

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

**WEDNESDAY, 15 JUNE 2016, 9:30 A.M.
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
EMILY COOPERMAN, PH.D., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Janet Klein
Bruce Laverty
Douglas Mooney
David Schaaf, R.A., Philadelphia City Planning Commission

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

ALSO PRESENT

Qiong Zhao Schickltanz
Laurence Mester, Esq.
Kathy Dowdell
Ken Milano
Eapen Kalathil, Off Penn Properties
Kelly Wiles, University City Historical Society
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Arielle Harris, University of Pennsylvania
Edward Jackson, Champion Development Corporation
John C. Manton
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Justin Rocznik
Joseph Kavanagh
Liam Anderson
Jack Bienenfeld, Champion Development Corporation
Ryan Pensabene, The Flynn Company
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
George Thomas, Civic Visions
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Ellie Devyatkin, Frankford CDC
Malcolm Burnley, Philly Mag
J.M. Duffin
Mark Mills, Metropolis Group
Sarah Chiu, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Matthew Pickering, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Andrew Palewski

Bill Schick Tanz
Aja DeGross, Star News
Andrew Fearon
Melissa Romero, Curbed Philly
Jed Levin
Robyn Willner
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Joshua Schrier, Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT)
Albert Rex, MHA
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
John Henry Scott, Spirit News
George Poulin, University City Historical Society
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Debbie Klak
Richard Thomas
Rachael Fowler, CHRS, Inc.
Joseph Menkevich
Silvia Callegari
Oscar Beisert
Stephanie Haller
Jill Betters
Henry L. Schirmer, Esq.

CALL TO ORDER

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

2007-13 N. 2ND STREET, COLUMBIA SINGING SOCIETY

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Owner: Yu Zhen Pan, Qiong Zhao Schick Tanz, Selina Zhao, Tiffany Zhao

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2007-13 N. 2nd Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Columbia Singing Society (or Gesang Verein) hall satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1889, is a fine example of the Second Empire style as interpreted by Victorian-era German-American architects Schaeffer & Ausfeld. The nomination further contends that the property is significant as a rare surviving example of a German-American singing society and social hall, an important cultural contribution of Germans in America.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2007-13 N. 2nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. DiPasquale and Mr. Baron represented the nomination. William Schick Tanz and property owner Qiong Zhao Schick Tanz represented the property. Sarah Chiu of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission translated to and from Mandarin Chinese for Ms. Schick Tanz.

Mr. Schicktanztanz stated that they recently concluded an expensive tax appeal on the property, which occupied two and a half years. He stated that “some faceless bureaucrat” had assessed the building at \$2,963,000 with a “drive-by” during the City-wide reassessment, and that the basis of that assessment is unclear. After much time and money, he continued, the building was reassessed at \$333,000. He stated that the building is basically a shell. It was purchased in 1980 because it is a significant piece of Philadelphia architecture.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the Committee on Historic Designation has no adjudicative authority over any financial matters. Mr. Schicktanztanz interrupted, stating that this matter is important to him. He noted that the nomination was submitted by Randal Baron and asked if Mr. Baron was present. Mr. Baron identified himself. Mr. Schicktanztanz asked Mr. Baron if he was a trained architect. Mr. Baron responded that he is a trained historic preservationist. Mr. Schicktanztanz asked the nature of Mr. Baron’s training. Mr. Baron responded that he has a graduate degree in historic preservation. Mr. Schicktanztanz asked where Mr. Baron received his degree. Mr. Baron responded that he attended Columbia University.

Mr. Schicktanztanz stated that Mr. Baron had assessed the building as in “good” condition during a “drive-by,” and that obviously his ability to determine condition was limited by the fact that he was never able to enter the building. Mr. Schicktanztanz opined that there are issues on the rear of the building that should have been noted, including a crack in the three-story brick wall. Mr. Schicktanztanz presented photographs of the interior of the building. Ms. Cooperman responded that the condition of the property is not before the Committee on Historic Designation. She stated that the Committee is tasked with assessing whether the building has historic significance relative to the Criteria for Designation in the preservation code. Mr. Schicktanztanz interrupted, stating that he is trying to point out some of the failings of the nomination. He stated that he does not believe that the building has any significance.

Mr. Schicktanztanz stated that the nomination notes that Schaeffer & Ausfeld were a short-lived but prolific architectural firm, and questioned whether a short-lived firm could have produced enough work that they should be memorialized by historic designation. Mr. Schicktanztanz argued that the nomination contends that the building does not conform to one particular architectural style, and opined that the building is a “bastardization” of several architectural styles to make it appear more grandiose than it actually is. Mr. Schicktanztanz stated that the nomination notes that Schaeffer & Ausfeld had also designed residences of wealthy German-Americans, and opined that those houses would be better examples of Schaeffer & Ausfeld’s work.

Mr. Schicktanztanz noted that the building was only utilized in its original configuration as a singing society until World War I. The singing society did not survive the Great Depression. He stated that a neighbor also indicated that the building had been a singing society, and then subsequently reinvented as a social club following World War II. Mr. Schicktanztanz commented that the Austro-Hungarian Society had installed a bowling alley and other features inside the building. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interiors of properties. Mr. Schicktanztanz replied that he understood that, but was trying to argue that the property was only utilized for a short time as a singing society. The bulk of the building’s history, subsequent to World War II, he continued, was for other uses. He stated that the other uses exceeded the building’s use as a singing hall. He commented that it was purchased in 1980 by Father Hermanowicz of the Polish American Society, and that supposedly a new roof and fire suppression systems were installed. However, Mr. Schicktanztanz opined, there was never a new roof installed, and the property has never been properly renovated.

Mr. Schicktanztan conceded that this building may instill nostalgia, but opined that it is not representative of the neighborhood itself. He stated that nomination is inaccurate in its statement that the building “towers over its neighbors, lending visual interest to the area.” Mr. Schicktanztan agreed that the building lends some visual interest to the area, but stated that the area is decrepit, and largely made up of empty lots and automobile workshops, and if Mr. Baron was being honest, there is an eight-story warehouse and a parking lot across the street, so this building does not tower over the neighbors if one considers the properties across the street.

Mr. Schicktanztan continued that his point is that other than lending visual interest, this building does not represent a significant part of Philadelphia’s history; it is merely the representation of a short-lived architectural firm, which, if it had been so significant, would have continued to design buildings. He stated that it certainly is a building of note, as that is what drew their attention to the property in the first place, but he does not understand how it could be considered significant to Philadelphia’s history, given the short-lived nature of the firm. Ms. Cooperman responded that this nomination does not propose to designate the building as a work of a designer who is particularly influential in Philadelphia’s history. Mr. Schicktanztan expressed his belief that that was one of the conditions of the nomination. Ms. Cooperman responded that it is not. She noted that that would be Criterion E, which is not cited in the nomination. Mr. Schicktanztan apologized.

Mr. Schicktanztan read Criterion D, emphasizing the phrase “an architectural style.” He stated that the building does not represent an architectural style, but rather many architectural styles. He emphasized that the building is a “bastardization” of architectural styles. Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Schicktanztan is an architectural historian. He responded that he is not, and asked if that was necessary. Ms. Cooperman asked about the basis of his opinion. Mr. Schicktanztan interrupted, responding that it is not his opinion, but was Mr. Baron’s opinion. Ms. Cooperman stated that Mr. Baron never described the building as a “bastardization.” Mr. Schicktanztan argued that the nomination states that the building does not conform to one particular architectural style. Ms. Cooperman responded that buildings rarely do. Mr. Schicktanztan reiterated the Criterion, again emphasizing the phrase “an architectural style.” He opined that the building disqualifies itself on that ground. Ms. Cooperman responded that buildings are not like bird species, and do not conform to the laws of nature in terms of their typology being replicated from one to the next. She stated that architects and builders have the ability to choose which details they wish to include in a building. Mr. Schicktanztan responded that if the building is not the genuine article, it is less significant. Ms. Cooperman responded that she appreciates his opinion.

Ms. Cooperman asked if Mr. Schicktanztan had any further comments on the content of the nomination, and whether Ms. Schicktanztan understood the discussion that had taken place so far. Mr. Schicktanztan stated that there are flaws in the nomination, and therefore it should be declined. Mr. Schicktanztan asked if the property owner understood. Ms. Schicktanztan responded that her husband already made enough comments. Mr. Schicktanztan asked again if she understood. She responded that she did.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor Ken Milano commented that his family was German on his mother’s side. He expressed his delight that the staff of the Historical Commission had nominated this important property. He commented that he has more than 30 years of experience researching, writing, and publishing six books on the history of the area. He noted that there are very few properties on the Philadelphia Register that represent the German-American community in Philadelphia, which was one of the largest German communities in America. Mr. Milano noted that there were at least 65 singing societies in Philadelphia, and that most of them centered in Kensington. He stated that he is not aware of

any other singing societies on the Register. He expressed his whole-hearted support of the nomination.

Mr. Schicktz addressed Mr. Milano, stating that Mr. Milano had said he wrote six books on the German history of the area. Mr. Milano responded that he did not write six books on German history, but on the history of the area. Mr. Schicktz asked if Mr. Milano had identified this property in any of his books. Mr. Milano responded that he had not, and that the Historical Commission staff had discovered the property. Mr. Schicktz asked rhetorically whether the building had not been significant enough to be included in his books. Ms. Cooperman responded that Philadelphia is a big place. Mr. Schicktz replied that it is, but that, if the property were significant, someone who has published six books on the German history of the area would have identified it. Mr. Milano responded that his books are not on the German history of the area.

Ms. Cooperman commented that, with respect to the architectural style, to identify the building as Second Empire is a little bit restricting. She noted that the building is a re-interpretation of the Rundbogenstil style in Second Empire form, which would be perfectly appropriate for its date. In terms of its expression of German identity, she would like to see that mentioned in the nomination, as it is an element of German heritage that has been lost in Philadelphia. She noted that there have been scholars who have identified the Academy of Music as an example of Rundbogenstil, a mid-century German architectural style. She noted that the building is a hybrid style that clearly harkens back to German forms, including the steep mansards. The building exemplifies the German traditions of the members and the American trends that they encountered here. Ms. Cooperman also commented that there was no united German country during the building's period of significance, and recommended that the nomination be edited to refer to German-speaking peoples rather than Germans, as Germany did not exist as a country at that time. Other than that one suggestion, she noted, the nomination demonstrates that this is a building that is eminently worthy of designation. It represents the culture of German-Americans in the city, and is worthy as an interesting exemplar of this hybrid style.

Mr. Laverty congratulated the staff on researching the building and placing it in its social context within the German-American presence in Philadelphia as well as the context of the singing society building type. Mr. Laverty noted that he drives down 2nd Street several times a week, and that this is one of the most significant structures between Lehigh and Girard Avenues.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2007-13 N. 2nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

1527 N. FRONT STREET

Nominator: Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC, Oscar Beisert
Owner: Thomas and Antoinette Scollon

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1527 N. Front Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A. The nomination argues that the property, constructed c. 1852 as a single-family dwelling on a parcel subdivided from the Second Associate Presbyterian Church, is significant as a distinctive component of the church's institutional court. The nomination argues that the institutional court was an important form of architectural and urban design in Philadelphia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 1527 N. Front satisfies Criteria for Designation A. The staff also recommends that the Committee comment on the condition and the building's capacity to represent its history.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. No one represented the property.

