

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

**WEDNESDAY, 29 MARCH 2013, 9:00 A.M.
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
RICHARD DILWORTH, PH.D., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D., chair
Jeffrey Cohen, Ph.D.
Bruce Lavery
David Schaaf, R.A., Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Douglas Mooney
Janet Klein

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Peter Commons
Stephan Salisbury
Mike Wolinsky, Broad Ent. Group LLC
Jon Vimr, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Christopher Mote, Hidden City
Jed Levin, Philadelphia Archeological Forum
Greg Smith
Samantha Kuntz
Jillian Knapp
Terry Buckalew
S. Korman, Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg
Bret Feldman, Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg
Aimee Landau
W. Lynette Taylor, Mother Bethel
Debbie Klak, Historical Society of Frankford
R. Thomas, Historical Society of Frankford
Richard E. Rosin
Harvey Finkle
Jacqueline J. Wiggins, ASALH
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq., The Reuter Law Firm, LLC
Rev. Mark Tyler, Mother Bethel AME Church
Allison Weiss, Happy Hollow Recreation
Theresa Stuhlman, Philadelphia Parks and Recreation

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Dilworth called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Ms. Klein and Messrs. Cohen, Lavery, Mooney, and Schaaf joined him.

2917-19 N. BROAD STREET

Joe Frazier's Gym, a.k.a. Cloverlay Gym

Owner: Broad Enterprise Group LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Joe Frazier's Gym at 2917-19 N. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The building was constructed in 1895 and converted by Henry D. Dagit & Sons into a gymnasium for former world heavyweight champion boxer Joe Frazier in 1969. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, H, and J. Joe Frazier's Gym was listed on the National Register of Historic Places on 30 April 2013.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 2917-19 N Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Leech stated that he wrote the nomination, but had collaborators. He stated that the Preservation Alliance listed the building on its *Endangered Properties List* in 2011 and the National Trust for Historic Preservation included it on its list in 2012 and designated it a National Treasure. He stated that research was conducted by students from Temple University and the University of Pennsylvania, with the support of the National Trust. Mr. Leech acknowledged the pro bono work of the Heritage Consulting Group for the National Register nomination. He thanked Carol Lee, recently retired from the Pennsylvania & Historical Commission, who supported the advancement of the nominations.

Mr. Klein asked for clarification of whether the billboard will be included in the designation. Ms. Coté stated that it would be because it is an exterior element of the building. However, if it is not historically significant, it could be removed.

Mr. Cohen asked about the side elevations. Ms. Coté explained that the side elevations are former party walls and could be altered in compatible ways because their current appearances have no historical significance.

Mr. Laverty stated that he appreciated that this site has social and cultural significance, and not only architectural significance, which is more typical of nominated sites. He opined that this building would not be designated if nominated on its architectural merits. He stated that the nomination made a great case for designation and commended Mr. Leech for his nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that the property at 2917-19 N Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2340 CECIL B. MOORE AVENUE

Dox Thrash House

Owner: Muhammad Ali Hasan

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Dox Thrash House at 2340 Cecil B. Moore Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The rowhouse was designed by Harold Godwin and constructed in 1895. It was the home of Dox Thrash, a distinguished African American printmaking artist, from 1944 to 1959. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 2340 Cecil B. Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Leech informed the Committee that this property was listed on the Preservation Alliance's 2011 endangered list. He stated that the nomination was written by a Preservation Alliance intern, Chelsea Troppauer, who is a graduate student in the Historic Preservation Program at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Lavery stated that he did not agree that the development of North Philadelphia was a result of a rowhouse building boom fanning out from North Broad Street, as the nomination claimed. He stated that the development progressed in a northerly direction along the street car lines, rather than moving east and west from N. Broad Street, the spine that runs up through North Philadelphia. He stated that he also disagreed that Godwin was a "notable" architect. He stated that, despite his decades of work in Philadelphia's architectural history, he was not aware of Goodwin before reading this nomination. He may have been a fine architect, but he is not a "notable" architect.

