.
- The district is representative of the wider developing Mount Airy community, satisfying Criterion J.

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

ITEM: French Village Historic District					
MOTION: Designate under Criteria A, C, D, E, J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Barucco					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

MANHEIM SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Keeping Society

Number of Properties: 6

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a small historic district comprised of six properties at 32-42 Manheim Street in the Germantown section of Philadelphia. Five of the properties are classified as contributing and one, a vacant lot, is identified as non-contributing. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criterion for Designation J, as exemplifying the economic, social, and historical heritage of the community as an early rowhouse development in southwest Germantown, "as it transformed from a linear community along one major street to a larger town or suburban setting." The period of significance spans from 1834 to 1861, when the houses comprising the historic district were built and occupied by members of the Roset family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criterion for Designation J. However, the staff recommends removing the property at 32 Manheim Street from the district. It is a vacant lot on the boundary of the proposed district. Historic preservation best practices advise against including non-contributing properties on district boundaries, especially vacant lots.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:23:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Sean Sneed spoke on behalf of his uncle and represented the property at 34 Manheim Street.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Sneed explained that he was rehabilitating the property at 34 Manheim Street when the property next door at 32 Manheim Street was demolished, which caused significant damage to his side wall. He stated that he supports the designation of the historic district.
- Mr. Cohen and Ms. Miller agreed that Criterion I should be included owing to archaeological potential, specifically in the rear yards.
- Ms. Miller argued that the property at 32 Manheim Street should remain in the district owing to its archaeological potential.
- The Committee members expressed support for the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Doug Mooney of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum recommended that Criterion I for archaeological potential should be included, and the now-vacant lot at 32 Manheim Street should not only be included in the district but should be classified as Contributing owing to archaeological potential. He referenced the survey map in the nomination that calls out privies and a pump in the rear yards.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the designation.
- Mike Simone, a resident across Manheim Street from the subject properties, commented in support of the designation.
- Hal Schirmer commented in support of the designation.
- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo Germantown Civic Association, commented in support of the designation and for the inclusion of Criterion I.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The proposed historic district represents an early cluster of rowhouse development in Germantown.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The historic district exemplifies the economic, social, and historical heritage of the community as an early rowhouse development in southwest Germantown, satisfying Criterion J.

- The open land in the historic district, including the property at 32 Manheim Street and the rear yards of all properties, may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, satisfying Criterion I.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Manheim Square historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation I and J.

ITEM: Manheim Square historic district					
MOTION: Satisfies Criteria I and J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Lavery					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

CHESTNUT STREET EAST COMMERCIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Various

Nominator: Keeping Society

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a district along the 600, 700, and 800 blocks of Chestnut Street in Center City as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Chestnut Street East Commercial Historic District, which is comprised of 56 properties, including condo units, primarily dating from the 1840s through 1920s with a few dating into the mid-twentieth century, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination argues that the district represents the architectural and historical timeline of Philadelphia's commercial heritage on Chestnut Street, covering numerous phases of commercial development along one of the city's most fashionable streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Chestnut Street East Commercial Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but not Criterion G, and that the period of significance should be amended to end in 1929, with the north side of the 600 block of Chestnut Street being excluded from the district boundary.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:57:57