Mr. Beisert stated that this nomination is a resubmission. He noted that Committee member Jeff Cohen had made some recommendations at the review of the previous submission in 2015. He noted that this building is one of two that formed the front edges of a church court. This building site and the corresponding one to the south were subdivided off from the church parcel to subsidize the lot's ground rent. He opined that the court is an unusual design feature, and, while the building may look like an ordinary rowhouse, it is part of the vanishing nineteenth-century urban fabric.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Andrew Fearon of Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage voiced his support for the nomination, noting that mid-nineteenth century building stock is important to the surrounding community. He opined that it is the type of vernacular architecture that is quickly disappearing, and it is significant as part of the church compound and in the history of Front Street.

Neighbor Ken Milano commented that across the street from this building are two old factories that were recently converted using historic preservation tax credits. He noted that there are other nearby properties that have been recently designated as historic on both the local and National registers, and that these designations are beginning to create a historic district of sorts. He expressed his support for the nomination as a member of the community.

Mr. Beisert directed the Committee's attention to page 2 of the nomination, and the image at the top right, which shows how the building helps create the church court.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the owner was present. Ms. DiPasquale noted that this property and the property containing the church were nominated at the same time in 2015, and were owned by the same individuals at the time. She stated that the property owner had supported the designation of the bottleneck shaped church lot, but had opposed the designation of this property.

Ms. Cooperman mused that, if designated as significant as part of the church court, it is important to understand this property for that relationship. She asked whether the church property is already designated. Mr. Farnham confirmed that it is.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination is a little confusing in terms of the discussion of the urban design. He opined that the inclusion of extensive discussion of courts that are actually just streets in the nomination detracts from the understanding of the significance of this type of court. Mr. Schaaf suggested that that be clarified in the nomination. Mr. Beisert retorted that there is a discussion of institutional courts in the nomination as well. Mr. Schaaf responded that the court for which this property is significant is a narrow drive that opens into a larger parcel and frames the building. Mr. Schaaf commented that some of the examples in the nomination are buildings that just happen to be in the middle of blocks, not ones that are framed by other properties. Mr. Schaaf stated that this is obviously a bottleneck court.

Mr. Schaaf asked the staff to clarify the recommendation that the Committee comment on the condition of the property. Mr. Schaaf stated that this is obviously a weathered property whose windows are boarded up. Ms. Cooperman commented that the property seems to retain its original fenestration patterns. Mr. Farnham explained that at the previous meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation at which the Committee discussed the original nominations of both the church and the house, the owner participated in the discussion and contended that the rear ell of the building was collapsed or collapsing. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff assumed that the property owner would be present at the meeting, and that the Committee could have addressed those concerns with him directly. Mr. Schaaf asked if there was a photograph of the portion of the building that was collapsed or collapsing. Ms. DiPasquale responded that there is a portion of the rear ell that has been rebuilt in cinder block, but that she is not sure if that is what the owner was speaking to.

Ms. Cooperman noted that the question of designating multiple properties that were historically a single property with one nomination as opposed to designating them with multiple nominations arose at an earlier Commission meeting. She suggested that nominating with one nomination might be an option for this property and the church. She opined that, if the significance of this property hinges on the fact that it is part of a court, the nomination should be connected to the court's designation. Mr. Beisert responded that that question came up at the previous Committee meeting. He asked if Mr. Farnham would like to comment on that question. Mr. Farnham offered no comment. Mr. Beisert expressed his belief that he was asked to separate the nominations. Mr. Farnham responded that these two properties could be nominated individually or as a small historic district of two properties. As long as the historic spatial link between two properties is made in the separate nominations, the two individual nominations would be essentially equivalent to the one district nomination.

Ms. Klein commented that, because of its closeness and part of the original church plan, the property would be better as part of a small district. It is a single, vernacular building that does not alone represent the history of the group that created the bottleneck court in front of the church.

Ms. Cooperman noted that, procedurally, the Committee could vote to recommend designation for this property, with an amendment to the church's nomination to create a very small district. Mr. Mooney questioned whether that additional step was necessary, opining that two individual designations would essentially create that district.

Mr. Schaaf opined that the property should be considered significant under Criterion C rather than Criterion A. He read Criterion C, which is satisfied if the property "reflects and environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style." He noted that it does not reflect an architectural style per se, but rather an urban design motif, as it establishes a keyhole or bottleneck court. He opined that it does reflect a familiar architectural style, Philadelphia's own rowhouse, but contended that the urban design component is more important than the architectural style. Mr. Beisert remarked that he would not object if Mr. Schaaf wanted to add Criterion C to the nomination. Mr. Schaaf clarified that he was suggesting that Criterion C replace Criterion A. Ms. Cooperman concurred.

Mr. Beisert opined that the property is interesting because, after the Presbyterian church building was erected, the church immediately carved out the front two lots to subsidize the ground rents.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 1527 N. Front Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A, but the property does satisfy Criterion C for its role in the creation of the church court, a significant example of urban design.

81-95 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission

Owner: VMDT Partnership

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the rowhouses at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J. The nomination argues that the rowhouses are a rare surviving example of a once common building type of the early Philadelphia waterfront between Front Street and the Delaware River, and the row retains original early Federal-style characteristics despite a significant but sensitive Colonial Revival renovation in the early 1920s. The nomination further contends that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue exemplifies the cultural, social and historical heritage of the Northern Liberties community, having served as the Beach Street Mission, representing the first facility of the Guild House organization.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the rowhouses at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Michael Sklaroff and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the property owner.

Mr. Schaaf stated that staff members at the City Planning Commission prepared the nomination. Mr. Schaaf indicated that the current document is the third draft of the nomination for the property and acknowledged the deficiencies in the previous versions. He added that the City Planning Commission has endeavored to clarify the misrepresentations of the second nomination through successive site visits and assessments of visible fabric. Mr. Schaaf stated that this nomination identifies the wagon house at 704-708 Beach Street as non-contributing. He summarized the property's history, commenting that there are many instances of overlapping time periods, but that the buildings were constructed in 1828, and that the units housed the same tenants until the mid-1860s. The property, he continued, then became home to the first Guild House, but was repurposed in 1921-23 when Thomas D. Sullivan, founder of the Terminal Warehouse Company, converted the eight houses into an office building for his own company and reestablished some of the elements of the early building. Mr. Schaaf noted that, at the time of the restoration, all the dormers were reestablished and regularized, so what is visible today is essentially a 95-year-old rehabilitation of a 190-year-old building. Mr. Schaaf referred to the effort as a 1920s Colonial Revival treatment of a Federal style building. He stated that the property went from individual houses to a clear-span office space, the conversion of which required a considerable engineering effort to remove load-bearing walls and insert steel girders to facilitate the support of the joists. Mr. Schaaf further identified the three existing chimneys, emphasizing their significance despite the loss of the other two. Mr. Schaaf indicated that the three remaining chimneys were important in establishing the roofscape.

Mr. Sklaroff stressed that this review is the third for the nomination of the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue, and he commented that, even with the extensive sections on the property's

history included in the first and second versions of the nomination, it was still not sufficient. He noted that the Committee previously asked that the Commission allow the nominators to resubmit for a third time. This revised nomination, Mr. Sklaroff contended, offers no new information of significance. He reminded the Committee that it should be reviewing the merits of the building as set forth in the nomination and not simply looking at the building itself. He stated that the nominator has an obligation to demonstrate in the nomination that the property satisfies the cited Criteria for Designation. The Committee must consider the property as seen through the nomination and not simply the property itself. He stated that, over the years, the character-defining features of the original 1820s Federal building have been lost, that the historical context is gone, and that only if the building were part of a historic district could the building be treated as historic based on its massing. Mr. Sklaroff underscored that the building stands alone in area designated for redevelopment by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The site is part of the Greyhound bus service facility, he continued, which the landowner plans to redevelop. Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged that the Friends Mission tenancy at the building (1879-99) is interesting, but argued that no historic fabric relevant to that occupancy remains. He also maintained that there are many other opportunities to designate buildings that represent the history of the mission of the Society of Friends in Philadelphia. This third revision, he added, focuses on the significance of Thomas Sullivan, who, Mr. Sklaroff contended, is not a figure of significance in the history of the city. He further stated that Sullivan's circa 1922 alterations created a hodgepodge of Victorian, Federal, and Colonial elements that are not explicated by the nomination. The nomination claims that the alterations resulted in a "sensitive Colonial Revival renovation," but Mr. Sklaroff disagreed, asserting that many elements are missing and that the building is not worthy of the Committee's recommendation that the nomination satisfies the stated criteria for designation.

Mr. Thomas presented a series of slides showing the context of the row and outlining areas of the buildings he believed were altered. He remarked that the nomination still contends that the row is a rare surviving example, but he noted that the nomination never indicates what it is that the row exemplifies. Mr. Thomas displayed an image to show the original appearance of the buildings with doors at each unit, paired chimneys at the party walls, and grouped buildings identifiable as a row. He stated that the original nomination made no reference to the massive alteration and only mentioned that some changes may have been made to the buildings. Mr. Thomas opined that, when the interior structure was removed, the whole roof structure and all its framing and dormers would also have been removed. He stated that the removal of original fabric resulted in a "Cheshire Cat version" of the building, referring to an image of the properties with the altered areas digitally removed. Mr. Thomas noted that the image shows that a few brick panels remain along with several chimneys, and he remarked that the core of the nomination is based on a collection of bricks, with most of the building being comprised of twentieth-century material. Mr. Thomas further commented that the nomination argues that two units of the building are significant as a Quaker mission, potentially the first in Philadelphia, and were used for such a purpose for 20 years. He then criticized the nominators and contended that they failed to research the context of the institutions. Through a very quick survey, Mr. Thomas argued, an individual could find an 1880s publication citing 187 different missions and related organizations in the City of Philadelphia, of which the building's Quaker mission was but one. He further indicated that these types of organizations began well before the Civil War with the Sunday School Movement and continued through Methodist efforts that addressed working-class issues. Of the dozens of related buildings, Mr. Thomas indicated, the building that housed the Bedford Street Methodist Mission survives on Kater Street and the building that housed the Bethany Quaker Mission for African Americans survives on Brandywine Street. Presenting a historic photograph of 81-95 Fairmount Avenue and contrasting it with a current image, Mr. Thomas stated that a comparison shows that all the historic features are missing and suggested

that a more suitable method of the site's commemoration would be through the installation of a plaque. The mission use, he argued, is no longer visible, and he asked whether this building is an important example of a restoration. He then opined about the definition of a restoration and referenced sources in defining the term. In citing several organizations and publications, Mr. Thomas noted that exacting drawings of details exist in Charles Willing's book *Old Philadelphia: Colonial Details*, as well as photographic examples of colonial buildings by Philip Lawless. He claimed the Philadelphia design profession fully understood the concept of a restoration at the time when this property was redeveloped in the 1920s. In the Fairmount Avenue case, Mr. Thomas questioned whether the alterations resulted in a restoration or even adaptive reuse and contended that a building cannot be restored to a period prior to its original construction. He commented that the idea of a sensitive Colonial Revival restoration of a Federal building is at best whimsical, at worst historically illiterate, and again reiterated that all the building's character-defining features have been removed, including the doors, large portions of brickwork, the entire roof structure, and shutters. He concluded that the building is neither a restoration nor an adaptive reuse and showed an image featuring a series of doors to nearby buildings. Mr. Thomas stated that he knows a restoration and this is no restoration.

