

**THE MINUTES OF THE 571ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**12 MARCH 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Scott Wilds, Acting Chair, Office of Housing & Community Development
Richardson Dilworth III
Susan Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas
Miles Wilson

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner III
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Ken Karlan
Richard Sanford, Sanford Architects
A. Charles Peruto, Jr.
Chas Peruto, Peruto Construction Services
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects
Robert Powers, Powers & Company

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wilds called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Jaffe, Leonard, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Thomas, and Wilson joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 570TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 570th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 February 2010. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

UPDATE ON HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION PROGRAM

Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission's staff is seeking the Commission's guidance and direction regarding the historic district designation program and related efforts aimed at increasing efficiencies.

Mr. Farnham reported that, at its November 2008 meeting, the Commission dedicated itself to undertaking three projects to ensure that its permit review processes were as efficient as possible: the revision of the Rules & Regulations to promote clarity and extend staff authority; the establishment of an automated system to verify the accuracy of all addresses on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; and the issuance of written notice of designation to all property owners on the Philadelphia Register. Those projects have been or are about to be completed. The Rules & Regulations have been revised, twice, in fact. The automated address system is up and running and the Philadelphia Register is accurate for the first time in decades. And, with the financial support of the Preservation Alliance, letters reminding all owners of their properties' designations and the Commission's authority will be mailed shortly. At the same meeting in November 2008, to take advantage of the anticipated new efficiencies as well as the slowing real estate market, the Commission directed its staff to restart the historic district designation program with the processing of three district nominations. The program had been effectively suspended with the designation of the Old City Historic District in December 2003 because, at that time, during the real estate boom, the Commission did not have sufficient staff to administer new districts, especially very large districts. The district designation program was restarted and the Commission designated Tudor East Falls and Parkside in 2009. The Commission will consider Awbury in May 2010.

With these projects nearing completion, the staff again seeks the Commission's guidance regarding increasing efficiency and continuing the district designation program. To obtain additional efficiencies while providing more and better information to the public, the staff proposes replacing the Commission's current website, which is not adequate, with an entirely new website. The current website was created nearly a decade ago and has never been fully functional. For example, the online Philadelphia Register was disabled years ago because it was neither reliable nor accurate. The staff has been developing the structure and content for a new website for several months and has nearly completed that effort. The staff will begin working with the City's Division of Technology to implement the new website.

Mr. Farnham explained that the staff is seeking the Commission's authorization to continue the historic district designation program. The staff suggests that the Commission direct it to process the proposed East Logan Street Historic District, for which a nomination was submitted in May 2009, when it completes the processing of the Awbury nomination currently under review. The proposed district is very small, only 26 properties, many of which are already designated. The review of the nomination and, if designated, the review of the resulting permit application, would consume little staff time. The staff also suggests that the Commission direct it to update the Overbrook Farms nomination, which was submitted in October 2004. The proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District contains 520 properties. Summer interns funded by the Preservation Alliance would likely be assigned the task of updating the Overbrook inventory and other aspects of the nomination, under the direction of staff member Erin Coté. Once the updating was complete, the staff would request authorization from the Commission to submit it for review to the Committee on Historic Designation and Commission. Finally, the staff suggests that the Commission direct it to analyze the Spruce Hill nomination, which was submitted in July 2002

and includes 1930 properties, meet with stakeholders to understand their needs and concerns, and report back to the Commission with suggestions regarding potential actions.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission need not take any official action on this matter today. The staff is simply seeking the Commission's comments, guidance, and an informal indication of support or lack thereof.

Ms. Merriman stated that she supports the restarting of the district designation program. She observed that the processing of the recently designated districts has been very successful. She applauded the proposal to seek a resolution to Spruce Hill impasse. She wholeheartedly supported improving the website, which will enhance the Commission's customer service. She thanked the staff for undertaking these initiatives.

Mr. Dilworth asked if the Commission anticipated any interior nominations. Mr. Farnham replied the staff is working with a consultant funded by the Preservation Alliance but directed by the Commission's staff to prepare the first interior nomination. He stated that the nomination should serve as a model for subsequent nominations. He noted that the property owner fully supports the nomination. It should be ready for review within the next six months. Mr. Wilds stated that he would like to see the nomination submitted in less than six months. Mr. Farnham responded that he expected that it would be completed and ready for review in much less than six months, but the formal contract with the consultant had not yet been signed. Until it is signed, the schedule is speculative.