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

- Attorney Brett Feldman and consultant Nick Kraus represented the property owners of 130 S Independence Mall West, also known as 601 Chestnut Street, and opposed the inclusion of the property in the district.
- Jim Tran, property owner of 703 and 705 Chestnut Street, opposed the inclusion of his properties in the district.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman questioned the staff recommendation regarding the exclusion of the north side of the 600 block of Chestnut Street from the district boundary.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale responded that most of the properties in the district date from the 1840s to 1920s; only one mid-century building is considered contributing to the district, and that is 130 S. Independence Mall West, which is geographically separated from the other blocks by a large non-contributing building to the west.
 - o Mr. Farnham further clarified that the nomination associates the building at 130 S. Independence Mall West with Independence Hall and Independence National Historic Park, which are across 6th Street to the east, but that area is not included within the historic district, so the justification for including the property is not made. He also noted that what connects it geographically to the district is a large non-contributing 1970's office building.
 - o Mr. Farnham noted that the staff recommendation regarding the property at 130 S. Independence Mall West was formulated before the staff knew the owners' opposition to the proposed designation. The staff developed its recommendation independently, not in coordination with the property owners' consultants.
- Mr. Beisert opined that, while it is a relatively small district with some holes in it, it is a strong district with distinctive entrances at 6th and 9th Streets. He disagreed that the Colonial Revival bank at 130 S. Independence Mall West should be classified as non-contributing. He conceded that it is distinctly different in character than the rest of the district. He noted that he originally had it classified as significant but changed it to contributing at the staff's suggestion. He opined that it speaks to changes in the district when larger buildings were getting torn down and smaller Colonial Revival buildings constructed. While the nomination does not include Independence Mall, part of the district faces it, he continued. He opined that it is a continuation of the Colonial Revival tradition, which includes the Public Ledger building to the south. He maintained that without the building the district is worthy but noted that he feels it should remain contributing.
- Mr. Feldman explained that they are in support of the district overall, but do not feel property at 130 S. Independence Mall West is contributing to the district. Mr. Feldman explained that they prepared a presentation and submitted a letter that they would like incorporated into the record.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee is happy to hear the presentation, but the Committee was provided with the materials, including the letter, the night before, and it is impossible for the Committee to give due consideration to such materials when they are received in the 11th hour.
 - o Mr. Kraus opined that it is a well-written nomination and that the 700 and 800 blocks of Chestnut Street are cohesive and worthy of designation. He noted that they support the staff's recommendation.
 - o Ms. Cooperman reiterated that the slideshow should have been submitted as a written report far in advance of the meeting, and that it is difficult to read slides with text on the spot.

- o Mr. Kraus moved ahead in the presentation, showing the context of the building at the edge of the district and separated by a non-contributing 1979 high-rise, noting that there is no physical or aesthetic connection between 130 S. Independence Mall West and the primary blocks in the district.
- o Mr. Kraus explained that the building at 130 S. Independence Mall West fronts on Independence Mall, not Chestnut Street, and according to the nomination, “serves as a companion piece to Independence Mall” and “deviates from the vertical form of the other commercial buildings in the district.” The building is one of only two buildings in the proposed district constructed in the 1960s, and the other, 800-06 Chestnut Street, is considered non-contributing.
- o Mr. Kraus presented a c. 1910 photograph showing the prior buildings at the northwest corner of 6th and Chestnut Streets, which fit into the commercial context outlined in the nomination.
- o Mr. Kraus noted that there is no discussion of the block in the nomination beyond the urban renewal phase and as it relates to Independence Mall, which is not part of the district.
- o Mr. Kraus concluded that the property at 130 S. Independence Mall West, also known as 601 Chestnut Street, does not meet the Criteria for Designation and is not consistent with the building stock on the 700 and 800 blocks of which the nomination is focused.
- Mr. Tran explained that they did not have a chance to attend in the first meeting. He noted that he rehabbed the fronts of the buildings at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street and does not consider them historic. He noted that there are other historic buildings on the block, but he would like his buildings excluded from the designation. He explained that he was told when he purchased the properties that 703 Chestnut Street was constructed in 1929.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that this is the first public meeting regarding the district, and that the Committee will make a recommendation to the full Historical Commission, which will meet next month and is also open to the public.
 - o Mr. Farnham clarified that the earlier meeting was an informal, informational meeting run by the Historical Commission's staff for property owners to ask questions about the designation process, but no decisions were made about the nomination at that time.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that the inventory form dates 703 Chestnut Street to 1854, and that as an architectural historian, she believes that is likely to be an accurate date, perhaps with alterations circa 1929, which is within the period of significance.
 - o Ms. Barucco noted that the inventory dates 705 Chestnut Street to 1942.
 - o Mr. Tran asked what he can do at this time to oppose the designation.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that he is doing it, by putting his objections on the record. She explained that the Committee on Historic Designation makes a non-binding recommendation to the Historical Commission regarding the nomination and the classification of the buildings, and the Commission will make its final decision at its meeting on 12 November 2021.
 - o Ms. Barucco clarified that the proposed district includes several blocks along Chestnut Street, not just the 700 block.
 - o Mr. Farnham commented that the façade of 705 Chestnut Street probably dates to the mid twentieth century.
 - o Mr. Tran explained that he purchased the property in 2004, and that alterations had been made approximately 10 years prior to that, and that he remodeled the storefronts subsequently.

