

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

**13 SEPTEMBER 2017, 9:30 A.M.
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
EMILY COOPERMAN, PH.D., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.
Janet Klein
Douglas Mooney, M.A.
R. David Schaaf, RA

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Laurie Yuhnke, Trinity Church Oxford
Tom Carroll, Trinity Church Oxford
Ben Leech
David Meram, Trinity Church Oxford
Tahne Hall, Christian Street Baptist Church
J.M. Duffin
Patricia A. Floyd, Christian Street Baptist Church
M. Nyiz, Trinity Church Oxford
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Kyle Tucker, Trinity Church Oxford
Janice Tucker, Trinity Church Oxford
Charles Tucker, Trinity Church Oxford
Andrew Dalzell, Office of State Rep. Jared Solomon
Sani Jarah, City of Philadelphia, Department of Health
Mandy Davis, PIDC
Tom Waring, Trinity Church Oxford
Jon Edelman, Office of State Rep. Jared Solomon
Shawn Wamsley, Trinity Church Oxford
Sean McCauley, Trinity Oxford Church
Weston Huang
Simi Kaplin Baer
John Gordon
Merton Schwab
Richard Reimet
Tony Bracali
Michael Stokely
Heather Miller
Timothy Miller
Joseph Bozzelli

Brett Peanasky, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Cynthia Straughter
Harold Bolger
Carolyn Payne
Claire Brown
Grace Ong Yan, Docomomo
Amy Furlong, Trinity Church Oxford
Lorie Henry, Trinity Church Oxford
Kyle Sammin, Trinity Church Oxford
Jeffrey Hill, Christian Street Baptist Church
Dan Macy, Docomomo
Matthew Jackson
Mona Cohen
Virginia McCracken, Trinity Church Oxford
Debbie Klak, All Saints Church
Richard Thomas, Trinity Church Oxford\
John Klak, All Saints Church

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Cooperman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Klein and Messrs. Cohen, Schaaf and Mooney joined her.

ADDRESS: 1821-27 RANSTEAD ST

Name of Resource: The Musical Art Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Bian and Lia Yu

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 1821-27 Ranstead Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Musical Art Club building, constructed in 1917, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion J as a representative of a time in which Philadelphia's musical community was striving to enlarge its capacities. Under Criterion E, the building is significant as the work of Price & McLanahan, a local architectural firm whose experimental work influenced the development of Greater Philadelphia, Atlantic City, and the Midwest. The building's unusual style embodies the culmination of Price & McLanahan's evolution of a "protomodernist" architecture, while still featuring Arts and Crafts elements utilized in their early work, satisfying Criteria C and D.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Committee consider the review of the continuance requests for 1821-27 Ranstead Street, 6369 Germantown Avenue and 6365-67 Germantown Avenue simultaneously. Ms. Cooperman asked if any Committee member wished to comment on the requests. No one offered comments. Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on the requests. No one offered comments.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 1821-27 Ranstead Street and remand it to the Committee for review at its 18 October 2017 meeting.

6369 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: "Genteel Two-Story Stone Dwelling"

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6369 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination contends that the property holds significance to the development and heritage of Germantown and is one of several properties purchased by developer Thomas Reilly following the subdivision of the Chew estate. The nomination further argues that the building, while potentially constructed decades earlier, currently reflects the bracketed mode of the Italianate style popularized in the mid-nineteenth-century and applied extensively to other Germantown Avenue properties. The nomination also suggests that, owing to its inclusion in the National

Register's Colonial Germantown Historic District, the property is part of and related to a distinctive area.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 6369 Germantown Avenue and remand it to the Committee for review at its 18 October 2017 meeting.

6365-67 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Mill are significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination contends that the property represents the less common industrial typology that included domestic, commercial, and residential buildings located on a single parcel and that the property contributed to Germantown's industrial landscape through the manufacturing of rag carpets. The nomination further argues that the store and residence exemplify the Queen Anne style, while the rear mill building serves as an example of Second Empire architecture. The nomination also suggests that, owing to its inclusion in the National Register's Colonial Germantown Historic District, the property is part of and related to a distinctive area.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 6365-67 Germantown Avenue and remand it to the Committee for review at its 18 October 2017 meeting.

1301-25 CHESTNUT STREET

Name of Resource: Grand Court, John Wanamaker Store

Proposed Action: Designation of Interior

Property Owner: Behringer Harvard REIT

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Grand Court satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the interior, the Grand Court, of the former John Wanamaker Store at 1301-25 Chestnut Street as historic and list in on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property's exterior is already designated as historic. The nomination contends that the Grand Court is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, H, and J. The nomination claims that the Grand Court, a significant work

conceived by Philadelphia merchant John Wanamaker and architect Daniel H. Burnham, stands as the unifying core of one of America's most acclaimed and influential department store designs and serves an expression of Beaux-Arts classicism. The nomination further argues that the Grand Court reflects the environment of an era shaped by the City Beautiful movement as applied to monumental commercial buildings and that the interior space includes two of Philadelphia's most recognized and established icons, the Wanamaker eagle and Wanamaker organ, which are situated in a unique and familiar architectural setting within the heart of Center City.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman presented the continuance request for 1301-25 Chestnut Street. She noted that the request asked that the nomination be continued and remanded to the 13 December 2017 Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination but did not oppose the continuance request. Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 1301-25 Chestnut Street and remand it to the Committee for review at its 13 December 2017 meeting.

ADDRESS: 717 GLENGARRY RD

Name of Resource: White Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Peter W. Clark Jr. and Tama Myers Clark

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy, Docomomo Philadelphia, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 717 Glengarry Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 717 Glengarry Road and list it on the Philadelphia of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the house, constructed in 1963 for Dorothy White Shipley, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the house is significant for its bold Modernist design and for its prominent place in the Philadelphia School. The nomination argues that it is also significant under Criterion E as the work of internationally important Philadelphia architects Mitchell/Giurgola Associates. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the house exemplifies the cultural and social heritage of Chestnut Hill as an incubator of progressive Modernism in postwar Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused, owing to her association with two of the organizations nominating the building. Mr. Mooney assumed the chair. Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominators Ben Leech, Lori Salganicoff, and Grace Ong Yan represented the three organizations that collaborated on the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Salganicoff noted that the Chestnut Hill Conservancy is interested in seeing this building protected by the Historical Commission, and that it is one of the most important buildings in Chestnut Hill that is not protected. She noted that it is in the top tier of mid-century modern

buildings, and is possibly threatened by a lack of maintenance. She expressed her organization's excitement to see the nomination move forward and the building protected. Ms. Ong Yan noted that Docomomo sponsored the nomination for its significance as a Modern work of architecture, and also its significance on a national and international scale, which has not been recognized to its fullest. She argued that the preservation of the building would support that significance.