Messrs. Lavery and Schaaf made some suggestions for grammatical and technical corrections.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved recommend that the property at 2340 Cecil B. Moore Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2501-15 S. MARSHALL STREET

Stiffel Senior Center, a.k.a. Jewish Education Center #2

Owner: Temple Housing Associates

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Stiffel Senior Center at 2501-15 S. Marshall Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. The building was designed by Frank E. Hahn and constructed in 1928 as an educational center for South

Philadelphia's Jewish community. The building later served as a Jewish Y and ultimately a senior center. It was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 2004.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 2501-15 S. Marshall Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Ms. Coté noted that the Commission had received a petition supporting the nomination as well as several letters of support.

Mr. Leech commended Sharon Reid, who wrote the nomination as a volunteer for the Preservation Alliance.

Ms. Klein suggested that the property satisfies Criterion F, as well, for its details, materials, and design. Mr. Cohen stated that he did not think the materials and design were particularly innovative for 1928. He stated that they are interesting, but not necessarily innovative for the time.

The Committee members made note of the need for some grammatical and technical corrections.

Richard Rosin, an attorney and a member of the Friends of Stiffel, stated that the group was formed in 1985 after the building was gutted by a fire. He stated that the group organized an annual fundraising dinner, which raised money for programming for the senior center. He stated that his wife taught art classes at the center for 28 years. Mr. Rosin stated that the building originally served as a Hebrew school that hosted activities for the community. He stated that the building was named the Stiffel Center in 1986 upon a generous donation from the Stiffel family to fund the rebuilding of the interior of the center after the fire. Mr. Rosin described the Senior Center as a second home for the local Jewish community and a source of pride for the neighborhood. He asked the Committee to recommend that the Commission designate this building as historic and protect it.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the property at 2501-15 S. Marshall Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1525 CHESTNUT STREET

A. Pomerantz & Co. Building

Owner: TGDGME Chestnut LLC

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the A. Pomerantz & Co. Building at 1525 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation F. Designed by Edwin P. Simon and David B. Bassett and constructed in 1917, the diminutive skyscraper for A.

Pomerantz & Co., a stationary and printing business, is architecturally significant and includes an innovative, unusual four-story glass curtain wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 1525 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation F and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the building is magnificent and extraordinarily handsome. He stated that the section titled “The Pomerantz Building in Context” seemed to make exaggerated claims. He suggested editing that the section. Mr. Dilworth stated that the section adds to the argument about this building’s design as an innovation. Mr. Lavery stated that he thought the section does not strengthen the case, but confuses it. Mr. Cohen agreed that the section should be abbreviated. Mr. Lavery stated that the nomination is strong enough without this section. Mr. Schaaf concurred that it could be edited.

Mr. Dilworth asked why Criteria for Designation D and H were not included in the Statement of Significance. Mr. Farnham agreed that arguments could be made that the building satisfies both of those Criteria. He stated that he wrote the nomination rather narrowly to point out its satisfaction of Criterion F. Mr. Farnham stated that the building is primarily important as an innovative example of skyscraper design, even though it is technically too short to be considered a skyscraper. Mr. Cohen stated that Criterion D would also apply, but not Criterion H as Mr. Dilworth had suggested. He stated that he is not convinced that this building is or was generally perceived as a familiar landmark.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved to recommend that the property at 1525 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and F, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

125 N. 10TH STREET

Chinatown YMCA, a.k.a. Chinese Cultural and Community Center

Owner: Chinatown Building and Education Foundation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Chinatown YMCA, also known as the Chinese Cultural and Community Center, at 125 N. 10th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, H, and J. Originally constructed about 1832, the rowhouse was redesigned by Taiwanese architect Yang Chou-Cheng in the late 1960s in the style of a Mandarin palace to serve as the Chinatown Y.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 125 N. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nomination.

Mr. Lavery asked if there was a connection between this building and the 1967 Exposition pavilion. Mr. Leech stated that there is a traditional assumption that architectural elements from the 1967 Exposition were reused for this building. He stated that this could not be confirmed; however, the pavilion was designed by the same architect.

Mr. Schaaf observed that, although this building served as a Y, there is no mention of any YMCA activities in the nomination. Mr. Leech stated that he had no knowledge of any exercise facilities in the building. He stated that the founder of the organization that erected this building was associated with the YMCA and established it as a Y, but it was ultimately used as a cultural facility.