- o Ms. Cooperman acknowledged that the upper floor of 705 Chestnut Street clearly does not date to 1854. The building has been altered.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned the where the construction date of 1965 listed in the inventory for 130 S. Independence Mall West came from.
 - o Mr. Lavery responded that the Philadelphia Architects and Buildings website lists the construction date as 1965 and attributes the design to Martin, Stuart & Noble, but noted that that date could be incorrect.
 - o Mr. Lavery conducted additional research and determined that the date of 1965 came from interior alterations by the Nicholas Berberich company in 1965.
 - o Ms. Cooperman determined that the property is included in the Turner Company's 50 Years of Buildings publication, published in 1952, so it predates 1952.
 - o Mr. Lavery explained that Martin, Stuart & Noble, were a significant firm who recreated the Library Company for the Philosophical Society in 1958 and 1959, but also designed the modernist Mercantile Library on Chestnut Street in the 1950s. He noted that the one firm created a Minimalist classic while also going right back to the Colonial Revival. He further noted that the Grant Simon plan for the East Independence Mall had planned a dozen buildings lining Chestnut and Walnut Streets that were of the same massing and shape as 130 S. Independence Mall West.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that she is struggling with the boundary and the period of significance identified in the nomination, opining that they are unnecessarily narrow, though the buildings are extremely worthy. She explained that she spent a long time working on the National Register amendment for the Center City East Commercial Historic District, which encompasses and extends beyond these blocks, so she is struggling with excising them from the many around them, and therefore the period of significance in this district versus the larger context. She noted that there are larger patterns of development that go into the 1960s but opined that it is problematic that the nomination classifies the bank at the corner of 8th and Chestnut Streets as non-contributing simply because it is later. She explained that the National Register Center City East district has an extremely long period of significance.
 - o Ms. Barucco agreed, noting that the district brings to mind the updates to the larger National Register district, which she reviewed as chair of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission board. She noted that she is also concerned about the narrowness of the district. She noted that the update to the National Register district included mid-century modern buildings. She noted that the proposed Chestnut Street Commercial historic district nomination has great mid nineteenth through early twentieth-century history, but the buildings on the north side of the 600 block of Chestnut Street are part of the continuum of what happened in this district. She further noted that the parking garage at 727-35 Chestnut Street is listed as non-contributing, but that she sees it as contributing because it represents how people got to the district, which should be recognized as well.
 - o Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that 727-35 Chestnut Street is a very early architect-designed garage and still retains many of its key historic details.
- Mr. Cohen commented that it is amazing that facades along Chestnut Street were able to be moved back five feet when the street was widened in the 1890s. He noted that some of the facades clearly date from the 1870s and 1880s, so they had to have been reconstructed or somehow otherwise moved, which is remarkable.