Mr. Mooney opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cohen addressed Mr. Leech, noting that, as usual, the nomination was extremely well written and makes the case for the significance. Mr. Cohen offered one minor correction, that on page 16, the nomination says that Philadelphia, Germantown & Norristown Railroad became part of the Pennsylvania Railroad, but it actually became part of the Reading Railroad. He also suggested that the photographs of the building be incorporated into the text owing to the complicated nature of the building. He admitted that he does not fully understand the geometry of the building, and what the aesthetic idea is that accounts for the distribution of the different masses that form its overall composition. Mr. Leech responded that he had the same difficulties, although after careful study of the building, has come to have a greater understanding of it. He noted that he would have liked to include a photograph key to help orient the reader. Mr. Cohen reiterated his support for the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf noted that it was exciting to see the 1960s photographs of the building without any foliage around it.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 717 Glengarry Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

ADDRESS: 1108 S 5TH ST

Name of Resource: Southwark Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Greater Philadelphia Overseas Chinese Association

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1108 S. 5th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1108 S. 5th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Southwark branch of the Free Library is significant under Criteria for Designation A and E. Satisfying Criterion A, the nomination contends that the building has significant interest or value as part of the City's development, the history of public libraries in the United States, and for its association with Pittsburgh industrialist Andrew Carnegie. Satisfying Criterion E, the nomination contends the building is significant for its association with David Knickerbacker Boyd, the industrious Philadelphia architect who designed and supervised or directed the design of nearly 3,000 buildings during his career.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he is unsure of the number of designated Carnegie libraries, but this one appears to be an obvious candidate for designation. He commented that the site constraints of 60 feet by 60 feet necessitated the unusual interior mezzanine. He stated that he supports designation of this building. Mr. Cohen commented that it was interesting to learn more about David Knickerbacker Boyd. He asked if the quote on page eight of the nomination about the model plan was regarding all libraries or just this one. Ms. Chantry responded that she believes it was not specific to this library. Mr. Cohen responded that it is interesting that the Hewitts may have had a national role in the development of Carnegie libraries at the beginning of the campaign. He expressed appreciation for the inclusion of permits from 1966. He asked if it is known who Boyd trained with. Ms. Chantry responded that she does not know if he trained with other architects. Mr. Schaaf commented that he appreciated the inclusion of the 1908 article from *The American Architect and Building News*, because its ideas are reflected in the Philadelphia zoning code. Mr. Cohen commented that he is pleased to get this building protected by listing on the Register.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 1108 S. 5th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

ADDRESS: 500-10 S BROAD ST

Name of Resource: District Health Center 1

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 500-10 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 500-10 S. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J. The nomination contends that the District Health Center 1 building, completed in 1960, embodies architectural characteristics of mid twentieth-century Modernism, and was designed by the prominent architects Montgomery & Bishop. The nomination further argues that the building is broadly representative of the mid twentieth-century decentralization of public health in Philadelphia, and is a neighborhood landmark, sited at the central intersection of Broad and Lombard Streets.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Patrick Grossi and Paul Steinke represented the nomination. Amanda Davis of the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation represented the property owner.

Mr. Grossi stated that the Preservation Alliance identified this building a while ago as a good candidate for designation, as it is a particularly intriguing work of public architecture. Mr. Steinke stated that public reaction to the nomination has been interesting. Those against designation are primarily arguing for density and height at this site. But the other side of that is that this is a building from an era that is otherwise not represented on South Broad Street between City Hall and Washington Avenue. It is a strong representative of its era, and is a prominent visual feature, satisfying Criterion H.

Ms. Davis stated that she has no comment on the nomination itself, but it should be noted that the building straddles several parcels, some of which are owned by the Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development (PAID), and some of which are owned by the City of Philadelphia.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the sites Ms. Davis is referring to are owned by the Johnson family. Ms. David responded that they were conveyed to PAID. Mr. Schaaf commented that that family is connected to the John Johnson collection at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. The Johnson house stood at this site. Mr. Cohen commented that this is where the “flower by the wayside” stood. In 1873, Louis Sullivan came to Philadelphia and saw the home of Bloomfield and Clara Jessup Moore at this site. Sullivan decided to find the architect who designed it and to go work for him. The architect was Frank Furness. No one has ever seen a photograph of the front of the building, which was altered for Johnson.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Ms. Cooperman stated that she has admired this building for a long time. It is an important building with important Philadelphia architects. Montgomery & Bishop were architects with a very active social conscience, and it is a particularly important example of their work. Color was very important in Modern architecture, and this is a wonderful example.

Mr. Schaaf agreed with previous statements. He stated that the argument that the Alliance heard regarding density is troublesome, in that South Broad Street is a place where one enjoys real urbanism in terms of scale and tallness. He stated that he is supportive of the nomination, but hopes that in the future, a clever and talented architect and developer can think of a way to manage urbanism of a greater scale than this building, and invest it both with the historical nature of the building as well as continue the energy of S. Broad Street.

Mr. Cohen agreed with previous statements. He stated that Montgomery & Bishop are not as well-known as other modern architects. Their use of color, floating planes, and rounded corners is remarkable. Mr. Schaaf commented that it is almost World’s Fair Architecture, and the Brussels World’s Fair was one year before this building’s construction. Mr. Cohen commented that it would be helpful to have a floor plan to illustrate the organization of space which is mentioned in the nomination. He also suggested that graphics be integrated with the text. He praised the excellent research on the history of health centers. Mr. Grossi gave credit to Libbie Hawes. Mr. Cohen commented that the section with rounded windows at the roof is intriguing and worthy of more comment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 500-10 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J.

After the motion passed, Mr. Steinke, speaking out of order, commented that the younger generation may view this building in the same way that a previous generation viewed the work of Frank Furness. Ultimately, the young generation will thank the Historical Commission for preserving this building. The appreciation of the building will only grow over time.

ADDRESS: 1020-24 CHRISTIAN ST

Name of Resource: Protestant Episcopal Italian Mission & Church of L'Emmanuello

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Christian St Baptist Church Inc.

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1020-24 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1020-24 Christian Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the chapel and parish house are significant under Criteria for Designation A and J. Founded as Philadelphia's first and only Protestant Episcopal Italian Mission, the subject property is one of the oldest purpose-built Italian missions in Philadelphia, constructed between 1890 and 1904.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. James Duffin of the Keeping Society of Philadelphia represented the nomination. Christian Street Baptist Church representative Jeffrey Hill and Pastor Clayton Hicks represented the property owner.

Mr. Hill stated that he wished to provide background on the severe hardship that a designation would pose to the congregation. The building, despite the façade, is in severe disrepair. The church cannot utilize the main sanctuary of the building. The church is trying to grow a ministry in an area that is being gentrified. Most of the congregants no longer live in the area. In good faith, the church entered into an agreement of sale with a buyer. Negotiations began on this offer on 5 June 2017, and were fully executed 8 June 2017, by both parties. At that time, there was no mention of the historic designation or a proposal to do so. The property was not advertised as being historically designated. The buyers, in good faith, along with the sellers, entered into a binding contract, only to learn one week later that someone had proposed to designate the church as historic. Ms. Cooperman commented that this Committee addresses only the technical merits of the nomination, and not matters related to financial hardship or physical condition. Those are matters that can be presented to the Historical Commission. If the property is designated, there is the option of pursuing a financial hardship exemption with the Commission. Mr. Hill responded that he understood. He directed the Committee's attention to page 13 of the nomination, which shows a photograph of the church cornerstone. He explained that the Reverend C.H. Bolger was Pastor Hicks's grandfather. The church has gone from Pastor Hicks's grandfather, to his father, to him, as three generations of pastors. The cornerstone is one of the things that the congregation plans on taking with them and preserving, along with the stained glass windows, and a fountain on the front of the church.