Mr. Thomas stated that the federal tax credit program for preservation projects may be extended to include other types of properties and projects. He observed that the Commission should promote the fact that historic designations can attract investment to the city, especially if local historic districts are mirrored by National Register districts. He also commended the proposal to meet with the various constituencies involved with the proposed Spruce Hill Historic District. Mr. Thomas asked if the Philadelphia Register is available again online. Mr. Farnham stated that it is not yet available online, but a pdf version should be available soon and a more user-friendly searchable version within the next several months.

Mr. Wilds asked if the Real Estate Certification provided by the Department of Licenses & Inspections currently indicates whether the property is designated as historic. He noted that the Commission has sought to include this information on the certification for several years, but has never received confirmation that it is or is not included. Mr. Farnham replied that he would seek confirmation with the Department. If it is not included on the certification, he promised to have it included soon.

Mr. Schaaf added that the City and Montgomery County created an overlay district on City Line Avenue that includes parts of the proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District. He asked Mr. Farnham to confirm that this overlay would be compatible with the historic district.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 FEBRUARY 2010

David Amburn, Chair

1701 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Tenth Presbyterian Church

Applicant: Christopher Miller, AIA

History: 1854, John McArthur, architect

Project: Enclose rear porch and install ADA ramp

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an open-air porch at ground-floor. The porch is located on the west side of the property at the rear of a side yard. The yard is closed-off from the Spruce Street by a wrought iron gate. The applicant proposes to enclose the porch and create an ADA accessible entrance. The existing iron columns and exposed lintel would remain in place and exposed. The proposed masonry enclosure would be completely reversible.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Christopher Miller represented the application.

The Commission members agreed with the Committee that the proposal satisfies the Standards.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

115-117 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: Olde North Third LP

Applicant: James M. Francis

History: c. 1840

individually designated, 12/31/1984;

contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Reconstruct rear wall

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option B, provided the lintels and sills are limestone, the cornice is brick, and the windows are real double-hung sash, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options to reconstruct the rear or east walls of these adjacent buildings. Option A proposes a four-bay series of tripartite wood casements and single casements with Juliette balconies. Option B proposes six bays of wood casements and Juliette balconies on the outer bays. Both options propose brick elevations and window openings to match the height of neighboring window openings.

On 26 January 2010, the Architectural Committee reviewed a proposal to reconstruct the rear in a modern design using a series of aluminum awning windows, Hardieboard panels, and balconies. The Committee recommended denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and

9, and stated that the design is not compatible in materials, proportions, and patterns of the historic rear facades. The applicant withdrew the proposal before the February 2010 Commission meeting.

These properties are part of a row of eight Greek Revival buildings that contribute to the historic significance of Old City. Not only are these buildings important because of their age and architectural style, but they are exceptionally well-preserved and have retained their original design, configuration, and materials. The consistency in the row is demonstrated best in the front facades, but is also evident at the rears, where the original brick, window openings, lintels, and sills survive.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Sell to summarize the differences between Options A and B as well as the differences between the staff's and Architectural Committee's recommendations. Ms. Sell explained that Option A proposes a four-bay series of tripartite wood casements and single casements with Juliette balconies; Option B proposes six bays of wood casements and Juliette balconies on the outer bays. She explained that the Architectural Committee rejected Option A because it would create the appearance of a nineteenth-century factory building with steel tripartite windows and bands of fenestration. The Committee contended that Option B was more compatible with the rhythm of the historic rears. She added that the Committee objected to the use of casements in favor of double-hung sash. She noted that Committee member Dan McCoubrey proposed a potential third option of enlarging one bay of existing windows at each of the two buildings. The staff did not oppose Option A because the rears of these buildings are not visible to the public and because it maintains the historic materials and vertical orientation of the windows.

Ms. Merriman asked Ms. Sell to clarify the visibility of the project zone from the public right-of-way. She asked if it would be visible from Bread Street. Ms. Sell clarified that the rears are not visible from Bread Street or any public right-of-way. She explained that the upper stories of the rears can be seen from a private courtyard accessible to the residents of a neighboring condominium building only.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Sell to explain the reasons for reconstructing the rear facades. Ms. Sell stated that an engineer had concluded that the rear facades were detaching from the building; the facades are currently braced with a temporary interior support system to prevent a collapse. Mr. Thomas asked why the applicants proposed casement windows. Ms. Sell stated that the applicants would like to bring more air into the building and that they believe that casements would allow for better air flow than double-hung windows. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that ventilation is an issue and explained that there are double-hung windows that tilt open to allow for more air flow. He stated that the Commission should balance energy conservation and preservation needs. He noted that the rear is not visible to the public.