Mr. Schaaf interjected that the context has not been compromised, since similar buildings, shown in Mr. Thomas's photographs and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, exist on the next block. Mr. Sklaroff replied that there is no historic district in the area and added that the examples show what the rowhouses in question could have been if they had been restored in 1922.

Mr. Thomas questioned Thomas Sullivan's importance and his role in the history of the city. He opined whether the building should be designated as a memorial to Sullivan, whose business was as a warehouseman. He commented that other buildings owned by Sullivan exist in the city and would better represent the man, his business, and his life. This property, Mr. Thomas argued, does not meet the Criteria for Designation and does not warrant designation. Mr. Sklaroff added that, were the fabric intact, the building would be a worthy Federal structure. He then stated that, if the remaining fabric were reflective of the tenancy of the Quaker mission, or if Sullivan were a significant figure in the history of the City of Philadelphia, then the building may be worthy of designation. However, Mr. Sklaroff suggested that neither statement is true, and concluded by asserting that the building is a mixture of Federal, Victorian, and oversized colonial elements that do not relate to the 1920s era when the building was altered.

Oscar Beisert claimed that the Committee had not rejected the first version of the nomination. He then stated that the Quaker mission began at this location because of the industrial nature of the neighborhood and its changing context. Mr. Beisert distributed information to the Committee on the Terminal Warehouse Company produced by the War Department's Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The information, Mr. Beisert asserted, states the importance of the company and information on the company's business up to the 1930s; a comparison to other warehouse companies in Philadelphia was also included. He addressed the questions about Sullivan's importance and stated that Sullivan owned what may have been the second largest warehousing company in America, a company that was certainly the largest in Philadelphia during the 1920s to the 1940s. Mr. Beisert also distributed information on restoration and commented that Independence Hall could be overlaid with a grid similar to the one presented by Mr. Thomas to prove that it does not have much original fabric. He remarked about the changed context of Independence Hall and Elfreth's Alley, and emphasized that many renovations and restorations have occurred in Society Hill. He then presented Ms. Cooperman with a list of incorrect statements found in the report of Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Sklaroff contended that no new information on the Beach Street Mission has been presented. He stated that the additional information was not part of the recently revised nomination, so he and his colleagues have not had a chance to respond. He then noted that he finds no issue with the warehouse company being identified as significant for its role in the warehouse trade in the City of Philadelphia. He also commented that two of the company's warehouse buildings exist nearby on Delaware Avenue and are emblematic of the warehousing business. He suggested that, if Sullivan's work and business are important to the city's history, then perhaps those buildings should be considered for designation. Regarding the structure currently under consideration, Mr. Sklaroff continued, Sullivan's presence is not significant enough. He argued that Sullivan is not recognized in the panoply of significant Philadelphians. He again asked that the Committee not move forward with recommending that the property satisfy the Criteria for Designation.

Patrick Grossi stated that it was his understanding that the nomination does not seek to designate the building as an example of Federal-style housing that has retained its integrity. He asserted that the building's form and function have evolved over time, and the building reflects multiple eras of the American built environment. He defended the building's seeming lack of an obvious and apparent history by noting that numerous buildings on the local and federal registers also lack a narrative that is immediately transparent in its materials. The narrative, Mr. Grossi continued, is usually embedded in the efforts to protect those buildings. He concluded that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue is an example of an embedded narrative.

Mr. Schaaf addressed several issues previously raised about the building's integrity and argued that the roof has not been rebuilt, and that the six dormers that remain in place at the north elevation, though not in great condition, indicate that that part of the building has not been altered since its 1828 construction. In discussions over the amount of existing brick, Mr. Schaaf noted that the north elevation has not been included and that he believes this elevation retains its original integrity. He reiterated that at least four houses located just west of the building that are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and are of the same era contribute to an intact streetscape.

Ms. Cooperman stated that Committee member Jeff Cohen could not attend the meeting and read comments he provided on the nomination:

More generally, very well-researched, with deficiencies of previous version remedied. At times, facts of deep research are presented more strongly than larger arguments of significance, capturing some of David Schaaf's point of view at last meeting.

Regarding Michael Sklaroff's letter of 6 June, I would strongly disagree on point 1, regarding the character-defining features of the property. And on point 2, it is a vivid presence and articulate testimony of the historic evolution of this district. In the attached report by CivicVisions, the image that yellows out window glazing, shutters, roofs, and chimneys to represent the proportion of missing fabric tendentiously focuses on elements that have often been replaced in buildings nearly 200 years old that have often been certified by the PHC. Did their certification and preservation not fulfill the public purpose of the policies embodied in the enabling laws? And in the early 20th century Sullivan's choice to present his firm's offices in Colonial Revival form well represents that impulse.

Ms. Cooperman also stated that, while Mr. Cohen is not present to vote, he indicated that he would endorse the nomination on Criteria A, C, D, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

1325 BEACH ST, PECO DELAWARE STATION

Nominator: Stephanie Haller and Jill Betters

Owner: Delaware Station LLC

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1325 Beach Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former power station satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, D, E, H and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in two phases between 1917 and 1924, is significant as an expansive reinforced concrete power station, designed in the Classical Revival style by Philadelphia civic architect John T. Windrim. The nomination further argues that the building stands as an established landmark on the Delaware River waterfront, and exemplifies the economic and historical heritage of the community.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1325 Beach Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, H and J. The staff recommends that the nomination does not demonstrate that the building “is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation,” fulfilling Criterion B.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Stephanie Haller and Jill Betters represented the nomination. Kevin McMahon, preservation consultant at Powers & Company, represented the property owner.

Ms. Haller stated that the building’s importance is related to the age of electricity, and she claimed that electricity was discovered in Philadelphia. Ms. Betters stated that she and Ms. Haller are not professional nominators, but rather she is a community resident that cares about the built environment, while Ms. Haller has some undergraduate training in historic preservation. She conceded to the removal of Criterion B from the nomination. She stated that the building serves as a backdrop to Penn Treaty Park, and that any loss or change to the structure will change the character and environment of Penn Treaty Park. She referenced an online petition, which she started 72 hours ago, that more than 100 people have signed to support the nomination.

Mr. McMahon, representing the property owner, explained that his employer Powers & Company was hired last year to complete a National Register nomination for the property and to start facilitating an historic tax credit process for the building’s rehabilitation. The National Register nomination was approved by the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) in February, is now with the National Park Service, and is expected to be officially listed on the National Register within a few weeks. As part of the federal tax credit application, detailed documentation of all work proposed for the building, both interior and exterior, will be submitted to and rigorously reviewed by the PHMC and the National Park Service. He stated that the building is not threatened and will undergo a sensitive rehabilitation. He noted that Joe Volpe, the owner of the property, has been quite transparent about his plans, and has presented those plans to neighbors, Central Delaware Advocacy Group, and Councilman Mark Squilla.

Mr. McMahon continued that there are serious concerns about the quality of the nomination and that it could be considered insufficient in addressing the Criteria for Designation. He stated that there are also many factual errors. He opined that the building is eligible for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but the nomination does not make an adequate case for the building's significance. He suggested that the Committee must review the nomination, not the building. He directed the Committee's attention to his letter dated 9 June 2016, in which he outlined the weaknesses of the nomination. Ms. Cooperman asked him to elaborate on specific weaknesses of the nomination. Mr. McMahon summarized from the following section of his letter:

"Concerning criteria (a), (b), and (j), the nomination fails to sufficiently explain how and why the station was developed, particularly in the context of World War I and industrial expansion in Kensington and Fishtown; how the design and operation of power stations in Philadelphia evolved from the late 19th through the early 20th century; how the Delaware Station functioned to generate electricity and how that process changed over time; how the station operated to provide electricity to a citywide network of substations and industrial sites; and how, after WWI, the station played a major role in the expansion of residential service, improving the lives of Philadelphians of nearly all backgrounds. Concerning criteria (d) and (e), the nomination also fails to address how the station was innovative in terms of its technological and engineering achievements, particularly how constraints imposed by the silty riverfront site required an inventive structural system and creatively designed furnaces and coal storage and distribution systems; how Windrim was significant in shaping Philadelphia's civic realm through his numerous major works in the Beaux Arts and Classical Revival styles in the early 20th century; how Windrim adapted the Beaux Arts style as a corporate branding strategy to reinforce PECO's suffering public image; and how the Delaware Station compared to the Schuylkill, Chester, and Richmond stations in terms of scale, architectural style, material treatment, structure, technology, and generating capacity."

Mr. McMahon stated that they are only asking for revisions to the nomination, so that the points in his letter are addressed. Ms. Betters asked if that means that Mr. McMahon is not opposed to the existing nomination being revised. Mr. McMahon responded that the Committee should decide whether the revisions are substantial enough that a revised nomination should be reviewed by the Committee at a future meeting. Ms. Cooperman asked if the property owner objects to a designation, or just to the nomination's specific content. Mr. McMahon responded that the nomination needs to make a much stronger case than it currently does in order for the building to be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf asked about that procedure. Mr. Farnham responded that the Committee can offer a recommendation to the Commission to table the nomination to allow for the nominator to amend the nomination. Such a tabling is typically capped at 90 days. Ms. Betters noted that some of the points addressed by Mr. McMahon were included in the first draft of the nomination, but the staff had asked for their removal.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Andrew Fearon, representing Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, stated that he supports the nomination, and that everyone can agree that the building is worthy of designation. Oscar Beisert thanked the nominators and praised their work. He commented that 3600 Lancaster Avenue is an example of a tax credit project. Mr. McMahon interjected that it is not a tax credit project. Mr. Beisert responded that it was a tax credit project originally, and when the 30-year period expired, they immediately sought to demolish the whole block. Mr. McMahon questioned the validity of Mr. Beisert's statement, noting that tax credit restrictions last for a five-year recapture period, not 30. Mr. Beisert responded that he does not know if it was a 30 year period, but the PHMC had an easement on

the property. Mr. McMahon responded that an easement is in perpetuity. Mr. Beisert responded that maybe it was not an easement, but the property was protected by the PHMC for a period of time, and when that time expired, the block was threatened with demolition. Ken Milano, local resident, offered his support for the nomination, and suggested that the Committee give very specific instructions for revisions, should the Committee decide that the nomination needs to be revised. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance conceded that there are areas of the nomination that could be strengthened, and noted that Mr. McMahon's National Register nomination is a very strong and thorough document, but that this is one of the most important physical embodiments of Philadelphia's infrastructural history, and on those merits of the building alone, the Alliance supports listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Klein opined that the current nomination provides adequate information for the Committee to make a decision. She suggested that any additional information be added to the file, to assist future researchers. She agreed that Criterion B should be removed. Ms. Cooperman commented that there are certainly edits that could make for a stronger nomination, and noted that there are concepts that are half-understood and half-articulated, but agreed with Ms. Klein that there is enough information to assess the eligibility of this building for designation based on the current nomination. She stated that she would support edits to strengthen the nomination, and concurs with the removal of Criterion B. Mr. Lavery commented that both Mr. McMahon and Aaron Wunsch could assist greatly with editing the nomination, as they both are experts on the building. He stated that there is no disagreement that it is a worthy building, but as a worthy building, it deserves a worthy nomination. Ms. Cooperman agreed. She praised Mr. McMahon for his thorough National Register nomination for the property.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1325 Beach Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, H and J, but not Criterion B.