Mr. Hill continued that several years ago, sometime between 1999 and 2005, when the church was attempting to complete renovations, they applied for historical certification and were denied, based on modifications to the front façade and windows. Ms. Cooperman asked they nominated the property for the Philadelphia or National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hill responded that he is not sure. Ms. Cooperman noted that the staff indicated that the property had not been nominated to the Philadelphia Register. She explained that they had likely applied for designation to the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hill again responded that he is not certain. Ms. Cooperman responded that part of the rejection depends on the grounds in which a case may have been made. Given the information before this Committee, and as someone who has prepared a number of National Register nominations, Ms. Cooperman concluded that it is possible that a case could be made for National Register eligibility, not necessarily based on the

building as a grand work of architecture, but rather on a social basis. Mr. Hill responded that he is perplexed that the church sought historic designation, that would have benefited the church, but they were denied. Now, they are trying to move their ministry forward, and this is creating a hardship. There is a certain irony. Ms. Cooperman commented that Mr. Hill is talking about two different processes with two different sets of rules and two different government bodies. She offered to provide additional details outside of the meeting. Mr. Cohen commented that another difference between the historic registers is the requirement for national significance versus local significance.

Pastor Hicks asked the Christian Street Baptist Church members in attendance to stand to show their presence. Several people stood. He stated that he understands the Committee's position, but it is necessary to understand the history of the Italian Mission's attempt to convert Italians to the Episcopal faith, which they found quite difficult. They had to move and were allowed to move. In that same way, this church is finding itself at the end of its rope when it comes to ministry. He stated that the Committee has the opportunity to decide if the nomination advances, or if it is stopped and the congregation is able to continue on. He asked for the same liberty and freedom that those in the Episcopalian Italian Mission had when they were allowed to move. The church has been paid off. The church has been taken care of according to the congregation's financial means, but right now the church has mold and structural damage, and, although they love the church, they cannot continue to take care of the building with 20 members. He continued that they understand the history and architectural beauty of the church, but now they cannot even utilize the main sanctuary because of mold. He thanked the Committee for its work and the report, but noted that the sale went fast and they were prepared to move on, and asked that the Committee allow the congregation to continue to move.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cohen commented that he assumes that the current buyer will not want to preserve the church, but rather is interested in demolishing it for housing. He commented that it is a special place, not only visually, but with a remarkable history, and is a place that is an articulate representation of the history of that neighborhood. He commented that it would be ideal if it can be sold to someone who will preserve it, and perhaps that is precluded in the planning of the current buyer, but it might not be for another buyer, who could respect the significant and articulate representation of the history of a place. He commented that he would prefer to see the cornerstone remain, if the building is preserved, to represent that chapter of the building's history.

Mr. Cohen commented that Frank Watson was a remarkable architect who designed many churches. He referenced the former St. Anthony of Padua Roman Catholic Church on Grays Ferry Avenue, which was recently converted to apartments. He commented that it is interesting how Watson tailored this church specifically to its purpose, and reiterated that it is remarkable both for its social history and its architectural history. He explained that if this Committee recommends designation, the Commission will take it under advisement, and the possibility of a hardship case could be made, although that usually involves an attempt at a sale. He concluded that the buildings merit historic designation.

Ms. Klein commented that there is an emphasis on social history in the nomination, but the architecture is also historically significant. She asked that the Committee incorporate comments about the architecture. Ms. Cooperman responded that the motion can be made to include additional Criteria.

Ms. Chantry asked the Committee to discuss the relative significance of the chapel compared to the parish house. Mr. Cohen responded that clearly the chapel received the most architectural attention. He noted that Salter Street at the rear is not a “ubiquitous” alley, as it is referred to in the nomination, owing to its right angle turn. He commented that, in some ways, the parish house history is almost as significant as the chapel because the parish house is where the real educational and community programming was, and where the real missionary effort was. The parish house was used to provide social services to get people to attend the church services. Ms. Klein commented that the statement of significance in the nomination concentrates on social history, not architectural. Ms. Cooperman commented that the church is an important work of Frank Watson, which could be added to the motion. Mr. Cohen suggested that illustrations in nominations should be numbered. He added that the parish house is cleverly integrated in terms of the gate and entrance set back from the street. He stated that, with full recognition that this potentially imposes a burden on the congregation, he hopes that the congregation is successful in relocating and getting some value for the building. He reiterated his position that it is a historically valuable place, and the nomination makes the case very well for historic designation.

Mr. Schaaf suggested adding Criterion E for significance related to architect Frank Watson. Mr. Cohen asked if there must be text in the nomination which sustains the argument. Ms. Cooperman responded no, and that it can be part of the Committee’s recommendation which the Commission can judge as to whether or not they concur. Mr. Cohen responded that he would endorse the addition of Criterion E, as the work of prominent Philadelphia architect Frank Watson.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the buildings at 1020-24 Christian Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

ADDRESS: 6671 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: St. Michael’s Lutheran Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of St. Michael’s Evangelical Lutheran Church

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the complex at 6671 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, J, and I.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a complex associated with the former St. Michael’s Lutheran Church and list it on Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property includes a burial ground believed to date as early as 1728; the circa 1740 Walder-Essig house, also known as the Beggarstown School, which is already listed on the Philadelphia Register; an 1855 parsonage building; an 1886 Sunday School; and the 1896 church. The nomination contends that the property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, J, and I. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the complex is significant for its association with St. Michael’s Lutheran Church, Germantown, which was the oldest continually operating Lutheran church in Philadelphia until its closure in 2016, and represents three centuries of development of the Lutheran church and the cultural, social, and historical heritage of German Lutherans in Philadelphia. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the property has the potential to yield archaeological artifacts associated with the known cemetery as well as those related to the

Battle of Germantown, owing to the property's use as a hospital and barracks during the Revolutionary War.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. James Duffin of the Keeping Society of Philadelphia represented the nominator. Attorney John Gordon and property manager Dick Reimet represented the property owner.

Mr. Duffin opined that it is obvious that this is a highly significant site. He noted that, growing up in Mount Airy, he went by this property hundreds of times and always noticed it. He commented that there has recently been chatter on social media about the future of the site, and that it is clear that people in Mount Airy value this property as an integral part of their neighborhood.

Mr. Reimet noted that the Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod of the Lutheran Church operates 160 churches in the Philadelphia area, of which St. Michael's was one until it closed. He explained that, according to church rules, the ownership of the property then moved to the Synod to maintain the building.