Mr. Lavery stated that it is important to note that, when the Historical Commission was designated buildings in this neighborhood 30 and 40 years ago, it did not include this building because of its alterations. He stated that he was glad to see that the Commission is considering this building and buildings like it now.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the property at 125 N. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

15-21 S. 11TH STREET

Horn & Hardart Building

Owner: Morish Gabbay

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Horn & Hardart Building at 15-21 S. 11th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, and J. It designed and constructed in 1912 by William Steele & Sons. It is clad with polychromatic glazed terra cotta.

The nomination places William Steele & Sons in a class with Louis Sullivan, Daniel Burnham, and Cass Gilbert. William Steele & Sons was an early, locally-significant design-build firm, which erected many industrial buildings, but its significance does not rival that of Sullivan, Burnham, or Gilbert. The staff concurs with the nomination that the property meets Criteria for Designation E, F, and J, but disagrees with some of the statements equating William Steele & Sons with the iconic architects of the turn-of-the-century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 15-21 S. 11th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and Jon Vimr represented the nomination.

Mr. Vimr stated that he wrote the nomination under the guidance of Mr. Leech and the Preservation Alliance. Mr. Vimr clarified that he was not trying to equate the importance of William Steele & Sons with those iconic turn-of-the-century architects. He stated that, rather, he was trying to provide a temporal context and examples of stylistic and material influences on Steele & Sons.

Mr. Schaaf noted that sculptor Samuel Murray, in addition to Alexander Milne Calder, sculpted some of the ornament on the Witherspoon Building.

Mr. Dilworth asked if the Horn & Hardart interior is extant. Mr. Vimr stated that the interior has been changed. Mr. Lavery asked if any evidence of the D'Ascenzo glass survives. Mr. Vimr stated that he was unaware of any evidence.

The Committee made suggestions for grammatical and technical corrections.

Mr. Cohen suggested removing Criterion E from the nomination. Ms. Klein agreed. Mr. Lavery disagreed. He stated that, although Steele & Sons, was not Louis Sullivan or Cass Gilbert, the firm had a major impact on the City of Philadelphia. He stated that the firm did, in fact, significantly influence the architecture of the city. He stated that some of their projects are significant enough to be considered influential. Mr. Vimr stated that the firm designed and built a great number of buildings in and around Philadelphia. Mr. Lavery stated that the Steele System of buying a property, designing a building, constructing it, and then turning the property over to the client is also significant. Mr. Schaaf concurred.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the property at 15-21 S. 11th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, F, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

838½ N. 42ND STREET

St. Petri Evangelical German Lutheran Church, a.k.a. Community Church of God

Owner: Community Church of God

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate St. Petri Evangelical German Lutheran Church at 838½ N. 42nd 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 German-speaking congregation was founded by Christian F. Welden, a prominent Lutheran minister. The church complex consists of two interconnected buildings erected during three phases of construction. The original chapel was constructed in 1872. Architect Emil H.C. Hartmann designed the main church. The ground floor of the main church was erected in 1895. The main church was completed in 1906 to revised designs by the architectural firm of Durhing, Okie & Ziegler.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 838½ N. 42nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Lavery stated that this is a strong nomination and that the buildings are amazing. He stated that the nomination reads like a church history. Mr. Farnham stated that much of the information in the nomination was derived from a 50th Anniversary history of the church. He stated the book is in German and had to be translated. He stated that other important information was provided by the archivist at the Lutheran Seminary in Mt. Airy.

Mr. Cohen agreed that the style of the building is Rundbogenstil, a German brand of the Romanesque Revival style, but contended that this late nineteenth-century version of it is very sculptural and therefore very different from the earlier, simpler version Rundbogenstil of the early nineteenth century.

Mr. Lavery remarked on the good condition of the building.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen move to recommend that the property at 838½ N. 42nd Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1548 ADAMS AVENUE

Leech House, a.k.a. Worrel-Winter House

Owner: M. Holmes Investments LLC

Nominator: Historical Society of Frankford

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Leech House, also known as the Worrell-Winter House, at 1548 Adams Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The house was constructed sometime between 1718 and 1728. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J. It is a rare remnant of the early settlement in Frankford.