Mr. Wilds stated that, given that the rear is not visible to the public and must be rebuilt anyway, he would support the applicants' preferred option, Option A. Ms. Merriman agreed with Mr. Wilds, but contended that, owing to the lack of public visibility, either Option A or B would be acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve Option A or Option B, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2224 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Owner: Don Nguyen and Jenny Ly

Applicant: Jenny Ly

History: c. 1855, contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows that the current owners claim were installed prior to their purchase of the property in 2007. The Commission's staff worked with the former owner who renovated the building, approving permit applications in 2005 and 2006. Those applications explicitly stated that the front windows would not to be replaced. Instead, vinyl windows were installed on the front façade with an unusual two-wide, three-down pane configuration.

Current owner Jenny Ly has claimed that she and her husband and co-owner Don Nguyen have no connection to the former owner, Jonie Nguyen, who they assert installed the illegal windows. However, the staff discovered after the Architectural Committee meeting that the deed for the property recorded on 8 August 2007 indicates that the current owners, Don Nguyen and Jenny Ly, are the brother and sister-in-law of the former owner, Jonie Nguyen.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Merriman applauded the staff for obtaining the information about the transfer of the property from one relative to another. Ms. Merriman expressed outrage at the applicant's attempt to misrepresent the situation and deceive the Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

604-36 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Hopkinson House Owners Association

Applicant: Theresa Shephard, Klein & Hoffman, Inc.

History: 1961, Oscar Stonorov, architect; Contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Replace ground floor windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the R200 design for all four facades, provided that the full-height glass is restored in the window openings without doors on the north façade, unless documentation shows that the glass was divided originally, with removable opaque film applied on the inside surfaces of the glass as needed, and metal doors and panels where they currently exist, but not elsewhere, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows on the ground floor of this mixed-use, but largely residential high-rise building. The ground floor currently houses several commercial spaces. The occupants of those ground-floor spaces are seeking greater energy efficiency. The ground-floor windows have several different configurations with glass panes of several sizes. The largest panes of glass are 16'-6" tall. Only one manufacturer on the east coast, Rochester Glass Company, can manufacture such large panes of glass and they are very expensive. Replacing the large panes in kind, rather than dividing them up into smaller panes, would increase the total project cost from \$1.2 million to \$1.5 million. For this reason, the applicant seeks an approval to install windows with revised configurations. Transoms and/or bases and transoms would be introduced to reduce the sizes of the primary pieces of glass.

The window patterns differ significantly throughout the ground floor of the building. Moreover, the windows installed when the building was constructed in 1961 appear to deviate from architect Oscar Stonorov's original window plans. The south-facade windows are visible from a private courtyard only. The east- and west-facade windows are only visible obliquely from the street. The windows at the north façade, which are visible from the public right-of-way, currently feature a mix of full height and divided windows. Also, darkening film has been applied at the upper halves of many of them, at the mezzanine level, altering their appearances.

The applicant proposes two alternative ways of breaking up the window sizes with horizontal mullions. One proposes introducing transoms; the other transoms and bases.

The new window system would have structural corners that increase in width from 4½ for the existing to 6½ inches for the proposed. The intermediate mullions match closely the glass to glass dimension of the existing, although the shape differs somewhat. The applicant proposes adding a low base to the windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Engineer Theresa Shepherd represented the application.

Mr. Baron said that he had visited the building since the Committee meeting and found that the horizontal mullions dividing the large window openings appear to be later additions because they are much thinner than the original mullions above the doors. He added that the thinner mullions appear to be tack welded to the original mullions. In addition, the staff recently discovered a 1963 photograph of the building showing the ground-floor windows without horizontal mullions.

Ms. Shepherd stated that she could accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation, but asked for one minor modification to it. She stated that the very large pieces of glass must be installed with a crane. She said that it is not feasible to use a crane at the center of the north façade because the canopy of the porte-cochère blocks any access to the window openings. She asked the Commission to consider allowing the addition of horizontal mullions behind the porte-cochère at the level of the canopy room to facilitate the installation. She stated that the canopy would hide any views of the horizontal mullions.