Mr. Gordon stated that they could almost reiterate verbatim the arguments that were made by the Protestant Episcopal Church of L'Emmanuel regarding designation as a financial hardship. He conceded that they do not deny the historical value of the church, but that the biggest hardship for them would be the slate roof. He noted that they would address that next month at the Historical Commission meeting, which he understands would be the more appropriate forum. Mr. Gordon explained that their archivist is out of the country, but that Mr. Reimet is not sure that the parsonage is dated correctly in the nomination. He noted that they may ask that the parsonage be considered separately from the church. He explained that there is an agreement of sale for the property, but there are no plans to demolish any of the buildings. Mr. Reimet opined that the nomination combines the parsonage with Little Jimmie's Bakery (the Beggarstown School/Walder-Essig house), which, he noted, is already designated. He reiterated that they want to keep the parsonage and Little Jimmie's separate because they do not have any information as to when the parsonage was constructed and because the exterior of the building is in poor condition. Ms. Cooperman clarified that "Little Jimmie's" is alternatively known as the Beggarstown School. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that each building is identified separately in the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Duffin to clarify the construction date of the parsonage. Ms. Cooperman asked if the building was built as the parsonage. Mr. Duffin responded that Ziegenfus's history of the congregation published in 1905 identifies the building as being built as the parsonage in 1855, the date identified in the nomination. He explained that he confirmed that date through the Church Council minutes, which not only specify when it was built and for how much money, but also that it was designed by architect Napoleon LeBrun. He noted that he was shocked that, of all the buildings on the site, the parsonage would have been the one to have been designed by a renowned architect. He opined that the building is representative of LeBrun's low-style and low-budget kind of work, and that it is a very interesting survivor of something that a well-known architect would have done in addition to larger commissions. Mr. Cohen responded that it is a real find to have identified Napoleon LeBrun as the architect of the parsonage. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Schaaf agreed. Ms. Cooperman noted that LeBrun is an extremely important architect. Mr. Schaaf noted that within two years, LeBrun designed the Academy of Music. Mr. Cohen noted that LeBrun would also have been working on the Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter and

Paul at the same time. Mr. Cohen noted that the date of the building is very clear, based on the documentation of the parsonage.

Mr. Cohen noted that Mr. Duffin also provided good documentation on the date of the Walder-Essig house. Mr. Duffin responded that it was constructed sometime in the 1740s, and that the church acquired the building around 1805, using it as a sexton's residence for the next 100+ years. Mr. Cohen clarified that it was originally a separate parcel. Mr. Duffin confirmed this. Mr. Reimet asked if the Committee meant that Little Jimmie's, which had been the sexton's house, was designed by the architect LeBrun. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman responded negatively, noting that the small corner building is much earlier than the parsonage designed by LeBrun. Mr. Reimet noted that Little Jimmie's is the oldest building on the site, and that he thinks it was designed by the architect. Mr. Cohen responded that Napoleon LeBrun was not yet born when Little Jimmie's was constructed; LeBrun designed the parsonage building over 100 years later. Mr. Reimet responded that he cannot attest to when it was built, and that Mr. Duffin must have gotten the information from somewhere. Mr. Duffin responded that he obtained the information from the church's archives. Mr. Reimet opined that the nomination does not provide that information. Ms. Cooperman responded that Mr. Reimet appeared to be referencing only the Architectural Description portion of the nomination, and that the information about the building's date and architect appear in the Statement of Significance. Ms. Cooperman suggested that the nomination would have benefited from including that information in the Architectural Description section as well. Mr. Cohen directed Mr. Reimet's attention to page 33 of the nomination. Mr. Cohen reiterated that the date of the building is very well established, despite the fact that it is somewhat buried in the Statement of Significance. Mr. Reimet acknowledged that the nomination does identify the buildings separately.

Mr. Mooney noted that the inclusion of Criterion I is very important. He recounted a story of his work on the archaeological investigation for the post office across the street. He noted that, during that excavation, people repeatedly came up to him to note that there had been a tavern on the corner that dated back to the Revolutionary War. Numerous people told him that it was also a stop on the Underground Railroad, and that there was a rumor that there was a tunnel that went from the tavern's basement, under Phil-Elena Street, and into the church graveyard as an escape route. He explained that, sure enough, when they did the excavation in the basement, there was a passageway heading out under Phil-Elena Street. He noted that he does not think that it was constructed for the Underground Railroad. It was probably much more utilitarian in nature, but it was funny that they did find an actual exit that seemed to align with the stories.

Ms. Cooperman noted that one of the things that occurred to her in reading the history is that, in addition to human remains and potential materials associated with the Battle of Germantown, it is likely that there would be below-ground foundations of the original church buildings. Mr. Mooney agreed, and that if the buildings were used by the sexton, there could be materials associated with him. Ms. Cooperman reiterated that the potential for archaeological artifacts goes beyond just human remains and battle-related artifacts.

Mr. Cohen opined that, although he had some trouble following the denominational history in the nomination, the nomination does make an excellent case for the importance of this church's position in the history of the larger Lutheran Church in the United States. Mr. Duffin responded that there were many name changes and mergers within branches of the Lutheran Church, and that he tried to include their historic names and modern equivalents. Mr. Cohen asked if Evangelical Lutheran is a different denomination than Lutheran. Mr. Duffin responded that it is not.

Regarding the other buildings on the property, Mr. Cohen noted that T. Frank Miller designed the church, and asked if an architect had been determined for the chapel. Mr. Duffin responded that the building was architect-designed, which he knows from having found a reference to paying a bill for an architect and how much money was paid, but not the name of the architect. Mr. Cohen asked what year the chapel was constructed. Mr. Duffin responded that it was built in 1883. Mr. Cohen opined that it is a very elegant building. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that the pressed brick is an excellent detail.

Mr. Reimet questioned why the Historical Commission did not designate the church when it designated Little Jimmie's and the cemetery. Mr. Duffin responded that most of the early designations along Germantown Avenue were done as a result of a grant-funded survey of Colonial Germantown completed by Margaret Tinckom and the Germantown Historical Society in the early 1950s. Margaret Tinckom, Mr. Duffin noted, became the director of the Historical Commission in the 1950s, and had the surviving seventeenth and eighteenth-century buildings identified in the survey added to the Philadelphia Register. Nineteenth-century buildings, such as the church, were not included as part of the survey.

Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination is well researched and that he is pleased with the nominator's findings. He suggested some minor typographical corrections. On a personal note, he explained that he was amazed to see a reference to Donald Beetham's paper from George Thomas's seminar in 1975, noting that he was in that class at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Duffin replied that that paper is the Rosetta Stone for the archivist at the Lutheran Archives, and that he makes frequent references to it. Mr. Cohen asked if Mr. Duffin had heard of Leseuer, a Frenchman who traveled through the United States in 1830s or so, and whose drawings are in Le Havre, noting that he drew a church that looks like the second church with the stepped gable. Mr. Duffin responded that it is the same church. Mr. Cohen explained to the owners that Mr. Duffin is one of the most reliable researchers on this sort of topic. Mr. Reimet noted that the Lutheran Church has one of the best archivists, and that they appreciate that he was able to assist Mr. Duffin.

Mr. Schaaf suggested the addition of Criterion E specifically for the parsonage building owing to the fact that it was designed by Napoleon LeBrun.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6671 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, I, and J.

1401 S WATER ST

Name of Resource: Engine 46 Firehouse

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Cedar-Riverview LP

Nominator: Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1401 S. Water Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1401 S. Water Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former fire station is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H. The

nomination contends that the building represents a period in which the City of Philadelphia invested heavily in the expansion of municipal services and in the architectural character of its facilities, satisfying Criterion A. The nomination argues that the Flemish Revival style reflects the environment of the late nineteenth century, satisfying Criteria C and D, and is an early work of John T. Windrim, satisfying Criterion E. Lastly, the nomination contends that the former fire station represents an established and familiar visual feature of the Pennsport neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H. A small portion of a circa 1999 addition stands on the building's historic and current legal parcel, and is considered non-contributing for the purposes of the nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Patrick Grossi and Paul Steinke represented the nomination. Brett Peanasky of Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP represented the property.

Mr. Grossi stated that the Preservation Alliance identified this building a while ago as a good candidate for historic designation. It is a remarkably intact example of architect John T. Windrim's work, and reflective of a transition from volunteer fire companies to a municipal fire department.