The staff questions some of the conclusions in the nomination drawn from the deed research, but generally agrees that the property satisfies the suggested Criteria.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 1548 Adams Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Debbie Klak of the Historical Society of Frankford represented the nomination.

Ms. Coté stated that the staff has some concerns about the veracity of some of the claims related to the deed research and will seek to verify them before the Commission meeting. She alerted the Committee to a defect in the nomination. She stated that, while reviewing the nomination, the staff learned that there is a non-historic building at the rear of the property that extends across the property line onto 1550 Adams Avenue. She stated that the building is not mentioned in any way in the nomination, but should be addressed in the nomination and by the Committee in its recommendation. She reported that the owner of 1550 Adams Avenue was not notified of this meeting or the Commission meeting. Therefore, the Commission cannot designate that property at this time. She explained that there are three potential solutions to this problem. First, the Commission could table the nomination, notify the property owner of 1550

Adams Avenue, and restart the process. Second, the Commission could redraw the boundary to include the historic house only, avoiding the non-historic building at the rear. And third, the Commission could leave the boundary in place and essentially treat the section of the non-historic building at 1548 Adams Avenue as equivalent to a Non-contributing resource in a district. The staff recommends the third option, moving forward with the consideration of the designation and treating the 1548 Adams section of the building as Non-contributing.

Mr. Lavery asked how this building can legally span the property line. Mr. Farnham stated that he is unsure, but the properties may be consolidated for zoning purposes and yet remain two separate tax parcels. Mr. Cohen asked if calling the building Non-contributing was the easiest way to solve this problem. Mr. Farnham stated that that seemed like the best solution. Mr. Mooney asked about the non-historic building's use. Mr. Leech responded that an approved zoning application indicates that it is used for catering. Mr. Lavery asked about the red poster on the door of the building. Mr. Farnham stated that it is a Clean & Seal notice posted by the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Mooney if the site has an archeological potential. Mr. Mooney affirmed that it does and suggested that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation I. It has a high potential for prehistoric or Native American artifacts, given its proximity to Frankford Creek, and for historic artifacts, given its early settlement date.

Mr. Cohen had asked if anyone had been inside the building. Ms. Klak stated that she toured the building prior to it being sealed. She mentioned that the Historical Society has had difficulty contacting the owner. She stated the buildings history is associated with the Frankford Creek and the ancient grist mill that stood on it.

Mr. Cohen stated that close diagnostic examination of the building may help in determining the date of the building and may be more accurate than deed research. He stated that it is likely that this is the eighteenth-century building mentioned in the deeds, but it would be beneficial to confirm that suspicion with a close examination of the building itself.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommends that the property at 1548 Adams Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J as well as I and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and that the rear building be viewed as non-contributing. Mr. Mooney seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

8047 AND 8049 WALKER STREET

Box Grove Plantation

Owner: Richard E. Frizell & Lorna A. Johnson and Aimee Aucott & Joshua Landau

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Box Grove Plantation at 8047 and 8049 Walker Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, I, and J. Box Grove is a mid eighteenth-century farm house that was constructed by and served as the ancestral home of the Holme family until 1923. Although unrelated to William Penn's surveyor Thomas Holme, the Holme family of Box grove included many prominent members and gave its name to the Holmesburg section of Philadelphia. The house is an important example of eighteenth-century rural residential architecture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the properties at 8047 and 8049 Walker Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, I, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Lavery congratulated the staff on the preparation of the nomination. He stated that it is incredible that this eighteenth-century house with some of its grounds survives in this neighborhood of rows and twins. He noted that he lives in Northeast Philadelphia and was entirely unaware of this important house. He reported that he went to see it recently and was amazed that it still stood and was in good condition.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the properties at 8047 and 8049 Walker Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, I, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