- Mr. Cohen opined that it is slightly disingenuous to say that the bank building at 130 S. Independence Mall West resembles nothing else in the area, as the Public Ledger Building is also Colonial Revival, even if at a massive scale. Furthermore, the building has a commercial history, and put a new face on commerce. He noted that it was built before Rohm & Haas, and perhaps the architects envisioned a Colonial Revival ensemble around the Mall. Martin, Stuart & Noble were one of the last competent Revivalist firms, he explained. The building at 130 S. Independence Mall West is a presentation of commercial identity in Colonial garb. He opined that it is a pivot between the buildings around Independence Mall and the linear Chestnut Street. He opined that it is a pivotal and thematically appropriate building, especially given the earlier date of construction.
- Mr. Cohen commented that in looking at the 1850s and 1870s Baxter commercial panoramas, it is clear that the building at 703 Chestnut Street is the first and second story of a taller mid-nineteenth century building, as evidenced by the fenestration and brick of the second floor. The upper floors were removed at some point. He opined that this is sufficient to keep the building classified as contributing.
- Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman opined that the building at 705 Chestnut Street should be classified as non-contributing because the historic façade is completely gone.
- Mr. Cohen supported with the inclusion of Criterion I, the archaeology criterion, opining that the district is on rich ground, even if many of the buildings likely have deep basements. He noted that the buildings were constructed during a period in which people were building ambitiously, but probably throwing away ambitiously as well.
 - o Ms. Miller agreed, noting that some of the nineteenth-century buildings likely incorporated eighteenth-century building components within them, explaining that it was common across the city to see reuse at the subterranean level in particular.
 - o Ms. Miller noted at 130 S. Independence Mall West, there is evidence that that site has been continually built on since the eighteenth century, and there are likely to be archaeological resources, especially under the parking lot.
 - o Ms. Miller pointed out that there are two fairly large parking lots in the district, one at 709-13 Chestnut Street and one at 801-17 Chestnut Street. In looking at aerial images of the parking lots, particularly that at 709-13 Chestnut, one can see where they have been filling in privies shafts that are sinking with different colored asphalt. She noted that the parking lot at 8th and Chestnut is in better condition but opined that there will also be archaeological resources there, and that the Historical Commission needs to consider the eighteenth-century components that existed on these blocks. She explained that the property at 130 S. Independence Mall West was the site of the original Chestnut Street theatre built by John Inigo Richards and rebuilt on a design by Benjamin Latrobe, and at the southeast corner of 7th and Chestnut Streets was the Waln mansion, also designed by Latrobe, so there is a lot of history on these blocks that extends beyond the period of significance identified in the nomination.
- Ms. Milroy addressed Criterion G, noting that the staff recommends against the inclusion of the criterion, but opined that it should be retained, since the district is contiguous along 6th Street with Independence Mall, even though the blocks to the west are not related to the Mall.
 - o Mr. Cohen agreed with the retention of Criterion G.