Mr. Peanasky stated that he has previously requested continuances of this review because they intend to work with the Alliance on a private easement. He is not requesting a continuance of the Committee's review, out of deference to the Alliance and the Committee's desire to move nominations through. The Alliance has agreed to support a continuance at the Commission level to allow for further conversation about a private easement. There is part of a non-contributing structure on the site, so if this nomination does go before the Commission, they may submit a proposed boundary that would limit the designation to just the firehouse building itself. He retained Powers & Company to prepare a report which is in draft form. Benjamin Leech noted that only a portion of the non-contributing structure is on this site.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cohen commented that it is an excellent nomination that makes a solid argument for designation. He commented that the building has become a place marker in the landscape, and can stand up to I-95.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 1401 S. Water Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H.

6901 RISING SUN AVE

Name of Resource: Trinity Church, Oxford Parish House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Rector Church Wardens, Vestryman of Trinity

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the parish house complex at 6901 Rising Sun Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the parish house complex at 6901 Rising Sun Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The eastern section of the property with Old Trinity Church, Oxford, which is now part of 6901 Rising Sun

Avenue, was designated in 1956. The western section of the property with the parish house was not previously designated. This nomination seeks to designate the parish house complex by arguing that the buildings are significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The nomination contends that the parish house complex embodies the Colonial Revival style and reflects the cultural environment and popular tastes of an era characterized by the widespread proliferation of Colonial Revival design motifs across a wide range of buildings. The nomination further argues that the parish house complex represents a significant period of suburban development in Northeast Philadelphia when religious institutions expanded their physical and civic footprints to accommodate new residents.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Patrick Grossi and Paul Steinke represented the nomination. Sean McCauley, Shawn Wamsley, Amy Furlong, and Lorie Henry represented the property.

Mr. Steinke suggested that the nomination was interesting for the Preservation Alliance. The property, he continued, is a very familiar feature in his life, because he grew up approximately one mile north of the site and always admired the site. To the east, he added, is the 1711 Trinity Oxford Church, which has been on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places since 1956. He noted that the entire parcel, which extends west, helps that neighborhood retain a late-rural or early-suburban character, which, he claimed, the parish has been proud of over the years. He then recounted some of the church's history, including how in 1952 the parish protested the construction of a gas station across the street, because it would disturb the neighborhood's character. The 1928 building, he continued, came out of the administration of Rector Waldemar Jansen, the second longest serving rector of this extremely long-running congregation. Mr. Steinke commented that Jansen served 32 years and oversaw construction of the 1928 parish house auditorium, which is named for him. All three Criteria for Designation, he added, are defensible, but he asked to call the Committee's attention particularly to Criterion C. He stated that the nomination discusses the sesquicentennial celebration that had taken place in South Philadelphia just two years prior to the dedication of this building. He then informed the Committee that he had recently finished reading a book by historian Thomas Keels titled *Sesqui! Greed, Graft, and the Forgotten World's Fair of 1926*. In the book, he remarked, Keel identifies the extent to which the world's fair embraced the Colonial Revival style as a way to connect back to the founding of the nation. He added that the women's committee built a scale-model replica of far east Market Street at the fair, which, according to Keels, was the most popular attraction of the entire fair. That popularity, he suggested, translated into a boom in Colonial Revival architecture throughout the nation. He contended that in Northeast Philadelphia, the parish house stands as a beautiful expression of the style and is surrounded by green space and mature trees. He argued that the building has become a real standout as that neighborhood has continued to develop over the years and as Rising Sun Avenue has become increasingly characterized by automobile-oriented, anti-urban development. He stated that the Alliance feels very strongly and stands with the surrounding neighbors, who have come out even more strongly for the preservation of this site. That activism, he commented, includes working with State Representative Jared Solomon, whom the Alliance cooperated with in the drafting of the nomination. He concluded that he hopes the Committee agrees with the Alliance and recommends the site for designation.

Mr. McCauley stated that he represents the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania, along with Canon Wamsley and members of the congregation and neighborhood, and that the Episcopal Church has had a long-standing relationship with its historic properties. The church's stewardship, he continued, dates back to the 1600s and, with this property, to the 1700s. He opined that the church has offered a place of refuge for people through times of war and times

of peace, despair, and prosperity. He then asserted that he does not view this property as a true historic structure or holding architectural significance. To the contrary, he observed, the property on the opposite side of the site is truly a historic building and one that the church has worked with the Historical Commission on for years. He noted that the church maintains it and the graveyard in a historic nature. The parish house, he continued, has gone through multiple renovations from the 1920s into the 1960s. He disputed the contentions of the nominators by stating that the church views the building as a hodge-podge of architectural additions to the building and that the building does not maintain the integrity of a true historic structure. This property, he added, was reviewed in 2012 when Mr. Farnham surveyed the whole region for a historic preservation memo of the Lower Northeast Planning District. The focal point at that time, he reported, was the historic church. He suggested that the current nomination has been brought on by the request for a lease and adaptive reuse of the property, which will provide the church with resources for many years and allow it to continue its mission in the community and care for the true historic structure.

Mr. Wamsley introduced himself as Canon to the Ordinary for the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania and stated that, according to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, the Colonial Revival style continued in a more simplified manner through the 1950s. He called the church proper the real historic building, built in 1711 and designated by the Historical Commission in 1956, adding that the parish hall had a significant expansion less than seven years later. The 1963 addition, he continued, changed the shape and nature of the parish house. He argued that while the building is in the style of Colonial Revival, it is not technically Colonial Revival and is instead an homage. On page 13 of the nomination, he added, the nominator expresses this very sentiment by stating: "Other examples of Colonial Revival design from the 1920s are more notable in terms of architectural pedigree or prominence." On page 14, he asserted, the nominator admits that the Colonial Revival style is so common that its utilization at this building was unsurprising. Mr. Wamsley contended that by this logic, any competently designed Colonial Revival building could be preserved under the same parameters and that the nomination does not prove the parish house is a remarkable building in the style. He quoted text from the historic preservation recommendations for the Lower Northeast Planning District report prepared by Mr. Farnham in 2012: "Old Trinity Church, Oxford, located at 6900 Oxford Avenue, which was constructed in 1711 and is the second oldest church in Philadelphia should be included as the centerpiece in the district. In addition to Old Trinity, three nearby structures at the northwest corner of Oxford Township should be considered for the thematic district." Those properties named, he added, are 6920 Oxford Avenue, 7032 and 7034 Oxford Avenue, and 6700 Rising Sun Avenue. The parish house complex at 6901 Rising Sun Avenue, he explained, rests among all the addresses mentioned in the report, with special note given to the Old Trinity Church building. He argued that there is no mention or comment of any significance or noteworthiness about 6901 Rising Sun Avenue. Mr. Wamsley contended that this widely used amorphous style that has been repeated and adapted numerous times holds no significance in this iteration that warrants preservation. He suggested that the style is widely used with dates difficult to pin down. He added that after more research he found two different date ranges given by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, one of the 1880s and one of the 1950s, with another end date for the movement being given in the 1940s. The nomination, he continued, asserts that the new building and subsequent renovations highlight the transition of Oxford from rural to urban, and it tells the story of the transition. However, he argued, one could say that about almost any building in existence since 1711. He contended that nothing makes the 6901 Rising Sun Avenue property unique from the countless other buildings constructed in the early twentieth century in that district and that new development would further highlight that very point. Redevelopment, he claimed, continues the narrative of preserving the real historical structure there, which is the church. He further alleged that there is

no historical significance associated with outstanding architects that merits preservation. He quoted from page 13 of the nomination: "Not particularly prolific or prominent in their day, Mayo and Moses were capable architects whose design for Trinity Oxford demonstrated an effective understanding of appropriate proportions and detailing in the Colonial Revival mode." Mr. Wamsley noted that designer Arnold Moses was the president of the New Jersey chapter of the American Institute of Architects. He then stated that, while no disrespect is intended toward Messrs. Moses and Mayo, the facts provided in the nomination are not the kind of ringing endorsements that speak to the historical prestige of the corner tower, belfry, and furniture in the historic church, which was designed by Furness & Hewitt. He added that the historic church building is the building that the church is working to guarantee will survive through the proposed development project. He concluded that it is his belief that the nomination fails to provide a detailed reason for why the parish house should be protected.