176 CONARROE ST, ST. MARY'S

Nominator: John Manton

Owner: St. Mary of Assumption Archdiocese of Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 176 Conarroe Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that St. Mary of the Assumption Roman Catholic Church and rectory satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the 1849 church and rectory represent the immigration and settlement of German Catholics in Philadelphia. It further contends that the architectural vocabulary of the church is a stylistic adaptation of an old German religious form, though constructed of local materials. The nomination intends to designate the rectory, which spans three parcels, and the church and burial ground, which share one larger parcel. Some clarification over the church's date of construction is needed. The nomination bases the 1849 construction date on a date stone found on the church's façade. However, the staff believes this date may indicate the founding of the church rather than the building's construction, since the church does not appear on the 1863 Smedley map.

The parish has been closed for several years and the Archdiocese began the process of transferring the property to a private owner about one year ago, prior to the nomination's submission. For the past year, the prospective owner has developed plans to sensitively reuse both the church and rectory and maintain the properties' green spaces. The project is part of a larger development program that includes the reuse of the school immediately across Conarroe

Street and the development of single-family residences at the property adjacent to the church, where a parking lot currently exists.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 176 Conarroe Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J, but that it does not present strong enough arguments for the satisfaction of Criterion C.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. John Manton represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips represented the current property owner, St. John the Baptist Parish of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Architect Jim Campbell represented the prospective owner.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Archdiocese has no objection to the nomination. However, regarding the churchyard and burial ground, Mr. Phillips noted that five separate court orders were entered in March 2016 permitting the removal of the remains of the five pastors who were buried on the grounds and the reinterment at nearby St. Mary of the Assumption Cemetery. Mr. Phillips asked that the nomination or a resulting designation not interfere with that process. Ms. Cooperman asked whether the process has already occurred. Mr. Phillips replied that it has not occurred.

Mr. Manton commented that the Smedley maps have shortcomings and often contain omissions, but the 1863 Smedley map was the earliest map he could locate. The building was not listed in city directories prior to 1856, he continued, because of the Consolidation Act legislated by the Pennsylvania General Assembly that absorbed the townships and boroughs of the County of Philadelphia into the City of Philadelphia. In addition to the date stone that bears the date 1849, there is an 1849 article in the nomination that references the laying of the church's cornerstone, as well as an 1849 advertisement from the Public Ledger. Mr. Manton indicated that the date stone reflects the building's construction date rather than the church's founding.

Mr. Campbell stated that his firm, Campbell Thomas Architects, has been developing plans for the property for approximately one year and voiced his support for the nomination of the buildings. He noted that he looks forward to working with the staff and Commission on an appropriate adaptive reuse of the buildings and introduced Jack Bienenfeld as the prospective owner and potential developer of the property.

Mr. Manton referred the Committee to several pages of the nomination and denoted the distinctive architectural style of examples within the text. He asked that the Committee compare the features of the examples to the tower of the nominated church building and argued that the nomination presents claims that there is a distinctive character or architectural style that qualifies under Criterion C. Ms. Keller responded that, while the nominator did provide examples reflective of the church's character and style, the staff contends that the early German examples were neither of the nominated property's environment nor era. To satisfy Criterion C, a property must "reflect the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style." The nominator has not demonstrated how the church reflects its environment or its era. Mr. Manton countered that the property offers the hipped-roof tower of the German examples and that its fabric consists of the same local Wissahickon schist present at many Manyunk buildings.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the research is fascinating and that he recognizes the derivation from the German examples presented in the nomination. He remarked that the nomination would make a strong case for designation regardless of whether Criterion C is included. Mr. Manton

acknowledged that the nomination only needs to demonstrate the satisfaction of one Criterion for Designation.

Ms. Cooperman commented that, like the German Singing Society building, this church is a hybrid form. From the appearance of the building, Ms. Cooperman stated that she would believe the building dates to 1849, adding that the early atlases frequently contained errors and that the nomination provides sufficient evidence to confirm the 1849 construction date.

Mr. Manton asked whether the burial ground would be disqualified from designation if the bodies were transferred to a new site. Mr. Phillips replied that he understood that the nomination intended only to designate the buildings and he was providing context on the court orders pertaining to the grounds. Ms. Cooperman clarified that the burial ground is historically part of the property and that, while designation would include the entire parcel, it would specifically address the buildings. She added that Mr. Manton did not present separate arguments in his nomination for the burial ground's significance. Mr. Manton inquired whether the adjacent rectory was being addressed by the Committee, and Mr. Schaaf confirmed that it would be.

Mr. Schaaf requested clarification on the parcels on which the buildings are situated, and the staff responded that the rectory straddles three deeded parcels, while the church and burial ground share one larger deeded parcel; however, the entire site, comprising all four parcels, consists of one tax parcel. Mr. Farnham added that the Historical Commission regulates by tax parcel and that this property would be regulated according to the tax parcel, which is 176 Conarroe Street, and would include the church, rectory, and burial ground.

Mr. Phillips explained that the Archdiocese does not object to the designation, as long as designation is not sought specifically for the bodies, gravestone, or markers. Mr. Manton responded that it is not the intention of the nomination to designate the bodies, gravestones, or markers.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 176 Conarroe Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J, but not Criterion C.

2012 AND 2014 RITTENHOUSE SQ ST—RECLASSIFY FROM CONTRIBUTING TO NON-CONTRIBUTING

Owner: Robyn Willner

Applicant: Tim Kerner

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the properties at 2012 and 2014 Rittenhouse Square Street from their current classifications of contributing to non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The inventory describes these properties and the adjacent 2016 and 2018 Rittenhouse Square Street as “Four, 2-story modern houses, garages—Contributing.”

The applicant argues that the twin, two-story structures, built in the early 1950s, do not contribute to the District in terms of their architectural character or their scale, are inconsistent with the spatial hierarchy of the neighborhood, and do not support the social unity of the district as defined by the district nomination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the reclassification of 2012 and 2014 Rittenhouse Square Street from contributing to non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fidler

Residential Historic District, pursuant to Sections 14-203(78) and 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance, because the buildings do not reflect the historical or architectural character of the District as defined in the Statement of Significance of the District's nomination.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Architect Tim Kerner and property owner Robyn Willner represented the application.

Mr. Kerner explained that he and his client contend that the buildings in question do not qualify for classifications of contributing in the historic district because the buildings do not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district as defined in the Statement of Significance of the district's nomination.

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 reclassifying the properties at 2012 and 2014 Rittenhouse Square Street from contributing to non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District, pursuant to Sections 14-203(78) and 14-1004(5) of the historic preservation ordinance, because the buildings do not reflect the historical or architectural character of the District as defined in the Statement of Significance of the District's nomination.

1020-24 MARKET ST, ROBINSON STORE

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Owner: 1020-24 Market Street R

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1020-24 Market Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and J. The nomination argues that the property is a rare surviving example of the early retail work of architect Victor Gruen, now widely considered one of the most influential and significant commercial architects of the twentieth century, and his then-wife and partner, Elsie Krummeck. The nomination further argues that the Robinson store is the only example of Gruen's work in Philadelphia, and one of the only surviving Grayson-Robinson designs anywhere in the United States. In addition, the nomination asserts that the Robinson Store is locally significant for its association with the history of commerce in Center City Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1020-24 Market Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination. Patrick Grossi and Benjamin Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination. Attorney Tony Forte and preservation consultant Albert Rex represented the property owner.

Mr. Grossi stated that the Preservation Alliance submitted the nomination for the property which is a unique and significant example of Philadelphia's Mid-Century Modern architectural heritage. He noted that the property is also reflective of national trends, and opined that the nomination makes a clear and convincing argument that the property merits listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Grossi summarized the Criteria for Designation cited in the nomination, stating that the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by a

distinctive architectural style, was designed by an architectural firm of national impact, and exemplifies a dynamic period in cultural and economic evolution of Philadelphia's most important commercial corridor.

Mr. Forte stated that he and his client had submitted a letter with a discussion of their numerous reasons for opposing the designation. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Forte to summarize their arguments as briefly as possible. Mr. Forte distributed the letter to the nominators. Mr. Rex stated that the nomination is well researched, written, and documented. He argued that although the nomination does an excellent job discussing the building's period of design, his primary concern from a preservation standpoint is the building's lack of integrity. He noted that the building is mostly significant for its main façade, as the rest of the building is an earlier, nineteenth-century building, upon which the façade was added in 1946. He stated that when added, no windows were included in the main elevation, as it was seen as a 70 foot tall billboard. He opined that the Robinson sign was a critical component of the design's significance. Mr. Rex noted that the façade's curl at the base to create a podium-like setting with jewel box storefronts is obscured and that the jewel box storefronts have been missing for a long time. He argued that the façade was impacted by the removal of the storefronts as early as 1958, when the storefront started changing its appearance. He reiterated his opinion that the façade does not retain enough integrity. He conceded that, historically the building was an interesting representation of the period, but argued that it no longer conveys that significance. He opined that the property has also lost context on Market Street. He noted that the history of Market Street, East Market in particular, is important, but opined that this property is a very small snapshot in time of that history. Likewise, he opined, the building is not representative of the best work of the architects, who were a couple when the building was designed, but divorced soon after, with the firm being reconstituted under a different name. He noted that architect Victor Gruen went on to become the father of the American shopping center, and Robinson's went bankrupt. Mr. Rex reiterated that the building is a snapshot in time. He noted that some of the nearly one million mosaic tiles on the façade are missing, and that there are signage anchors attached to the elevation. He opined that good preservation is good planning, and questioned how this property would fit into the context of a revitalized Market Street.

Mr. Forte stated that this property is a tremendous obstacle to redevelopment. He noted that this stretch of Market Street is a historic retail district for Philadelphia that has fallen on difficult times. He conveyed that the City has been working very hard for over seven years to redevelop this district to connect the Convention Center to areas to the south. He stated that City agencies including City Planning and other organizations have been working together with the new owners, Pennsylvania Real Estate Investment Trust (PREIT), to redevelop this area. He described other development projects in the area, including the Gallery and the project at the Girard Estate site. He stated that PREIT purchased this block at the urging of City agencies because the block is not performing at the level the City or the national retailers want it to be. He argued that the building could not be located worse in terms of being an impediment to the redevelopment of the district, as it is a five-story blank wall in the middle of a block. He stated that he cannot imagine how to redevelop the property, as he cannot imagine building marketable space behind the blank wall. He noted that he does not want to have the property designated and then have to come back to ask permission to demolish it almost immediately. He concluded that the elevation, which was once a sign, is now just a backdrop to a sign; a weighty blank wall, no longer recognizable for what once made it great. He reiterated opposition to the designation.