125 W. WALNUT LANE

George T. Pearson House

Owner: Peter T. & Katherine B. Commons

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the George T. Pearson House at 125 W. Walnut Lane 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 E. Prominent Philadelphia architect George T. Pearson converted and added to an earlier structure for his residence in 1893. The style and design of the house are unusual and showcase Pearson's architectural talents. The property is classified as significant in the Tulpehocken Station National Register Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 125 W. Walnut Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Peter Commons stated that he owns the property. He requested that the Committee "set aside" the nomination. He explained that he has personal reasons for making the request, he has concerns about the claims made in the nomination, and he has concerns that a designation will have implications for his mortgage. He contended that his mortgage is "jeopardized" by the nomination. Mr. Commons reported that he lives and works in Germantown and grew up in Germantown. He stated that he is a lawyer and owns the building where his practice is located on Germantown Avenue; he noted that he walks to work. He noted that he apprenticed as a boat builder before attending law school and builds historic boats as a hobby. Mr. Commons explained that he has undertaken maintenance and restoration work himself on the exterior of his house. He remarked that the maintenance performed by the former owners was of a poor quality. They used finger-jointed pine and plywood, which are inappropriate. He stated that he

constructed a gate at the house. He stated that the house is “more than his home; it is my hobby. It is a big part of my life and my family’s life.” He stated that they have lived at the house for five years. He contended that the nomination is “full of errors.” He claimed, for example, that the period of significance is incorrect. He noted that he attended Oxford and knows that the Victorian period ended at World War I. He claimed that the architect, George Pearson, died in 1907. Mr. Cohen corrected him, stating that Pearson died in 1920. Mr. Commons stated that the description is incorrect. He pointed to the section that described the house as two-and-one-half stories tall; he countered that it is a full three stories tall. He observed that the stucco is described as smooth and claimed that it is textured. He claimed that the half-timber elements are a “façade,” not structural. He reported that elements of the half-timbering have been replaced and are not original. He contended that the 1959 photograph in the nomination does not provide sufficient information about the original appearance of the house. He reported that the roof is not red slate, as claimed, but is green slate that has been discolored by the trees. He also reported that some sections of the roof are clad in asphalt shingles. He stated that the window hoods have been repaired and adjusted. He reported that the east party wall is not blank, as claimed, but has some windows including basement windows. He stated that the porch was not originally enclosed; it includes no double-hung windows. He stated that “the main entrance to the house, of course, was through the porch to the house, not from the exterior to the porch.” He said that the main part of the house and the wing are connected everywhere; “it is one house.” He stated that his “real objection, personally,” is he wants to be able to maintain the property as he has maintained it. He stated that the house is not the architect Pearson’s alone. It is his “sweat and blood.” He read from the Historical Commission’s notice letter regarding the extent of its jurisdiction. Mr. Commons stated that the residents of Germantown cannot afford to comply with the Commission’s requirements. He stated that he does not have the financial resources to comply with the Commission’s requirements. He stated that his property is better maintained than any other in the neighborhood. He stated that he does his own maintenance work. He claimed that the Commission would be jeopardized and doing a disfavor to architectural history if it designated the house.

Mr. Commons explained that he writes mortgages for a living and then read from his own mortgage. It states, he asserted, in Section 9 that “if there is a legal proceeding that significantly effects lender’s interest in the property and/or rights under the security instrument such as proceeding to enforce laws or regulations, lender may do or pay, may do, whatever is reasonable or appropriate to protect lender’s interest in the property and rights under the security instrument.” He stated that this implies that the lender will call in the loan if the property is designated as historic. In Section 11, Paragraph 8, the mortgage states that the “borrower shall be in default if any action or proceeding, whether civil or criminal, is begun that, in lender’s judgment, could result in material impairment of lender’s interest in the property or right’s under this security instrument.” Mr. Commons argued that the lender could reasonably determine that the historic designation could undermined the value of the property and could call in the loan and foreclose on the property, thereby placing the building in jeopardy. He again asked the Committee to “set aside” the nomination because it is “faulty,” it “endangers the property,” and it is “fundamentally unfair.” He stated that the Commission’s oversight would be “injurious” to him. He stated that he “objects” to the potential designation.