Ms. Furlong, a member of Trinity Church Oxford for over 40 years, explained her personal affiliation to the church and added that she served on the vestry for multiple terms and was part of the redevelopment effort, which Trinity started seven years ago to plan its financial outlook. This nomination, she continued, was prepared and presented without any notification of or consultation with the church. She argued that the nomination focuses on preserving the wrong building. The eighteenth-century church is the important building, not the twentieth-century parish house. She described the redevelopment program begun seven years ago to preserve Trinity Church Oxford. The building in question, she stated, was constructed between the 1920s and 1960s as a way to support the church. She asserted that, while the Trinity Church building has been serving the community for over three hundred years, the nominated building quickly lost its usefulness to the church in just a matter of decades. She explained that the church leased the building for different uses to multiple organizations, including a daycare and the Police Athletic League. Those particular organizations, she opined, were state- and city-funded, and their combined rent could not pay the heating bill for the building, and the church assumed all operating costs for decades. Now, she claimed, the church has run out of money to support the building, and it has a significant impact on the congregation's ability to support the church building. She noted that the nomination includes photographs of the 1711 church that show the walls collapsing. She added that the congregation cannot repair them, and that while she understands that this is not a hardship meeting, and the church is not applying for hardship, the church needs to sustain and preserve the historic church building. The parish house complex, she continued, is noted as being in good condition in the nomination, although it is not in good condition. She argued that, two years ago, the church needed to remove its tenants from the building owing to liability concerns and could no longer support the tenants in the building. The result, she explained, is that the building sat vacant for two years. She stated that for the last five years, the church has engaged neighborhood constituents, political leaders, and community leaders to find solutions to repurpose the building. She described the process of reaching out to original tenants and asking them to run the building, but that has not been a feasible option. She asserted that the church has approached political leaders to inquire whether the building could house state offices, but that was not an option. She contended that the church worked with Penrose Management Company to try to subsidize elderly living, but that also proved not to be an option. She then explained that the church engaged with a commercial real estate agent and was just recently able to identify a potential commercial tenant to lease the space. As a reaction to that, she suggested, the political leaders that the church formerly worked with for over five years decided to move this nomination forward from a political perspective to stop the redevelopment. She claimed that stopping the redevelopment of this part of the property is dooming Trinity Oxford to the same hardships presented by others with church properties earlier at the meeting. She argued that the church is working very hard to stop that and are instead looking to redevelop a portion of the property in order to support and maintain the historic

building. She also asserted that the church can redevelop its green space into a community garden and ball field, which could be utilized to help the community and continue on that part of the church's mission.

Ms. Henry stated that she is a 40-year Trinity Church Oxford parishioner and volunteer member of the vestry, as well as the rector's warden, which is the leader of the lay portion of the church. She explained that she works hand-in-hand with the rector to maintain the buildings and forward the Episcopal Church's mission. She implored the Committee to understand the impact of the parish house's designation and the fundamental consequences for the church. She noted that the church has been pursuing this redevelopment project for seven years and, prior to that, the church took time to discern what it needed to do to ensure the protection of the truly historic building, which is the church building and surrounding graveyard. Without the ability to develop this land, she continued, Trinity Church Oxford will close, which would be devastating for both parishioners and the community. She added that the church partners with Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, and other support groups that, for decades, have held meetings several times a week in the fellowship buildings. She noted that the church also partners with community members and parishioners who experience unexpected life events and unexpected expenses, and that it also provides bus fare and meals for the needy. Additionally, she described the church's partnership with the Episcopal community services group to provide services to the larger Philadelphia community and its partnership with the Philadelphia Protestant Home to work with the elderly. Closing Trinity Church, she contended, would end relationships that have developed for generations, and she noted the generational range of parishioners who attend Sunday services. The church, she continued, has fostered a multi-generational environment where the youngest interact with the oldest members and that all come together in fellowship every Sunday morning and offer support to one another. She asked rhetorically: If the church has those bonds, why does the historic church building matter? She answered that the historic building matters to the parishioners because it is their spiritual home and one of comfort and refuge. On the archway leading to the altar, she added, are the words: "Lord, thou has been our refuge from one generation to another." She stated that it truly embodies Trinity Church Oxford to its parishioners and community. She concluded that it would be a disservice to designate the parish house property as historic at the expense of the truly historic Trinity Church Oxford.

Debbie Klak, historian of Northeast Philadelphia and former president of the Historical Society of Frankford, stated that she and other historians work very hard documenting historic properties, which requires a significant amount of time and effort. Ms. Klak showed a copy of the historic preservation memorandum from the Lower Northeast Planning District, part of the Phila2035 Plan produced by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Some of her work, she continued, has been used for the Lower Northeast Plan. She reiterated that three properties less than a block from Trinity Church Oxford were recommended by the Historical Commission to be placed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klak suggested to the representatives of the Preservation Alliance that they read the memorandum, adding that she and others worked very hard to identify historic properties. Not once, she continued, did the parish house property come onto the radar as being historic, even after extensive research of the Lawndale area. The work identified nothing historic, and was completed prior to the work on the parish house being undertaken. She asked the Committee to take her point into consideration for all the historians who have worked on this research pro bono. She further contended that the submission of the nomination is a knee-jerk reaction to a self-preservation cause, because it is politically charged. She implored the Committee to take that issue into consideration and again stated that she and other historians find that the property is not historic. She concluded that she opposes the nomination. She asked the Committee to reject it.

John Buffington introduced himself as a retired lawyer interested in preservation issues and always in support of nominations. The Historical Society of Frankford, he noted, has taken the position on the nomination. He explained that he has always supported nominations and prefer to see buildings stand. He then offered a metaphor that preservationists are physicians of the built environment. The first rule, he suggested, is to do no harm. He argued that this designation would, in fact, do harm and would cast serious doubt on the survival of the crown jewel of historical architecture in Northeast Philadelphia. He then noted that the truly historic building is located at the other end of the block. The building in question is not historic. The original building on the site, he continued, was a log structure mentioned in the nomination and was built to house a meeting for the Quakers. It changed hands peacefully in 1698 to Anglicans, he clarified. He remarked that the historic church building stands as a regal, visible, physical monument to the man who founded Pennsylvania as a British place, William Penn, who was persecuted in England. He and his Quaker friends, Mr. Buffington recounted, settled the area and extended a hand to Anglicans to live here quietly next to the Quakers. He described it as American and that the 1711 structure represents that process. However, he noted that the church needs to be maintained and is important for its context. He argued that the nomination does not meet the Criteria for Designation and certainly lacks distinguished architects associated with it. He contended that the property has no interesting history and lacks interesting features that distinguish it from other Colonial Revival structures. He referred to it as just another 1928 building, in complete contrast to the church itself. He stated that to place the parish house on the Register is to throw a wrench into the church's effort to finance the care of the historic church itself. He reiterated that preservationists should do no harm. He asked the Committee to reject the nomination.