Mr. Grossi responded that he does not believe that a "perceived obstacle to redevelopment" is germane to the Committee's discussion, and that they are at the Committee to discuss the

merits of this building as presented in the nomination. Ms. Cooperman agreed. Mr. Grossi noted that, despite the loss of signage and slight alterations to the ground floor, the building does retain integrity in terms of its most character-defining features.

Ms. Cooperman stated that it is not the Committee's purview to wade into economic matters. Mr. Forte responded that he understood, but wanted for everyone to understand the impact of a designation.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Aaron Wunsch, professor of historic preservation at the University of Pennsylvania, stated that one of the issues with this building is that it is not representative of Victor Gruen's work, but in many ways, from an architectural history perspective, that is what makes it interesting. He opined that this building is representative of Victor Gruen before he gave up on downtown, a period when Gruen had an urban vision, that later gets woven into his mall vision in an interesting and complicated way. Secondly, he continued, there is no question that the signage was an important part of the façade, but proffered that there is no question that the PSFS sign on the PSFS building is a major part of that building, but that no one would argue that building would no longer be worthy of designation even if that sign was missing.

Mr. Leech commented that the Gruen connection is not just tangential. He stated that he recognized while researching the building that Gruen's later work came from buildings like this one. Gruen, Mr. Leech argued, was trying out new ideas that thrust him into the national spotlight, and were taken up by other architects. He opined that Gruen inspired a style of architecture that became representative of an era. He noted that not only Gruen's malls are significant; Gruen was designing very small boutique stores in Europe before coming to the United States, and this property is in that continuum of design. He stated that he cannot deny that the sign is gone or that the ground floor has been altered, but opined that the building is still recognizable for its original design. He noted that he recently led a bike tour of mid-century modern architecture in Philadelphia, and that people were intrigued by this building in particular. He suggested that the building might not be placed well for one vision of redevelopment, but is perfectly placed for an alternative vision of redevelopment that recognizes the attraction that people have to architecture of this era is only going to grow.

Mr. Schaaf lauded the nomination, noting that he was hanging on every page because the information was so fascinating. He stated that he had not known the Victor Gruen connection. He noted that, when he first came to Philadelphia when he was in his early 20s, this building captured his attention immediately, and he could not decide whether it was delightful or frightening, but either way, the building was impactful. He noted that what he recently learned about Victor Grünbaum, who grew up in Vienna, was a student of Peter Behrens, carrying on the legacy of profound architectural attention to this building. He suggested that when presented with a resource such as this, the Historical Commission should take note. He expressed his understanding that this building is challenging, but opined that, to actually imagine a building associated with it and which would complement it, would be an architect's dream. He opined that the building is a delightful discovery. He noted that there is one other similar building in Los Angeles, which is compromised far beyond this building, and that the Commission should pay attention to the resource presented to them, and designate the building.

Mr. Lavery agreed that it is an incredible building, opining that the fact that the building represents a very narrow window in time does not detract from its significance. Additionally, he argued that one of the key features of the building is as a sign front. He lamented the lack of evening photographs of the property, but noted that the neon sign and glass front display cases

would have been designed to attract evening shoppers and walkers, even after hours, as they would have been illuminated. Between 1945 and 1960, he noted, a stroll downtown illuminated by neon from this building and the adjacent movie theater, was part of the cultural package, and the building was designed to promote that. He suggested that with some creative neon, the sign would be a fairly simple thing to replace for whatever new business or entity occupies the building. He expressed his wholehearted support for the building, and congratulated the nominator on presenting the building in a national and international context. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that it is a fantastic nomination that covers each narrative extremely well. She offered one minor suggestion to more explicitly discuss the 1930s arrival of this group of architects and designers from Europe. She noted that in the overall narrative of Modernism as it emerges after the war, it is important that these people are on the ground already in Philadelphia by the 1930s. She commented that the PSFS was not the only Modern building being constructed. Ms. Cooperman stated that one of the challenges of Modernism for many people is the conundrum of minimalism. She stated that the form of the building is intact, and that one might argue that form is the most important character-defining feature when discussing minimalism.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1020-24 Market Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, E, and J.

5129-35 FRANKFORD AVE, PENN FRUIT

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Owner: Rite Aid of Pennsylvania

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5129-35 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the arched-roof supermarket, constructed in 1955, possesses significant character, interest, and value as part of the development of Philadelphia in the postwar era, exemplifies the legacy of the Penn Fruit Company as a major innovator in the supermarket industry, reflects the environment of the postwar era characterized by the popularity of exaggerated modernism, and embodies the distinguishing characteristics of the supermarket as a building type uniquely emblematic of this era and style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5129-35 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Patrick Grossi and Benjamin Leech represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Mr. Grossi asked the Committee to table the review of the nomination. He explained that the Preservation Alliance has met with representatives of the Frankford CDC and the current tenant. They are not opposed to the nomination, but are in the midst of a market analysis, and would like more time to understand what historic designation would mean for the work that is already underway. Ellie Devyatkin, the Commercial Corridor Manager for the Frankford CDC, concurred with the request that the nomination be tabled. She explained that Holiday Thriftway currently occupies the building, and is the only supermarket in Frankford. She stated that they would like time to explore implications of designation and how it could affect development opportunities

around the parcel. The Frankford CDC has commissioned a study to assess transit-oriented-development opportunities at this location. They would also like time to determine if planned upgrades to the building would come into conflict with historic designation. Lastly, the Frankford CDC would like time to present different development scenarios to the community. She noted that the CDC has met with the Preservation Alliance and the Historical Society of Frankford.

Mr. Farnham commented that historic designation is a two-step process. First, the Committee on Historic Designation assesses the technical merits of the nomination. Second, the Commission assesses the Committee's recommendation and, if the Commission finds that the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation, it then determines whether it is good policy for the City to designate a property. The concerns expressed by the Frankford CDC and the Preservation Alliance appear to relate to policy question, not the technical merits question. He suggested that the Committee could move forward with its analysis of the merits of the nomination as proposed today, and then allow the Commission to consider tabling. He noted that the Committee itself does not have the authority to outright table a nomination; rather, that decision is made by Commission. He commented that, no matter how the review progresses at this meeting, whether there is a recommendation to table or whether the Committee reviews the merits and then takes into account the request to table, it should not impede discussions in community. Mr. Grossi responded that, if the Committee would like to proceed and offer a recommendation, they understand and will make the tabling request to the full Commission. Mr. Lavery asked whether the Committee would have to review the nomination again, if it votes to recommend designation. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee would not have to review the nomination again. Mr. Leech commented that if there are any concerns about the merits of the nomination itself, he asks that it gets remanded back to the Committee for review. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission can remand it back to the Committee if there are questions about the technical aspects of the nomination.

The Committee members stated that the nomination is well-written and cogently demonstrates that the property satisfies the cited Criteria.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment, of which there was none.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5129-35 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

6901 CASTOR AVE, OTT CAMERA

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Owner: Robert and Maureen Ott

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6901 Castor Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The nomination argues that the commercial building, designed by architect Allan A. Berkowitz in 1955 for Ott Camera, is significant as an intact structural glass shopfront in the "Main Street Modernism" style, as an example of integrated architectural signage, and as an example of the role product advertising played in the dissemination of commercial modernism.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6901 Castor Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Patrick Grossi and Benjamin Leech represented the nomination.

Mr. Grossi read from a letter received that morning from Martin Treu, author of *Signs, Streets and Storefronts*: “The building is one of America’s finest examples of modernism along Main Street, and is perhaps even in the top five extant examples in the nation. It may very well be my favorite in America, and must be preserved at all costs.”

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Kathy Dowdell stated that she appreciates the fact that the Commission is considering designations of buildings outside of Center City.

Ms. Cooperman asked about recent alterations to the building. Mr. Grossi confirmed that a second-story window was replaced, two ground-floor neon signs were removed, and an awning was installed over the main entrance. Ms. Cooperman asked when the work was undertaken. Mr. Grossi responded that he was not entirely sure exactly when the work was done. Mr. Farnham responded that the work was done without a building permit, and the Commission staff has requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect and issue a violation if warranted.

Mr. Lavery commented that it is an excellent nomination and a worthy building, and that being able to place it in an international context is remarkable. He noted two minor edits, those being that Cottman should be Avenue instead of Boulevard, and that it should be the Philadelphia Rapid Transit instead of Philadelphia Trolley Company. Ms. Cooperman asked about 194X. Mr. Leech responded that it is a term used during World War II to describe the period after the war. Ms. Cooperman stated that the nomination was very well executed.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6901 Castor Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

1132-40 N. FRONT ST, DOUGHERTY BONDED WAREHOUSE

Nominator: Kensington & Olde Richmond Heritage, LLC, Oscar Beisert
Owner: John Galdo

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1132-40 N. Front Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1864 and enlarged in 1880, is a surviving Italianate industrial facility in Northern Liberties, significant for its function as a bonded warehouse and its association with pre-Prohibition rye whisky distilling.

The property owner was preparing plans for the residential redevelopment of the building including constructing a one-story addition and stair tower. The plans were reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 24 May 2016 and will be reviewed by the Historical Commission on 10 June 2016.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132-40 N. Front Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf inquired whether the Architectural Committee can review a building that has not yet been designated. Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over a nominated property begins as of the date of written notice to the property owner that a nomination will be considered. The Department of Licenses & Inspections must forward all building permit applications for the property received on and after the date of the mailing of the notice to the Historical Commission for review. The Architectural Committee recently reviewed an application for the property in question and recommended for approval with some modifications, to which the property owner agreed.

Andrew Fearon voiced his support for the nomination and commented that designation would aid in protecting the city's rapidly disappearing industrial heritage.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the property owner or a representative was present. Mr. Farnham explained that, although no one representing the property is present at today's meeting, the Historical Commission's staff met with representatives of the property owner, who indicated that they are aware of the nomination and its review process.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1132-40 N. Front Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J.

4046, 4048, 4050, 4052, 4054 AND 4056 CHESTNUT ST

Nominators: Aaron Wunsch, Elizabeth Stegner, Oscar Beisert

Owners: 4046-48 Chestnut Street LP (4046 and 4048 Chestnut Street)

DPL Properties LP (4050 and 4052 Chestnut Street)

Off Penn Properties LLC (4054 Chestnut Street)

Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania; 40th St Live Assoc. LP (4056 Chestnut Street)

OVERVIEW: These nominations propose to designate the properties at 4046, 4048, 4050, 4052, 4054 and 4056 Chestnut Street as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nominations contend that the "restrained interpretation of the Italianate" twins satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G and J. The nominations argue that the twins, constructed between 1869-72 as part of the Thomas H. Powers development consisting of 4046-60 Chestnut Street, are a group of houses that have significant value as part of the development of the twin housing type and the formation of West Philadelphia as a suburb for white-collar commuters. The nominations further contend that the twins are part of and related to a distinctive area, owing to their listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing resource within the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District.