Ms. Shepherd also asked to add a horizontal mullion in the very thin window openings that sit behind columns. Because the windows are only 12 inches wide but 16 feet tall, it is very likely that the glass will break during shipment or installation. Mr. Baron introduced a photograph that shows that the narrow window openings are visible to the public. Ms. Shepherd stated that, with one exception, every narrow window opening is located adjacent to a door. The door openings are already divided. Dividing the narrow window openings would not significantly alter their appearances, owing to their relations to the door openings. The Commission reviewed the matter and concluded that the narrow, undivided glass should be installed. The Commission informed the applicant that she could seek an approval of the divisions in the narrow window openings if she discovers that the narrow glass cannot be manufactured, transported, or installed.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve of the R200 design for all four facades, provided that the full-height glass is restored in all window openings without doors on the north façade except those behind the porte-cochère; to approve removable opaque film applied on the inside surfaces of the glass as needed; and to approve metal doors and panels where they currently exist, but not elsewhere; with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2000-2002 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner/Applicant: A. Charles Peruto

History: 1865

Individually designated, 1/6/1972

Contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct penthouse and deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a penthouse and deck on top of this corner townhouse. In November 2008, the Historical Commission approved a stairhouse and roof deck as part of the larger rehabilitation of this building. The approved stairhouse and deck were significantly smaller than those now proposed. The new application proposes a deck expanded to the full width of the building and setback 11' from the front façade, as opposed to the 13-foot setback originally approved. In addition, the new penthouse includes a larger stairway and bathroom and measures approximately 15' by 18'-11.5", rather than the approved 3'-6" by 11'-2".

When it approved the original proposal, the Commission inadvertently approved the demolition of a rear chimney because the plans were incomplete and did not explicitly call out the demolition of the chimney to make way for the penthouse. The applicant now proposes to save

that chimney. Although the staff commends the retention of the chimney, it contends that the enlarged deck and penthouse will be much more visible on this corner building than the smaller stairhouse and deck originally approved. Therefore, allowing the demolition of the chimney may be the best preservation option.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner A. Charles Peruto Jr., Chas Peruto, and architect Rick Sanford represented the application.

Mr. Baron provided a report on his site visit to review the mock-up of the latest design of the penthouse. He said that the mock-up showed that the penthouse would be highly visible. He said that photographs of the mock-up had been included in the Commissioners' meeting packets. He then introduced the applicants' latest revision of the design for the penthouse, called Alternate A, which had not been reviewed by the Architectural Committee. Although the applicant had created a computer generated rendering that appeared to show that it would not be visible from the public right-of-way, Mr. Baron asserted that, based on what he learned during his site visit, the alternate would also be visible. He cautioned that the rendering was not accurate. Mr. Baron said that the previously-approved scheme allowed for the removal of the chimney; he contended that the removal of the chimney would have a less significant impact on the historic resource than the construction of the penthouse because the neighboring property has a mirroring chimney that would remain and that is difficult to distinguish from the chimney in question.

Chas Peruto stated that the original penthouse would have been stuccoed with a flat roof. As currently proposed, it would have a shingled, pitched roof that may make it appear more prominent. Charles Peruto described the condition of the property upon purchase. He explained that it was in deplorable condition and pointed out that he has invested over \$300,000 to rehabilitate this building. He stated that he appreciates the Historical Commission guidelines, but is asking for a relatively small concession relative to the significant work that he has done.

Ms. Merriman stated that she could support the Alternate A scheme provided the roof structure was limited to covering the stair and not extended east to create an overhang. She asked the architect to explain the reasoning behind the overhanging roof, which doubles the size of the penthouse. Mr. Sanford explained that the overhanging roof is intended to provide some shade. Ms. Merriman suggested that shade could be achieved with umbrellas or other impermanent devices. She asked the architect if the roof could be limited in size to cover the stair only. Mr. Sanford stated that the roof could be reduced in size. Ms. Merriman asked how far the penthouse extends out from the party wall. Mr. Sanford stated that it extends out 10'-8" from the party wall. The overhanging roof extends further.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the Alternate A of the application, provided the roof on the penthouse does not extend more than 10'-8" from the party wall, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1523 PINE STREET

Owner: Kenneth Karlin

Applicant: Victor Brubacker

History: c.1850

Project: Construct elevator tower, replace front door

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the elevator tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; and denial of the replacement of the front door, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: At its February 2010 meeting, the Commission reviewed an application to construct and elevator tower and roof deck with pilothouse at 1523 Pine Street. The Commission approved the roof deck with pilothouse, but denied the elevator tower owing to a lack of information. At the Commission meeting, the applicant asked the Commission to approve a replacement door and railing as well, which the Commission also denied owing to incompleteness, because the information had not been submitted with the original application. At the February 2010 meeting, the Commission voted “to approve the roof deck with stair house as submitted, but deny the remainder of the application including the elevator tower, front door, and railing, owing to incompleteness.”