Mr. McCauley asked to make some concluding remarks. Ms. Cooperman requested that he be brief, stating that others would like the opportunity to speak. Mr. McCauley asserted that the reason he is present is not just as a representative of the Bishop but also because the church would come under his direct control if the parish house is designated, because it would cause the church to suffer financial duress and cease operations. Owing to the historic nature of the property on which the historic church stands, he continued, neighbors in the community will lose access to the truly historic buildings, because all of the buildings on the church property would need to be closed and secured. In that scenario, he added, the church would fence off the property, because it could not have someone present on a daily basis to protect the church's interest. Designating the parish house property would lead directly to the closing of the historic church.

Ms. Cooperman thanked Mr. McCauley and asked that the Committee accept other comments from members of the public. Parishioner Maria McKeegan stated that she vehemently opposes the designation of the property for reasons previously discussed, including the structure being in severe disrepair, that it is not associated with any key person or event, and that it does not meet any Criteria for Designation. She contended that the Commission would need to designate the entire neighborhood since most buildings were constructed around the same time. By designating 6901 Rising Sun Avenue, she asserted that the Commission would add a severe hardship to the church and would move it closer to closure. In order to continue functioning, she continued, the church needs to redevelop the land to ensure that the church survives as a refuge. She implored the Committee, as a resident and parishioner, to listen to her plea and to not move the property toward designation.

Neighbor Matthew Jackson stated that he benefited from the services provided by the Police Athletic League as a child and, as an adult, serves as an advocate for the property's

preservation. He presented his research and explained that the parish house was constructed in 1928 at a cost of approximately \$80,000 and was appraised in 1973 at \$124,000. The construction costs, he continued, were defrayed by money left by Louis E. Hellerman, who resided on a nearby farm. The building's construction, he added was viewed as a proud achievement, especially on the heels of the Depression. He noted that despite the Depression, the church experienced growth and, in 1963, an addition was constructed and was eventually named after Waldemar Jansen, who was beloved by the people of Trinity Oxford. Mr. Jackson reiterated that many organizations used the parish house, including some community groups such as the Burholme Horticultural Society, the Oxford Child Care Center, and the Police Athletic League. He contended that the land the parish house sits on potentially holds more significance, because the church's deed from 30 December 1700 grants land from Thomas Graves to Joshua Carpenter and John Moore and states that "the three acres now embraced in the graveyard, and the lot adjoining, were to be for the use and service of those of the Communion of Our Holy Mother, the Church of England and to no other use or uses whatsoever." He interpreted the deed as meaning that the adjoining lot was also intended for use by the church and for no use whatsoever. With the parish house, he continued, the Episcopalians took great pride in having a parish house and prioritized the construction of parish houses over building new mission sites. Mr. Jackson reiterated Mr. Steinke's earlier comment that in 1952 church members protested against a gas station. Mr. Jackson added that in 1964 then-rector Reverend Noble M. Smith boasted in a *Philadelphia Inquirer* feature that the church had refused multiple offers to subdivide its large parcel and that Mr. Smith was quoted as stating: "This property has been the saving grace of this neighborhood. With this open space filled in by more homes, this area might have become on its way to becoming a slum." Mr. Jackson then commented that through the lease the church is entering into with an outside tenant, it is inviting onto their property the very thing it fought against in 1952. He questioned why the church is so despondent and considers this option its only choice. He suggested that they contact organizations such as Partners for Sacred Places to receive assistance. He then requested to read a letter from another individual. Ms. Cooperman responded that other people wish to speak. Mr. Jackson provided a copy of the letter for the record. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Jackson to summarize the letter. Mr. Jackson stated that Jack Newman, an archivist, wrote that the church was preparing to build on the site when the Burlington Historical Society became involved and advised that a dig be undertaken prior to any construction. Through a Phase One dig, Mr. Jackson continued, archaeologists discovered an old trash pit that contained many historic artifacts. He explained that the team researched the artifacts, and found they were extremely valuable historic items. The letter further explains, he added, that subsequent digs uncovered a Revolutionary War cannon ball that the team believed originated from a British ship on the Delaware River. He explained that what remains underground on this parcel of land is unknown but that other artifacts or graves could be uncovered following the demolition of the existing structure. In 1928, he opined, the builders may not have been searching for artifacts.

Mark Cohen, former state legislator from the 202nd District, stated that the controversy over this site came to his attention when he was in public office in 2015. In his role as state legislator, he continued, he asked the state to consider purchasing or leasing the property from the church and that he believed it was a viable option. He asserted that he received an email from the church indicating that the state could not possibly match the offer from Royal Farms and that the church was not interested in considering any other use of the property. He noted that someone had earlier stated that other options failed, but Mr. Cohen contended that those options failed because the church leadership of Trinity Episcopal Church refused to consider the offer. He then commented that his successor, Jared Solomon, has a similar position on the property's use. Mr. Cohen suggested that if the church was interested in state ownership of the building or a long-term lease that Representative Solomon and others would likely pursue such an option.

now. He added that until it becomes clear that having Royal Farms lease the site and tear down the building, the church will not be interested in pursuing any alternatives. He contended that alternatives exist and he strongly urged that the Committee support designation and encourage the church to pursue other options.

Committee member Jeff Cohen inquired about Royal Farms. Mark Cohen clarified that Royal Farms is a convenience store and gas station company similar to Wawa and that the company intends to install a 24-hour convenience store with a 24-hour gas station at the site, which would share a corner with two other gas stations.

Andrew Dalzell, an employee in the office of State Representative Jared Solomon, who is on his honeymoon, emphasized the office's commitment to working with the Diocese to find a long-term solution. He asserted that he believed the Committee has been presented with a false choice, which is that designation of the parish house complex would preclude the property's redevelopment. He stated that he is of the belief that designation and redevelopment go hand-in-hand and that he believes that the designation of the property makes redevelopment a possibility. He argued against a previous comment in which the proposed demolition was referred to as an "adaptive reuse" of the property. He then noted that the parish house resembles no other building on Rising Sun Avenue and that it reflects the character and history of the community, whereas a gas station that sells fried chicken converts the corner into "Anywhere, USA." He explained that he and his colleagues have had the pleasure of working with the Preservation Alliance since early spring and that he believes they have put together a strong case for the property's historic merits. He recalled a comment earlier in which his office was accused of playing politics and responded that the nomination was submitted in April prior to the signing of a lease. He added that the nomination was submitted because it was the right thing to do and that he is committed to the process, hand-in-glove, with the church, Preservation Alliance, and other preservation partners in trying to find a long-term use for the property.