Regarding 4046 and 4048 Chestnut Street, the property owner submitted a demolition permit application for the complete demolition of this twin to the Department of Licenses & Inspections on 17 March 2016, nearly two months prior to the receipt of the nomination by the Historical Commission. The Historical Commission has no authority to review or intervene in the work proposed under this permit, which was issued on 26 May 2016.

Regarding 4050 and 4052 Chestnut Street, the property owner submitted a demolition permit application for the complete demolition of this twin to the Department of Licenses & Inspections on 16 May 2016, the same day that the Historical Commission notified the property owner of the consideration of the nomination, initiating its jurisdiction over the property. The Department may not issue the demolition permit without the Historical Commission's review and approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nominations demonstrate that the properties at 4046, 4048, 4050, 4052, 4054 and 4056 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, but not Criterion G. The staff suggests that Criterion G, which reads "Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif," should be reserved for squares, parks or truly unique and distinctive areas.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nominations to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert, Aaron Wunsch and Elizabeth Stegner represented the nominations. No one represented the property owners of 4046, 4048, 4050 or 4052 Chestnut Street. Eapen Kalathil of Off Penn Properties attended as the owner of 4054 Chestnut Street. Attorney Laurence Mester represented the master lessee of 4056 Chestnut Street.

Mr. Wunsch stated that he lives in this neighborhood and wrote the architectural description for the nominations. He stated that he did so because he is distressed about the loss of historic nineteenth-century fabric in his neighborhood. He stated that he would like to stop this kind of demolition. Ms. Stegner stated that she is the president of the University City Historical Society, and she would like to rewrite Criterion J to use "and" instead of "or." She stated that West Philadelphia is unique, and contains the greatest number of intact Victorian buildings in the United States. She stated that more of the neighborhood needs to be designated, and the Historical Society will be nominating more West Philadelphia properties in the future.

Mr. Mester, the attorney representing the master lessee of 4056 Chestnut Street, stated that his client has a long-term lease for this property. He stated that there is a failure to connect the dots between the history of the area and the history of construction with the actual buildings themselves, and he questioned the lack of substantive architectural ornament on the building. He stated that the nomination states that these buildings are refined versions of a standard Philadelphia style. He opined that these buildings do not constitute a significant architectural style or one that is unique to the particular area, and a historic designation would be misplaced. He noted that the buildings have been altered. He stated that what separates these buildings from the ones already reviewed at this meeting is the "wow factor." This is not the Ott Camera building, nor is it the façade of a Robinson's building on Market Street, nor does it have the architectural uniqueness of the Columbia Singing Society or the PECO Delaware Station. He stated that the twins do not possess distinctive architecture, and noted that the nomination does not identify an architect. He stated that the nomination focuses heavily on Thomas Powers, the original owner, who was a chemist and not an architect, and is not known for his building prowess. He noted that the buildings are situated in the University City District, an area that has undergone enormous change over the last two decades. He stated that he is sensitive to the fact that many older buildings have been demolished, and, in fact, the two twins in this row have already been demolished and an apartment building constructed in their place, but this is the nature of change in the area. He summarized that the historic importance of the buildings has been overstated in the nomination, and he requested that the Committee recommend to not designate the properties.

Eapen Kalathil, the owner of 4054 Chestnut Street, commented that Thomas Powers used the buildings as rentals, as they are used today. He stated that he likes that his building is simple. He stated that the building has been altered over time, including window replacement, lowering of the roof, removal of original chimneys, door, front dormer, and steps, and reworking of the masonry at the front of the building. He stated that he is saddened to see the demolition of great buildings that are replaced with cardboard boxes, but he opined that his building has been too altered to qualify for historic designation. He asked about 4058 and 4060, the twins to the west, which were not included in the nominations. Mr. Beisert responded that the long-term goal would be to nominate those as well.

Ms. Broadbent clarified that there are active demolition permits for 4046 and 4048.

Mr. Beisert claimed that Thomas Powers and his partner William Weightman were significant real estate developers, who developed projects all over the city.

Ms. Cooperman asked if there are any property owners or representatives for 4046, 4048, 4050 or 4052 Chestnut Street present who wish to speak. No one came forward.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment.

Aaron Wunsch commented that it is a valid argument that these buildings are not great individual works of architecture, and these buildings are not the known works of a noted architect. However, he opined that they are representative of the best urban fabric of the area. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance, seconded Mr. Wunsch's comments. He stated that the nominations stem from the state of demolition in West Philadelphia. He opined that the merits of the nomination are strong, and stated that the Preservation Alliance supports the designation of these properties. Hal Schirmer, the attorney for the University City Historical Society, stated that the buildings are good representations of the urban fabric of the neighborhood and should be protected. Justin Rocznik, a tenant at 4052 Chestnut Street, commented that the buildings may not have the "wow factor" but they are well preserved and are representative of the neighborhood. He stated that he cannot imagine the block of Chestnut Street without them, and he supports the historic designation. Ben Leech commented that the buildings exist in a unique position in what was once envisioned as a historic district. He stated that they are located in the far northeast corner of what was proposed as a boundary for the historic district, and are therefore a gateway to the district.

Ms. Cooperman asked about ownership of the gates between the twins. Mr. Wunsch explained that the property lines run down the middles of the gates.

Mr. Beisert questioned Criterion G, and asked if it is reserved for landscape features. Mr. Farnham responded that Criterion G is cited very infrequently. The staff has considered that Criterion G is applicable to a park or urban planning feature, like Rittenhouse Square, or a property that is somehow associated with the planning feature, for example the buildings surrounding Rittenhouse Square that help to form the street wall around the Square. He stated that the staff disagrees with an interpretation that any building within a National Register district satisfies Criterion G.

Mr. Mester commented that he is further concerned that some proposed significance is tied to things unrelated to the buildings themselves. He stated that the Committee should look at the buildings themselves and determine whether or not they are significant architecturally, instead of simply designating buildings because the surrounding area is changing. Ms. Cooperman

responded that the Committee will evaluate the designation based on the merits of the nomination.

Ms. Stegner commented that the staff overview mentioned that the demolition permit for 4046 and 4048 Chestnut Street was applied for in March 2016, but that someone at the Department of Licenses & Inspections told her it was applied for on 24 May 2016, with an accelerated review, and was approved on 26 May 2016. She stated that the nominations were submitted on 10 May 2016. Mr. Farnham responded that the dates Ms. Stegner obtained from an inspector at the Department of Licenses & Inspections are incorrect. He stated that he confirmed with the Department that the demolition applications for 4046 and 4048 Chestnut Street were submitted on 17 March 2016, predating the submission of the nomination and predating the notice letter to the property owner. The mailing of the notice letter initiates the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. He continued that, if that demolition permit application is valid and a permit is issued under that application, the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction to review it, and the demolition may proceed without the Commission's intervention. He commented that, if there are questions about the validity of the permit application, the Department of Licenses & Inspections will determine whether the permit is valid, not the Commission. He stated that the demolition permit applications for 4050 and 4052 Chestnut Street were submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections on 16 May 2016, the same day that the Commission mailed notice of the consideration of the nominations to the property owner; no demolition permits will be issued for those properties under those demolition permit applications unless and until the Historical Commission approves them. Ms. Stegner thanked Mr. Farnham for clarifying.

Mr. Schaaf commented that it is difficult to look at these buildings two at a time, because all together they establish a streetscape, similar perhaps to Portico Row. Mr. Lavery commented that it would be dangerous for the Committee to say these buildings do not have a wow factor. He continued that, if the Committee was told in 1960 that the city would not have any movie palaces remaining today, the Committee would have thought it was crazy. He stated that the Committee cannot just say that there are plenty of these types of buildings, so these particular buildings are not important. On the contrary, they are the DNA of Philadelphia buildings. Ms. Cooperman agreed.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nominations demonstrate that the properties at 4046, 4048, 4050, 4052, 4054 and 4056 Chestnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, and J.

339 E. WISTER ST

Nominator: Oscar Beisert and J.M. Duffin

Owner: Twin Enterprise, LLC.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 339 E. Wister Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination argues that the property, constructed as a country seat in three phases beginning in 1797, is important for its association with several prominent figures: Martin Godfrey Dorfeuille, a French educator and entrepreneur, who built the original residence when Germantown was gaining popularity as a resort for wealthy Philadelphians; Tench Coxe, an important Philadelphia merchant and politician, who resided at the property as a tenant; and Jeremiah Hacker and Beulah Morris-Hacker, two prominent Quakers responsible for the phased enlargement of the building and for

the incorporation of distinctive Philadelphia features, such as the broken-pitch, side-gable, gambrel roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 339 E. Wister Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Mr. Beisert discussed the building's distinct architectural features and recounted his experience visiting the site and first discovering the gambrel form at the rear of the building. He drew a comparison to Cedar Grove, the property where former owner Beulah Morris was raised. Mr. Beisert remarked on the photographs provided in the nomination that show the property's changes over time. He added that the building exhibits an architecture of nostalgia embodied in the gambrel roof, which was out of fashion by the time of construction.

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

Ms. Cooperman stated that the nomination offered good documentation on the property's history. However, she cautioned against referring to the design as architecture of nostalgia, stating that the building's architectural elements are more an expression of identity for the owners and not elements of something that had been lost. She also expressed concern over the building's loss of fabric. Mr. Schaaf noted that the form is still evident, and Ms. Cooperman agreed that the form, envelope, and fenestration patterns do exist. Mr. Beisert noted several changes in material and use that occurred during the building's history.

Mr. Lavery inquired about the change in grade along Wister Street, and Mr. Duffin replied that the grade had not changed but that Sheldon Street had been cut through at a later date. Mr. Duffin commented that the general architectural form created by the Hacker and Morris families still exists today. He also remarked that, while he was aware of some late-eighteenth-century buildings located on side streets within Northwest Philadelphia, he assumed they had all been identified. He expressed his interest in the history of development by the Hacker family, who he stated were locally significant figures involved in the 1830s movement of Quakers to Germantown. The Hacker family, Mr. Duffin continued, owned neighboring properties, and relatives built other houses in Germantown. He added that the family was part of the new Quaker identity burgeoning in the eighteenth-century borough in the middle of the nineteenth century. Mr. Beisert noted that, since submitting the nomination, he has confirmed that the property was named Woodside from the time of its construction.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 339 E. Wister Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

2503 W. OXFORD ST, MALCOLM X HOUSE

Nominator: All That Philly Jazz, Faye Anderson and Oscar Beisert
Owner: Ida Mae Vacca

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2503 W. Oxford Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that

the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that the property is significant due to its association with Malcolm X, whose leadership in the Nation of Islam laid the foundation for the growth of orthodox Islam among African Americans in the City of Philadelphia. Called the Unity House, or Fruit House, the property served as a boarding facility for single male members of the Nation of Islam in the early 1950s, and is where, according to oral accounts, Malcolm X resided for a short time while he established a local temple for the organization.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination does not demonstrate that the property at 2503 W. Oxford Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. After conducting additional research, the staff contends that the nomination insufficiently documents both Malcolm X's residence at the property and the building's use by the Nation of Islam as a Fruit House. The staff is prepared to discuss its findings with the Committee, if further clarification is desired.