Based on the earlier application, this application proposes to construct an exterior elevator tower and replace the front door. The railing is not included in this application. The elevator tower would be located at the rear of the building and it would be clad in stucco. The existing single-leaf door would be replaced with a replica of the original double-leaf doors. The existing door dates from the turn of the twentieth century and it has a fine wrought iron grill with a decorative cartouche. This door is a fine example of an Arts & Crafts door and, although not original to the building, it provides glimpse into the evolution and layered history of the district, in which architects often updated and embellished earlier Italianate houses at the turn of the twentieth century. Furthermore, the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation directly address the alteration of non-original elements, when those elements have achieved historic significance of their own.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Kenneth Karlin and contractor Victor Brubaker represented the application.

Mr. Brubacker stated that he was in agreement with the Committee's recommendation and would retain the door. The Commissioners agreed that the Committee's recommendation was appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the elevator tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; and deny the replacement of the front door, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, and 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

H.W. BUTTERWORTH & SONS COMPANY BUILDING, 2410-50 E. YORK STREET

Owner: 2424 East York Partners LP

Nominator: Powers & Company, Inc.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to list the H. W Butterworth & Sons Company, located at 2410 E. York Street in Philadelphia, on the National Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building is eligible under Criterion A because the company possesses great significance in the history of the textile industry. The Philadelphia Historical Commission's staff reviewed the nomination and concurs that the proposed building satisfies Criterion A and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to recommend the designation of the building to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commission. Robert Powers represented the nomination.

The Commissioners agreed that the nomination demonstrates that the H. W Butterworth & Sons Company, located at 2410 E. York Street in Philadelphia, satisfies Criterion A and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission that the H. W Butterworth & Sons Company, located at 2410 E. York Street in Philadelphia, satisfies Criterion A and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STEEL HEDDLE MANUFACTURING COMPANY COMPLEX, 2100-20 W. ALLEGHENY AVENUE

Owner: AM8 Group Steel Heddle Building LP

Nominator: Heritage Consulting Group

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to list the Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company Complex, located at the southwest corner of West Allegheny Avenue and N. 21st Street in Philadelphia, on the National Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the complex is eligible under Criterion A because the company patented the first flat steel heddle in the United States, which led to more efficient looms. This complex was the company's headquarter from 1919 to 1983, the company's period of greatest expansion and prestige. The Philadelphia Historical Commission's staff reviewed the nomination and concurs that the complex satisfies Criterion A and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to recommend the designation of the complex to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commission. The Commissioners agreed that the nomination demonstrates that the Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company Complex, located at the southwest corner of West Allegheny Avenue and N. 21st Street in Philadelphia, satisfies Criterion A and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission that the Steel Heddle Manufacturing Company Complex, located at the southwest corner of West Allegheny Avenue and N. 21st Street in Philadelphia, satisfies Criterion A and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CALLOWHILL INDUSTRIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Bounded by Pearl, N. Broad, and Hamilton Streets and Reading Viaduct

Owner: various

Nominator: Powers & Company, Inc.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to create a National Register Historic District in an area of 14 square blocks bounded by N. Broad Street, Vine Street, N. 11th Street, and the elevated Reading Terminal Viaduct. The proposed district is significant for its association with manufacturing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The nomination proposes that the district is eligible for listing under Criteria A for Industry and C for Architecture. The Philadelphia Historical Commission staff reviewed the nomination and concurs that the proposed district satisfies both criteria and should be listed to the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to recommend the designation of the district to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination. Robert Powers represented the nomination.

Mr. Powers stated that the proposed boundaries had been changed since the nomination was submitted. He noted that the southern boundary of the district had been moved to Coral Street from Vine Street. The Commissioners agreed that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria A and C and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission that the Callowhill Industrial Historic District satisfies Criteria A and C and is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 10:45 a.m. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.