Mr. Dilworth asked about the genesis of the nomination. Mr. Farnham responded that the property was nominated for several reasons. He reported that it has been on the Commission’s informal list of properties to consider for designation for several years. He explained that architectural historians including Professor Cohen of the Committee have exhibited a growing interest in Pearson, the architect, over the last decade or so. He noted that Aaron Wunsch, who offered a scathing criticism of the Historical Commission in a PlanPhilly interview several

months ago, decried the Commission's lack of attention on late nineteenth-century architects including Pearson. Mr. Farnham also observed that the staff has identified the Tulpehocken neighborhood in Germantown as one that is rich with architectural and historical treasures, yet underserved by the Commission. He stated that the staff has been nominating important sites in this neighborhood for individual designation because, although the area warrants designation as a historic district, such a designation is unlikely to occur for several years. He concluded that this house is one of the best examples of Pearson's architectural designs and is that much more significant owing to the fact that it was Pearson's home.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Farnham if the mortgage question was an appropriate discussion point for the Committee meeting, or if it should be reserved for the Commission meeting. Mr. Farnham responded that the Committee on Historic Designation is a technical advisory committee with a narrow purview; it is charged with evaluating and advising on the technical merits of nominations. In other words, the Committee's task is to determine whether the property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation. He advised that the Committee should leave other aspects of the review for the Commission. Mr. Cohen reminded everyone that an owner of a Modernist house under consideration for designation had suggested that a designation could potentially adversely impact his mortgage. He stated that the designation of that Modernist house appears to have had no adverse impact on that property owner's mortgage. Mr. Farnham remarked that one or two owners whose properties were under consideration for designation have claimed that any designation would compel their mortgage holders to call in the loans. He reported that he is unaware that a lender has ever recalled a loan owing to a historic designation. He noted that the Commission has designated several thousand properties in the 11 years that he has worked for the Commission and, in his experience, no lender has foreclosed in response to a designation. He advised the Commission to reject the assertion. Mr. Commons countered that, although the Commission is unaware of such an instance, the mortgage holder has the legal right to call in a loan owing to a designation. Mr. Commons asserted that the "threat" of lenders calling in loans in response to designations is "nearly existential" for the Commission. He stated that there will be "enormous public backlash if nomination leads to fear of lenders calling loans."

Mr. Commons stated that he would be happy to address the Criteria for Designation cited in the nomination. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Commons if he was asserting that his house does not "reflect the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style," or, in other words, does not satisfy Criterion C. Mr. Commons stated that his house does not look like the neighboring houses and therefore cannot "reflect the environment in an area characterized by a distinctive architectural style." Mr. Dilworth pointed out that the Criterion uses the term "era," not "area," as Mr. Commons stated. Mr. Dilworth observed that the Criterion relates to a time period, not a geographic space. Mr. Commons stated that the nomination refers to his house as "peculiar." He contended that something that is "peculiar" cannot reflect an era. Mr. Cohen stated that he would dispute that contention. He also noted that the minor errors in the description, for example red versus green slate, can be easily corrected. He applauded Mr. Commons for his excellent stewardship of the property, but observed that it would be a mistake to simply elect not to designate this property because the owner has maintained it well. He contended that that approach may work with a single owner, but is not a "scalable approach." If the Commission abdicated its regulatory authority to all property owners who argued "trust me," the system would cease to function. Mr. Commons warned that the Commission needs to be cognizant of the fact that there are few people in Germantown who are willing to spend the money that he has spent to maintain this property and properties like it. He stated that it is very expensive for owners of designated properties to retain the types of consultants that the Commission requires. If the Commission designates the property, he argued, it will be less