Trinity Church parishioner Kyle Simon asked to correct some misunderstandings about the original lease of land. He clarified that the reference to the 1700 grant from Thomas Graves for three acres for use of the Church of England is not the land on which 6901 Rising Sun Avenue is located. He explained that the actual lot from Oxford to Rising Sun Avenue is five acres. He then noted that the 1948 church history, which is cited in the nomination, explains that in addition to the three acres of land originally given by Thomas Graves, the church owned two-and-a-half acres adjoining it, extending to 2nd Street, which is now Rising Sun Avenue. The historical pedigree of the separate lot under consideration, he continued, should be separated from the original and historic lot that was conveyed to the church in 1700. Ms. Cooperman inquired about the date of acquisition of the additional parcel of land. Mr. Simon replied that some of the records were lost during the Revolutionary War, but the parcel would have been acquired prior to 1787. There were no structures on the land at that time, he explained.

Mr. Grossi asked to respond to some of the criticisms of the nomination. He stated that the presence of the 1963 addition does not compromise the existing 1928 structure and all of its surviving contributing features, especially since the 1963 addition was intentionally designed to blend in with the original structure. As the Committee knows, he continued, remarkable is not a threshold for designation. He contended that the work of an "outstanding" architect is not a prerequisite for designation, but, as Mr. Dalzell just stated, in the context of Northeast Philadelphia, this is a remarkable building. He recalled the earlier comment that the parish house is "just another 1928 building," and responded that, from a current vantage point, the building is a historic structure that is approaching 100 years in age. He stated that the nomination contends that the building is reflective of the transition to a suburban/urban way of

life in Northeast Philadelphia. Traditionally, he added, the Historical Commission memoranda, which were referenced, are useful and welcome documents but by no means serve as a definitive record of eligible properties, because they are not the equivalent of an exhaustive parcel-by-parcel survey. Mr. Grossi clarified that he is not attempting to dismiss the work of the Commission's staff but does not consider the memoranda to be the final record. He offered a similar assessment of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission guide, which was also referenced. He stated that the guide is intended as a user-friendly overview, particularly for online users. He explained that the fine architectural styles and our interpretation of most buildings are a merger of complementary styles. He suggested that the arguments presented on style and the lack of inclusion in the Historical Commission memorandum are not weaknesses of the nomination and that the property is a type of resource consistent with other properties that have been added to the Register. He concluded that he stands by the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Grossi to speak to the process whereby the Preservation Alliance selected this building for nomination. Mr. Grossi answered that it is not a building the Preservation Alliance identified itself, but that the organization was approached by a group of stakeholders concerned about the construction of a gas station.

Ben Leech, a consultant for the Preservation Alliance, stated that he approached the nomination agnostically and first questioned whether, in his professional opinion, there was a historic resource that he recognized. He asked whether the site's long evolution was significant in its own right and concluded that the church is absolutely the singular resource. However, he continued, he discovered through the stories he uncovered during his research that the property was a site that grew almost like clockwork every 30 to 50 years with no break. He asserted that the site provides a very important neighborhood story, particularly through the story of the Episcopal Church establishing a civic footprint in the Northeast. Typically, he argued, those parish houses were Gothic Revival and usually designed by Frank Watson, who is buried in the adjacent cemetery. This building, he contended, is trying to do something different and it stands out. He clarified that not all parish houses were Colonial Revival and asserted that this building is not simply another Colonial Revival structure in the context of the building campaign and the time period.

Ms. Klein commented on Criterion J, stating that she recalls when the Gibbons-Powell Center was located on the property and arguing that it was a very active community asset. She noted that the building is currently vacant. The building, she added, may have served as office space for the Police Athletic League and contended that Criterion J is very significant in considering the historical importance of the building and its grounds.

Mr. Schaaf remarked that the architecture of the 1928 Mayo & Moses elevation of the auditorium building is inventive with its obvious Colonial Revival symmetry, Doric porch, entrance surmounted by a tabernacle window, segmental arched tabernacle window, and the broken pediment return on either side. He observed the date stone above the entrance, adding that a bull's eye window was placed above. Compositionally, he continued, the architects created profoundly good Colonial Revival architecture and an extremely handsome elevation. He acknowledged that what is referred to as Colonial Revival in the remainder of the building is not as strong, but that the way the property is sited responds to the streetscape and the building's perception in the neighborhood. Mr. Schaaf clarified that the name of the building should not be confused with the author of the very famous text called the *History of Art*, which was written by Horst Woldemar Janson.

Mr. Cohen asserted that this nomination creates a tough case similar to some of the other church cases the Committee faces where it is presented with the idea that the congregation's future depends on its ability to develop the site. He stated that the concept is difficult but that he believes a false dichotomy is presented. He referenced an old issue of *National Lampoon* and stated that the issue is presented as: "Buy this magazine or we'll shoot this dog." He argued that the Committee should hope for and make possible the idea of the property going to another developer or another buyer and still being preserved. He added that the question before the Committee is not of the distress of the congregation as much as the Committee members feel their distress and importance of the issue. Instead, he continued, the question is whether the property is historic. He took issue with the suggestion that there is true history and what the Committee is reviewing is false history with political motive fueling the nomination. He contended that the clear issue is whether the building deserves historical merit and suggested that many arguments against designation are colored by the issue critical to the church's finances. He reiterated that he is hopeful the building can remain in the historic presence, adding that it is a place-making building. He then agreed with Mr. Dalzell's observation that in 1952 the church opposed a gas station. He called the action right-minded and argued that the Commission has a mechanism for defending against such development and enabling the building to stay in the persistent memory. He opined that the 1875 Furness tower on the historic church building projects a certain language and questioned whether it was Colonial Revival. He then answered that Furness was trying to create more modern architecture and that if it was meant to be Colonial Revival, it was prior to when the Colonial Revival movement adopted its true colors.

Ms. Cooperman argued that the Colonial Revival is not just archaeologically important and that she would consider the Furness tower to be Colonial Revival. Mr. Cohen responded that the ending of the style in the 1940s or the 1950s is a trivial argument. Ms. Cooperman suggested that the debate she and Mr. Cohen, two architectural historians with Ph.D.s, are having over the definition of Colonial Revival style supports the notion that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission's style guides function solely for the general public to gain a basic understanding of a building's style. She contended that historians such as she and Mr. Cohen apply more intellectual rigor based on academic training and knowledge from their own scholarship.

Mr. Cohen stated that in 1928 the congregation doubled down on its eighteenth-century heritage. Ms. Cooperman added that they also incorporated the eighteenth-century heritage of the city and the building's place within the city. Mr. Cohen contended that Moses is a figure of some note, although the nomination is not based on his distinction as an architect. He then argued that the building offers more than cookie cutter Colonial Revival detailing and is a very inventive design. He offered some technical recommendations to improve the nomination and asserted that the parish house is a distinguished complex. He opined that the 1963 addition may contribute if the property were part of a district, since it is a sensitively designed addition. However, he noted that it does not bear the same importance as the 1928 structure. That structure, he continued, is thoughtfully designed and a neighborhood landmark that resembles the buildings proposed to be built opposite Independence Hall in the 1930s. He described it as a building that refocuses attention to the oldest portion of the site and echoes its importance in that it is a red brick building with white trim and a characteristic form. Mr. Cohen reiterated that he believes the arguments against designation present a false choice between designation of the parish house and the survival of the historic church. He again argued for the retention of the parish house while maintaining the site's potential for redevelopment.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the parish house complex at 6901 Rising Sun Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 11:59 a.m.

§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.