- o Ms. Barucco responded that she is fine either way, noting that both the Public Ledger and bank at 130 S. Independence Mall West are contributing to the district, whether or not they are connected to Independence Mall. She argued that the thrust of the nomination is the significance of the long and changing period of commercial growth along Chestnut Street.
- Ms. Barucco noted that the nomination dates 705 Chestnut Street to 1942, and the upper floor of the façade appears to have already been altered to more or less its current appearance by 1959. She noted that storefront changes are a given in a commercial district and commented that she is in favor of maintaining the building as contributing.
 - o Ms. Miller agreed, acknowledging that it is unclear whether the building was completely demolished and rebuilt or whether the earlier five-story building was taken down to two stories with a new façade.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned what an appropriate start date for the period of significance would be.
 - o Ms. Miller initially responded that it could begin in 1790.
 - o Mr. Cohen opined that 1790 was too late and suggested that it begin in 1700. Other Committee members agreed.
- Ms. Cooperman addressed the individual buildings the Committee had discussed recommending be reclassified.
 - o For 709-13 Chestnut Street, the Committee members agreed the property should be classified as contributing for archaeological potential.
 - o For 727-35 Chestnut Street, the 1940s parking garage, Ms. Cooperman suggested that the property be reclassified as contributing as an exemplary early parking garage.
 - o For 705 Chestnut Street, Mr. Cohen questioned whether the property should be classified as contributing architecturally and whether that would restrict what could be done with the façade.
 - o Mr. Farnham explained that buildings could be classified as contributing for archaeological potential, or just as contributing, which would mean contributing for archaeological potential and architecturally.
 - o Ms. Barucco suggested that 615 Chestnut Street remain architecturally non-contributing but classified as contributing for archaeological potential.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that the former bank building at 800-06 Chestnut Street dates to 1966 and questioned whether the Period of Significance should be extended one year.
 - o Other Committee members questioned whether the building is architecturally meritorious, and the Committee determined that the period of significance should remain at 1965 and the building remain classified as non-contributing.
- Mr. Feldman asked that the Committee take a step back. He argued that it is his understanding that the nomination is about capturing the golden era of commercial development on Chestnut Street from 1840 to basically 1929 when the Depression hit and development screeched to a halt. He maintained that whatever one might think about 130 S. Independence Mall West and the significance of the Colonial Revival and what statement the building was making moving to Independence Mall, that history is a whole separate era from the one represented by the blocks to the west. He suggested that the building be considered separately and individually, and that if the nomination moves forward as-is, the property is being designated for something completely different than 99% of the district, which is composed primarily of three to five-story buildings that give the district its look and feel. He reiterated that

the history of 130 S. Independence Mall West is a completely different story than most of the district, that the appearance of the building is different in design, scale, scope, and is physically separated from the majority of the district by a large non-contributing building.

- o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee is not of the opinion that the 1929 Stock Market Crash is an appropriate end date for the period of significance. She argued that commercial activity in this area continued through the 1920s and well beyond, which is the basis for the recommendation for the period of significance. She noted that commercial activities also existed before 1840. She contended that 130 S. Independence Mall West is part of the commercial development that continued well past 1929. She explained that the end of the period of significance at 1965 coincides with a sudden enormous change of scale in the 1970s that is represented by the non-contributing building at 615 Chestnut Street.
- o Ms. Milroy agreed, noting that there was a similar conversation going with the construction of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, which was constructed during a time when there was a back and forth of scale. She noted that the district was able to capture buildings from certain periods, but that it is also important to think about the longer history of the blocks and how they have evolved over time.
- Mr. Beisert, the nominator, expressed concern about the addition of Criterion I to the recommendation, noting that the nomination does not discuss the early history of the district and the development of the properties. He noted it is primarily focused on the commercial history of the street, not the earlier residential history. He suggested that the archaeological component could be an amendment to the nomination at a later date. He noted that he does not object per se, but thinks it is as hasty decision to assign archaeological designation to all the properties without additional research. Archaeology is never mentioned in the nomination.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that it is not hasty but is based on the extensive professional expertise of the Committee members.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination, noting that it is one of the city's most important early commercial and retail districts. He commented that the Alliance has long been interested in this stretch of Chestnut Street and sponsored five successful individual nominations going back to 2015 and are sponsors of the Jeweler's Row district half a block to the south. He opined that the building at 130 S. Independence Mall West is a finely rendered example of Colonial Revival architecture, and kind of a reflection of the Public Ledger Building across the street, but on the other hand, it seems like its story is more about Independence Mall and its creation, in which a leading Philadelphia bank decided to plant a flag on the Mall with a sort of backward-looking Colonial Revival building right next to a forward-looking Rohm & Haas building just to the north.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination.
- Doug Mooney representing the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum supported the nomination and supported the inclusion of Criterion I, as the district encompasses a significant swath of Center City and possesses high potential for archaeological remains. He noted that there are 20 or more known archaeological sites within a few blocks of this district. He acknowledged that there have been impacts from more recent and substantial construction, and that not every property in the district is likely to have equal archaeological significance. He opined that a Phase 1A archaeological