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

Mr. Beisert clarified that he wrote the architectural description and contributed to the neighborhood context. He stated that Faye Anderson conducted the majority of the research for the nomination, but could not be present at the meeting.

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

Ms. Cooperman asked for clarification of the staff recommendation. Ms. Keller directed the Committee members to a page in the nomination and stated that while the nomination refutes the address recorded by the FBI, federal investigators had placed Malcolm X under surveillance to determine whether he was in violation of his parole. Ms. Keller noted that the FBI recorded Malcolm X as residing at 1522 N. 26th Street, and emphasized that it serves as documentation during the period in question. The nomination, she continued, provides only two oral accounts to place Malcolm X at the W. Oxford Street address. The first account, Ms. Keller stated, is given by a descendant of a former property owner, who purchased the property two years after Malcolm X purportedly lived in the building. Ms. Keller indicated that the staff found the secondary account to be insufficient in confirming Malcolm X's residence. The second source, Ms. Keller continued, came from a 2011 documentary film titled *Seeds of Awakening: The Rise of Islam in Philadelphia*. She read a statement from the film that was given by Brother Richard Hassan, in which he identifies the W. Oxford Street building as being the house where he and others would gather with Malcolm X. Ms. Keller noted that no date or time period is offered by Hassan and that the statement does not offer definitive evidence that Malcolm X resided at the property when he spent several months establishing the temple in Philadelphia. She indicated that the statement could refer to Malcolm X's brief visits at later dates and commented that the statement is not specific enough to serve as documentation to justify a nomination.

Ms. Cooperman stated her concern about the sources, and Mr. Beisert responded that additional research could be conducted. Mr. Schaaf inquired whether the period in question is March through August 1954. Ms. Keller responded that Malcolm X left Philadelphia for New York in May or June of 1954.

Ms. Cooperman raised several questions: Is 2503 W. Oxford Street is the only property meaningfully associated with Malcolm X's time in Philadelphia? Was 2503 W. Oxford Street

Malcolm X's residence, or was it associated with some other event? She observed that there are enough open questions pertaining to the events that a determination cannot be made.

Mr. Lavery inquired about the building's role as a Fruit House. Mr. Farnham replied that there are differing accounts, and that the nomination primarily relies on a statement given in a 2011 documentary. From this statement, he continued, it is not entirely clear that this is the property where Malcolm X resided for four months. Mr. Farnham added that FBI records provide a different address, and other published accounts offer other addresses, so a great deal of ambiguity exists. Mr. Farnham stated that the building where Malcolm X established the original Nation of Islam temple in Philadelphia still stands at 1643 N. Bailey Street. The building is now occupied by a church. Mr. Farnham suggested that the property on N. Bailey Street may be investigated as a better material artifact from Malcolm X's contribution to the cultural and religious history of the area.

Ms. Cooperman acknowledged that further documentation may not be possible, and this issue is endemic in African American history. Oral accounts are particularly crucial, she continued, but more published evidence would be preferable.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination for 2503 W. Oxford Street to allow for revisions and to remand it back to the Committee on Historic Designation if additional evidence is provided.

1026-28 BELMONT AVENUE, ENGINE COMPANY NO. 16

Nominator: University City Historical Society, Andrew Cushing and Oscar Beisert

Owner: Evangelistic Temple of I Am Inc.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1026-28 Belmont Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former firehouse satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. The nomination argues that the property, constructed in 1895, is significant as a representation of the Italian Renaissance Revival style as interpreted by important late-nineteenth century architect John T. Windrim.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1026-28 Belmont Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. The staff also recommends that the Committee comment on the condition and the building's capacity to represent its history.

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

Mr. Beisert noted that he did not write the nomination alone, but stated that he would be happy to answer any questions about the nomination. He opined that it is an important building, particularly for its location and distinctive design.

Mr. Lavery questioned the caption for the drawing on page 9 of the nomination. He noted that the primary source of the image is not included in the caption, and questioned its provenance. Mr. Beisert searched through the document, and determined that rendering was from a Philadelphia Inquirer article.

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

Ms. Cooperman commented on the condition of the building and its capacity to represent its history, noting that although it is in poor condition, it retains its major character-defining features including its openings, applied ornament, cornice, exterior, and rear windows. Mr. Schaaf agreed, opining that the building still reflects the civic pride that led to its construction. He commented that many Philadelphia buildings from this era have wonderful terra cotta representations of the seal of the City of Philadelphia, and that the seal on this property is still fully intact. He noted that Philadelphia designers often did this, and cited an excellent example on Lehigh Avenue just off of the reservoir, where two mechanical entrances to the reservoir featured the seal of Philadelphia carved in the round. He noted that the era in which this building was constructed was one of extraordinary civic pride in public works. He noted that during 2000 and 2001, the City Planning Commission showcased two emerging neighborhoods, Francisville and Belmont, and photographed landmark buildings in the communities. This property was among those featured, as a kind of civic boast.

Ms. Klein agreed, noting that many firehouses are being lost, and this property has so much potential for being repaired and saved. Ms. Klein questioned the amount of deferred maintenance, and suggested that the designation of the property may encourage the owners to conduct repairs. Ms. Cooperman responded that there certainly could be some enforcement of demolition by neglect. Ms. DiPasquale noted that there are numerous violations against the property, so the Department of Licenses & Inspections is certainly aware of the property's condition.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1026-28 Belmont Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

4704 LEIPER ST, GARSED-BROMLEY MANSION; FRANKFORD YWCA

Nominators: Joseph Menkevich, Debbie Klak, Diane Sadler
Owner: New Frankford Community

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4704 Leiper Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former mansion turned YWCA building satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J. The nomination argues that the brownstone mansion, constructed in 1866-67, displays significant characteristics of the Second Empire style of architecture. The nomination further contends that the building is associated with the lives of persons significant in the past, including John Garsed, the owner of several cotton mills in Frankford, and is an example of housing for elite mill owners who lived in the working-class neighborhood of Frankford.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4704 Leiper Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominators Joseph Menkevich and Debbie Klak represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Mr. Menkevich stated that this property is located in the Northwood section of the city, and he is the former president of the Northwood Civic Association. He stated that he got impeached because he focused too much on the history of the neighborhood. He stated that there was a great deal of conversation as to whether this building would get demolished. He opined that the Historical Commission has the ability to make it harder for people to demolish buildings, and if it is made harder, people will find ways to rehabilitate those buildings. He offered the example of Greenwood Cemetery. He also opined that nominators do not submit nominations in bad faith.

Ms. Klak stated that this mansion is the first mill owner's home that was built in Frankford, reflecting the neighborhood's historical connection to the textile industry. She stated that she has been the watchdog on this property for 10 years, and was involved in the battle when it was considered for demolition. She stated that the building is important to the integrity of the neighborhood. Mr. Menkevich commented that the building is actually in good condition, compared to some of the other buildings that have been nominated. He opined that it is a shame that money went towards the swimming pool addition rather than preservation of the house.

Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone representing the owner was present. No one came forward. Mr. Menkevich explained that it is owned by a non-profit. He stated that he expected someone from Councilwoman Maria Quiñones-Sánchez's office to attend the meeting.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. Ellie Devyatkin, Commercial Corridor Manager for the Frankford CDC, commented that there is significant community interest in this property. John Manton commented that the building is remarkable in the amount of Victorian detail that has survived. Richard Thomas, Board of Directors of the Frankford Historical Society, commented that he has been inside of the mansion, and it still has many of its original features and is worth saving.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4704 Leiper Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

1834-48 FRANKFORD AVE, MUTUAL BURIAL GROUND OF KENSINGTON

Nominator: Kenneth Milano

Owner: AVC Real Estate LLP

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the site at 1834-48 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation I. The nomination argues that a small portion of the former Mutual Burial Ground of Kensington, which was in use from roughly 1832 to 1868, may lie encapsulated under the existing garage building, constructed in the 1920s.

A demolition permit application for the complete demolition of this property was submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections on 4 April 2016, the day before the first draft of the nomination was received by the Historical Commission staff. The Historical Commission has no authority to review the existing permit, and the property owner is free to undertake any work authorized by the permit without the Commission's intervention.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation on this nomination, pending additional research.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ken Milano represented the nomination. Attorney Sean Whalen and property owner Ori Feibush represented the property.

Mr. Milano commented that the nomination speaks for itself, but that it may include a few errors, owing to his inability to access the interior of the building. He noted that the owner made him aware that there is a basement in the north of the building, and a small basement under the office on the southeast corner, as shown in a 1941 permit drawing. Mr. Milano noted that he sent that information to the staff for inclusion in the property file, but that he discovered that information subsequent to the official submission of the nomination and notification to the property owner. He noted that the 1941 permit authorized the installation of oil tanks. He noted that he spoke to the tenant in the north building, and she indicated that there is a small crawl space under that portion of the building.

Mr. Milano also pointed out the boundary shown in the nomination using the 1849 Sydney map indicates a large footprint of the cemetery; however, that boundary is misleading. He noted that the deed states that the new owner had permission to divide up the lot and cut out streets and alleys, so it was never the intention that the burial ground would be as large as the boundary extrapolated from the 1849 map. He noted that the Hopkins and Hexamer surveys were more accurate. Mr. Milano noted that the Hexamer survey from 1879 and updated in 1916 is the latest map he found. He stated that he only found mention of 200 bodies more or less being removed from the burial ground in 1914.

Mr. Milano stated that he wrote this nomination to preserve any bodies underneath the building, not to stop development or demolition, but to see if he could get an archaeological investigation to tell more about the history of the neighborhood. He noted that the cemetery was populated by many German immigrants.

Mr. Whalen directed the Committee's attention to the letter he submitted that the staff distributed to the Committee members at the start of the meeting. Mr. Whalen stated that he and his client are dismayed that this nomination was submitted in bad faith. He opined that individuals have started nominating properties not for their actual significance, but for personal animus and/or to block development in their own neighborhoods. Mr. Whalen noted that a demolition permit is already in place and demolition has commenced in earnest. He stated that there has been significant ground disturbance already for environmental remediation purposes. Mr. Whalen stated that no bodies have been found, and there has been no evidence of any bodies. He noted that Mr. Milano has written a book on burial grounds in Kensington, and claimed that Mr. Milano's book states that there is no evidence of burials in this burial ground. Mr. Whalen noted that the maps in the nomination do not show that most of the burial ground has been developed fairly recently, and that most of the site was developed as part of the Kensington High School. He noted that there are upwards of 30 developments that have taken place involving this property, and no other nominations were filed for any of those other properties. He reiterated that the nomination was submitted in bad faith, noting that it is the third time the nominator has proposed designation of a property that Mr. Feibush owns. He opined that the nomination is not timely, and is not able to prevent the demolition of the building. Mr. Whalen stated that the demolition of the property will be conducted carefully, just as with any other property. He noted that his client has retained an archaeologist from CRHS, because they are cognizant of the history of the site. He stated that if they find any bodies, there are state and local laws that obligate them to report the bodies to the police and medical examiner, who will determine

whether there was any foul play. After that, he continued, a funeral home would be enlisted to reinter all bodies elsewhere.