appealing to the next buyer and therefore it will be less likely that someone like himself with the money to maintain it will purchase it when he sells it. Mr. Cohen rejected the assumption that it is inherently more expensive to maintain a property that is designated as historic. He observed that the Commission and its staff assist property owners with identifying appropriate, cost-effective ways of maintaining and updating their properties. Mr. Commons countered that he purchased the building where his law office is located while in law school in 2005. The building was designated as historic when he bought it, but he did not know because neither the seller nor the Department of Licenses & Inspections informed him of its designation. He explained that he received a violation for illegal work undertaken without a permit including the installation of vinyl windows, railings, and a storm door. He claimed that the estimates to replace the vinyl windows were so high that it “nearly ended my law school career.” He stated that he reached a compromise with the Commission, but the cost to rectify the illegal alterations was still expensive. He contended that the Commission and the City were fortunate that he had purchased his office building because another owner might not have addressed the situation and the property would have been placed back on the real estate market for much less than he paid for it. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Commons if he was aware that the Commission has a financial hardship committee and process. Mr. Commons responded that he was not aware. Mr. Dilworth informed him that the Committee on Historic Designation is a technical advisory committee charged with evaluating the nomination. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Commons if he disputed the claim that the property is historically significant. Mr. Commons replied that he does dispute the claims in the nomination.

Mr. Commons disagreed that his property “reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style.” Mr. Cohen asked if his disagreement related to the use of the term “peculiar” to describe the house. Mr. Commons stated that, by definition, a house that is “peculiar” cannot broadly reflect an environment. Mr. Cohen disagreed with Mr. Commons. He stated that the architect, George Pearson, was explicitly peculiar and peculiarity was a primary characteristic of the architecture of the moment. Mr. Commons conceded that Mr. Cohen knows far more about architecture than he does. However, he asserted that something that is peculiar cannot be representative. Mr. Cohen again disagreed and stated that a particular kind of peculiarity was dominant in the work of leading architects at the time that this house was created. Mr. Schaaf agreed and stated that romantic revival architecture such as this is evident throughout the Tulpehocken area of Germantown. Mr. Schaaf explained that architects of the era of this house combined various elements from various historic styles to create unusual compositions. The peculiarity of this house is exactly the trait through which it reflects the era and characterizes the style. Mr. Commons contended that, by that definition, anything could satisfy the Criterion. He asserted that there is no standard, or the standard is too broad. Mr. Cohen strongly disagreed and stated that this house is reflective of an era and characteristic of a style. Mr. Commons again conceded that Mr. Cohen was the expert in architectural history. Mr. Dilworth asked if he was objecting to the word “peculiar.” Mr. Commons stated that he does not want his house designated as historic. Mr. Cohen stated that he would argue “to the hilt” that this house is extremely representative of an era and an architectural style. Mr. Commons countered that he would argue that a designation is not fair. Mr. Cohen countered that his arguments are purely legalistic and fail to address whether the property satisfies the Criteria. Mr. Commons replied that his arguments are legalistic because this is a legal process. He asserted that the Criteria are not met. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Commons if he is asserting that his house is not historically significant. Mr. Commons responded that he is not making that assertion, but is instead asserting that the Criteria are not met. Mr. Cohen stated that the property satisfies Criteria C, D, and E and should be designated. Mr. Commons stated that it does not satisfy Criterion C “as construed” by Messrs. Cohen and Schaaf. He contended that eclecticism is not an architectural style. Mr. Schaaf stated that the house exhibits a Romantic Revival Style. Mr.

Cohen stated that Mr. Schaaf's label is appropriate but broad. He contended that this building is an excellent example of an architectural style that was prominent from the middle of the 1880s to the middle of the 1890s. He explained that Pearson practiced in the Queen Anne Style and then became very inventive with it. He stated that this building, which was Pearson's own home, is a billboard for his architectural practice and that inventive strain of Queen Anne. Mr. Cohen concluded that this building is highly reflective of and characteristic of the architecture of the mid 1880s to the mid 1890s. He asserted that any architectural historian could look at this building and know exactly when it was constructed because it is so characteristic of its era and of the late Queen Anne Style. Mr. Commons suggested that the standard is akin to the court's standard for pornography: "I don't know how to describe it but I know it when I see it." Mr. Cohen disagreed and contended that this brand of late Queen Anne is definable and describable.

MOTION: Ms. Klein moved to find that the property at 125 W. Walnut Lane reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style (Criterion C); embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style (Criterion D); and, is the work of George Pearson, an architect whose work has significantly influenced the architectural development of the City of Philadelphia (Criterion E); and to recommend that the Historical Commission designate it as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion.