assessment would be needed to determine the archaeological potential for each property. He opined that the absence of Criterion I in the designation would preclude the Historical Commission from asking for such a report in the future. He noted that the nomination documents the history of the district from the mid nineteenth through early twentieth centuries, but the history associated with the district actually goes back substantially further in time and based on a quick review of historic maps, from at least from the middle of the eighteenth century the area was occupied, and certainly there are still significant resources preserved within parts of this district. For example, at the southeast corner of 8th and Chestnut Street was the mansion built by Robert Morris and known as Morris's Folly. Whether or not there are any remnants of that property is unknown at this time but it is a possibility. The goal at a minimum should be to afford the Historical Commission the opportunity to review the potential impacts to archaeological resources, should any arise in the future. As always, the goal is to keep archaeological resources in the ground and not dig them up.

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination, commenting that it was long overdue, and that the district is comprised of a marvelous ensemble of interesting architecture of its period.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The proposed district falls within the larger boundaries of the National Register-listed Center City East Commercial historic district and may be unnecessarily restrictive in its scope. Nevertheless, the blocks proposed for designation are worthy of designation.
- The proposed district, which extends from 6th to 9th Streets along Chestnut Street, has been continually developed since the early eighteenth century, with most of the existing buildings in the district dating from 1840 through the 1920s, and some dating into the mid twentieth century. A beginning date of 1700 for the period of significance is appropriate in order to cover the earlier archaeological potential of the district.
- Commercial development in the district did not end with the Stock Market Crash of 1929, but a change in scale and building types did occur in the late 1960s and 1970s, as seen in the non-contributing building at 615 Chestnut Street. An end date of 1965 for the period of significance is appropriate.
- Numerous storefront alterations over time are common in commercial districts such as this one.
- The properties at 703 and 705 Chestnut Street were historically five stories in height. The building at 703 Chestnut Street was reduced in height, as evidenced by the nineteenth-century brick and fenestration of the second floor. It is unclear whether 705 Chestnut Street was demolished entirely and rebuilt or reduced in height and reclad. The existing second-floor cladding and large window opening appear in a 1959 photograph of the property.
- The property at 800-06 Chestnut Street dates to 1966 and should remain classified as non-contributing.
- Documentary evidence shows that the building at 130 S. Independence Mall West was constructed in 1950, not 1965 as the nomination claims.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The proposed district represents the architectural and historical timeline of Philadelphia's commercial heritage on Chestnut Street, covering numerous phases

of commercial development along one of the city's most important streets, satisfying Criteria A, C, and J.

- The district's adjacency to Independence Mall and the position of the bank building 130 S. Independence Mall West and the Public Ledger Building at 150 S. Independence Mall West along the Mall satisfies Criterion G.
- Although not discussed in the nomination, the district encompasses land that was developed in the eighteenth century, and despite changes over time, retains the potential for archaeological resources, satisfying Criterion I.
- Owing to the earlier history and archaeological potential, the period of significance should be amended to begin in 1700, and all properties classified as contributing for their archaeological potential.
- The architect-designed building at 727-35 Chestnut Street, constructed in 1940, is an early garage and represents the development of the district and how people travelled to the commercial district.
- Additional research is needed on 705 Chestnut Street to determine whether it should remain classified as contributing or its classification should be changed to non-contributing.
- The classification of the property at 130 S. Independence Mall West should remain as contributing as proposed in the nomination's inventory.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Chestnut Street East Commercial historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J, and to amend the nomination to include Criterion I and classify all properties as contributing for archaeological potential; to amend the period of significance to 1700 to 1965; to retain the classification of contributing for 130 S. Independence Mall West; to classify 727-35 Chestnut Street as contributing; and for the staff to conduct additional research into the alterations to 705 Chestnut Street.

ITEM: Chestnut Street East Commercial historic district					
MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, C, G, J; add I					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Milroy					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 1:02 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.