Mr. Whalen stated that there is not a “small” basement in the property, but rather that the basement extends down 10 to 12 feet over a significant portion of the property. He noted that the nomination does not contend that the building itself is in any way significant or should be maintained.

Mr. Whalen stated that what is most troubling is that Mr. Feibush reached out to Mr. Fearon prior to finalizing his development plans, and that Mr. Fearon told him that he would not nominate the property. Mr. Whalen claimed Mr. Fearon did not keep his word and nominated the property anyway. Ms. Cooperman apologized, but asked Mr. Whalen to summarize his discussion, and to keep his comments germane to the Committee’s review. Mr. Whalen responded that the Committee and Commission’s role is being misused by the nominators. Mr. Whalen stated that the nominators are opening themselves up to personal liability and litigation, and called for the Committee to dismiss the nomination as meritless.

Mr. Milano responded that there are many inaccuracies in Mr. Whalen’s statements. Mr. Milano clarified that he did not claim that the entire boundary extrapolated from the 1849 atlas was the burying ground, but that he actually said that that lot was broken up immediately. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee heard Mr. Milano say that. Mr. Milano responded to Mr. Whalen’s claim that Mr. Milano’s book stated there were no bodies in the burial ground, stating that neither his book nor the nomination made that claim; in fact, he continued, he noted that there was great potential for remains at this site. Mr. Milano further noted that he did not submit this nomination in malice. He stated that the property owner did not contact him prior to his filing the nomination. Mr. Milano stated that he has advocated for the community for more than 30 years, and has no history of malice and disrupting development, noting that he was one of the founders of the neighborhood development corporation. Mr. Milano stated that the recent excavations Mr. Whalen mentioned were to dig out oil tanks, and opined that the lack of bodies at that location did not mean anything, as people would not have been so cruel as to install oil tanks in the midst of human remains. Mr. Milano stated that there is plenty of evidence of burials in the cemetery overall; he personally has over 500 records. Mr. Milano stated that Mr. Fearon is not the nominator; he is a neighbor.

Mr. Feibush explained that he purchased the property roughly six months ago and since that time, aware of significant concerns from an environmental perspective, had analyzed the site with ground-penetrating radar. He stated that significant excavations have been done not just for the oil tanks, but where fuel lines may have been, and have candidly torn up the entire site on the 30% of the site that does not have a basement. The other 70% of the site, Mr. Feibush claimed, has a basement, which would extend through the area where any remains could have been found. Mr. Feibush stated that no remains have been found after months of work. He further noted that he was involved with a project immediately abutting this site, and no remains were found there either. Speaking to his effort of good will, Mr. Feibush noted that his office was recently involved with the purchase of two properties that were nominated, and that he reached out to Messrs. Milano and Fearon regarding any potential significance of this property, which to him appeared to be a crummy garage. Mr. Feibush claimed that Mr. Fearon told him that there was nothing of significance on the site. Mr. Feibush noted that, despite his attempts to reach out prior to purchasing the property, it was only after he had a material interest in the property that the nominators came forward. Mr. Feibush acknowledged that he had been considering the property from an above-ground perspective, and had not thought of the potential for a cemetery site. Mr. Feibush noted that Mr. Milano has written books on neighborhood cemeteries, and

would have been aware of these concerns much more than he was. Mr. Feibush stated that there are no archaeological remains, noting that he hired an archaeologist to be on site every day during the demolition, and is going above and beyond what is required by law. He opined that the only thing this nomination will do is to stymie the development of the property, but will do nothing to preserve what is underground. Mr. Milano responded that he went by the building the previous day and did not see any evidence of excavation in the south building, where he was told there is only a crawl space.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor Andrew Fearon stated that he is in full support of the nomination, but clarified that the earlier comments that he had told the property owner that the property had no significance was taken out of context. He noted that he had no knowledge of the burial ground on the site, and once he and Mr. Milano discovered that fact, they contacted experts in archaeology and architectural history. Mr. Fearon introduced archaeologist Jed Levin and architectural historian Aaron Wunsch to make statements as to the property's significance.

Aaron Wunsch bemoaned the tendency of property owners to impugn the motives of nominators, stating that it is not useful or productive. Mr. Wunsch stated that he is not present to debate the significance of the garage building, stating that he could not care less about the building. Rather, he continued, he wanted to speak to the significance of the cemetery. He noted that this was the type of cemetery known as a mutual or social cemetery, which is a rare breed, but was recognized as a type in the nineteenth century. He noted that these were non-denominational workingmen's cemeteries tied to the waterfront and the increasingly fluid social environment that accompanied wage labor. He noted that the earliest were established in Queen Village, but, by the 1830s, they had become an established type throughout the city. Their status as such was noted in local newspapers and later in Scharf and Westcott's history of Philadelphia published in 1884. Most or all mutual cemeteries were later removed, as they were burial places for the poor and not able to withstand urban development pressure in the way that cemeteries such as Laurel Hill or the Woodlands could. He stated that, if Kensington Mutual does indeed survive underneath the building, it could be the last remaining of its type.

Archaeologist Jed Levin stated that he was present to discuss whether the property has yielded or is likely to yield information on history or prehistory. He opined that the nomination is well written and well researched, and commended members of the community stepping forward to nominate properties they consider to be significant. He suggested that the nomination presented sufficient evidence that there was a cemetery on this property, and that there is a likelihood, although not a certainty, that there may be human remains on this property. He noted that the nomination seeks to protect those remains and the information they may carry about the community. He stated that there is ample evidence, although there is never certainty in archaeology, to suggest that there should be a proper scientific investigation of the site, and if it proves that there are no remaining burials, then so be it. He noted that there are numerous cases in Philadelphia of heavily developed properties that had formerly been burial grounds yielding human remains.

Mr. Mooney commended Mr. Milano for a thoroughly researched investigation into the cemetery. He opined that the nomination does an excellent job of tracking the development of the cemetery over time, describing how its boundaries have been altered or may have been altered over time. He stated that Mr. Milano makes the case that there was a cemetery here through documentary evidence. He noted that it is not completely clear whether there were burials on this portion of ground, but reiterated Mr. Levin's comment that archaeology is never 100% certain. He noted that the document for the removal of bodies from the site in 1914

indicates that there was still a cemetery on this property in 1914. He opined that the case has been made, based on the historical document, that there could be burials preserved on this property. As far as information on current conditions, he noted, there seems to be some difference of opinion as to how deep basements are or how fully areas have been excavated. The bottom line, he concluded, is that there was a cemetery here, and that there may still be burials. To know for sure, one must look for the remains. Either there are human remains or there are not. If there are human remains, he noted, they do have clear archaeological significance. The remains themselves can tell us what life was like for people who lived in this neighborhood during the nineteenth century, in terms of demographics of the community, how old they were upon death, what types of diseases they suffered from, the types of nutritional deficiencies they suffered from, etc. He noted that the information that the human remains could carry would not be available from any other source.

Mr. Mooney lauded the fact that the owner had hired an archaeologist, but noted that he did not know whether the archaeologist has been on site for every piece of excavation that has been done on the site. He further stated that he does not know what authority the archaeologist has in terms of directing the demolition, noting that if this was a proper archaeological investigation, the archaeologist monitor would be directing the demolition to make sure machines are not digging big holes and eliminating any evidence. He noted that, although there may have been other projects in and around the area that did not recover any human remains, it may be more accurate to say that the other projects did not report human remains. He argued that it would be easy for someone who is not trained in what to look for to miss human remains. He noted that there have been countless instances in Philadelphia where heavily disturbed, redeveloped sites within the boundaries of what had been cemeteries, still do in fact contain intact burials. He stated that there does not need to be much space for there to be a series of burials. Speaking from personal experience, Mr. Mooney gave the example of an excavation at the Second Presbyterian Church on the site of the National Constitution Center, which had had a large factory built over it in the nineteenth century, were still preserved. In a space of 15 by 20 feet, he noted, there were 49 individual burials.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Mooney to speak to potential sites relative to existing grade. Mr. Mooney responded that sites can be modified in any number of ways; they can be filled in over time, which would raise the grade over what it had been historically. He noted that he did not know what happened at this particular site. He stated that it is a popular myth that burials occur six feet down, noting that Pennsylvania law only requires burials to be below two feet deep, but it also does not prevent much deeper burials. Mr. Mooney harkened back to the Constitution Center example, noting that some of the burials on that site were as much as 11 feet deep. He reiterated that it is a matter of going out and doing the proper archaeological investigation. If there are no burials, then it will not be a great expense on the part of the developer, nor should it be any great loss of time. With professional archaeologists who know what they are doing, he noted, a proper job can be done in a timely manner.

Ms. Cooperman noted that it is her recollection that eligible sites, sites that are worthy of the Criteria, have been found below excavated basements. Mr. Mooney concurred, noting that there are numerous examples, including the vineyard potters field on North 20th Street. He noted the depth of excavation can have an impact, but does not remove all potential.

Mr. Farnham noted that there has been a complete demolition permit issued for the building in question. He noted that that application was applied for prior to the submission of the nomination or the issuance of the Commission's notice letter. As such, he continued, the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the work conducted in compliance with

that building permit; it can be undertaken without the review or intervention of the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham noted that, if the property is designated, the Commission will only have jurisdiction over subsequent building permit applications. Mr. Farnham noted that any archaeological work that may occur under the current permit is occurring at the owner's initiation, and not as a requirement of the Historical Commission.

Mr. Schaaf commented that he has trouble pinpointing exactly what resource the Historical Commission would be protecting in regards to this nomination. He noted that normally, the Historical Commission's designations are very specific. He stated that this nomination cannot explicitly show what resource, if any, the Commission would be protecting. He also noted that it is not clear how long it would take to determine what resources do exist. Ms. Cooperman responded that the wording of the Criterion is "...has yielded or may be likely to yield..." and thus the precise information is not necessary in order to designate the property. Mr. Mooney noted that it is clear that this property fell within the boundary of the Mutual Burial Ground of Kensington. Mr. Mooney noted that the issue of potential to contain artifacts is routinely applied in archaeological investigations, and has successfully been applied in all archaeological investigations for the last 50 years. He noted that this is standard as part of his day job, and this nomination clearly makes the case that there is a significant chance that burials could be contained in this property, barring, for instance, information that this property had been excavated down to 50 feet twenty years ago. Mr. Mooney noted that this is not a large property, and the process for determining if there are any intact burials on this property is relatively straightforward and is something that could be conducted in a timely manner. He noted that part of the process would be normal demolition, but with an archaeologist directing the situation once something gets exposed.

Mr. Whalen responded that the demolition of the property has already begun. He noted that his client is only planning to excavate to seven feet, so if there are any archaeological remains below seven feet or under the existing basement, they would be left intact.

Mr. Levin commented that the purpose of the nomination is to protect the property for the values for which it was nominated. He noted that if this development leaves the ground untouched, the Commission needs to protect the site so that twenty years from now, when this development is demolished and a new one goes up, the below-ground resources are protected.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1834-48 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation I.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(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.