Mr. Commons disagreed that the property satisfies Criterion D. He claimed that the building cannot embody distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style because it has been altered. He claimed that, "once you get into the building," the changes to it are evident. Mr. Cohen responded that he has been inside the building. Mr. Commons stated that, by "get into," he meant investigate thoroughly, not physically enter. He claimed that the building has been changed. Mr. Cohen noted that Pearson altered and added to an existing building; therefore, one must be careful when using the term "original" about this building. Mr. Schaaf noted that all buildings change. Mr. Commons stated that "this building is not the building that George Pearson created and you all celebrate; this building is now my home." He asked the Committee members how they would feel if their homes were nominated for designation. He stated that his home was changed by Pearson and subsequent owners. He stated that he finds the thought of the Commission's review "objectionable." Mr. Dilworth asked if he objected to reviews by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Commons stated that he did not because they relate to safety.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Commons if he disagreed with the claim that the property satisfies Criterion E. Mr. Commons responded that he did disagree because the house is no longer the work of architect George Pearson. He reported that the roof and the half-timbering have been replaced. The stucco has been redone. Some windows have been replaced. Some have been repaired. Mr. Cohen stated that any inaccuracies in the nomination should be corrected. He asserted, however, that the property clearly satisfies the Criteria set forth in the nomination. Mr. Commons stated that he is seeking a compromise. He explained that he presented the compromise to Mr. Farnham, but that Mr. Farnham felt that he did not have the authority to make the compromise. Mr. Commons stated that the Commission does good work generally, but this is not the right situation for a designation. He stated that he "would like to be worked with." Mr. Farnham reported that Mr. Commons had presented what he called a compromise. Mr. Farnham stated that he not only did not have the authority to agree to the so-called compromise, but that he also fundamentally disagreed with it. He stated that he would not relay the terms of the compromise, but would leave that to Mr. Commons if he chose to pursue it. Mr. Commons held up his notice letter and stated that it told him that he could attend this hearing

and participate in it. He stated that he wanted to compromise and would like the nomination “set aside” until a compromise is reached. Mr. Dilworth asked him to be more specific. Mr. Commons stated that he asking that the nomination be “set aside” until a compromise is reached between “the homeowner who is paying the mortgage and living in the property” and the Historical Commission. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Farnham to comment on the procedure. Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee does not have the authority to table a nomination; that authority lies with the Commission alone. He suggested that Mr. Commons reserve his argument for tabling for the Commission meeting. The Committee is charged with providing the Commission with a technical recommendation on the historical significance of the property as judged through the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Lavery agreed. He stated that the Committee lacks the authority to negotiate any sort of deal or compromise with Mr. Commons. He stated that he seconded Ms. Klein’s motion because he agrees that the property satisfies the Criteria as noted.

Mr. Dilworth stated that it appears that Mr. Commons is opposed to designation itself. He stated that any additional regulation is inherently a qualification of property rights. The Commission’s task is to balance the public’s interest in historic resources with the interests of the private individuals who maintain and pay the mortgages on those resources. By design, the Committee on Historic Designation does not weigh those competing interests, but simply considers and recommends on historic significance. The Commission judges historical significance, guided by the Committee’s recommendation, and also considers the public and private interests. Mr. Dilworth stated that he agrees with the motion on the table. Mr. Commons questioned whether he had the authority to amend or “set aside” a motion. He asserted that the Commission is “at risk if property owners are not collaborated with.” Mr. Commons contended that, “if this process becomes adversarial,” there is “a lot at risk.” Mr. Dilworth stated that all of the evidence indicates that historic designation increases, rather than decreases, property values. Mr. Commons stated that his lender may interpret the evidence differently and may call in his mortgage if the property is designated. He stated that the public will become very concerned once he discloses that lenders can call in mortgages when properties are designated. He asserted that the change to the regulations governing his property will cause his lender to consider calling in the mortgage. Mr. Dilworth expressed skepticism about the claims of Mr. Commons regarding the mortgage. He suggested that, by his logic, any regulatory change could result in foreclosure. Mr. Commons warned the Committee “that the public will become very concerned and nervous about the actions of this Commission should the notion that a lender can call their loan be disseminated.” Mr. Schaaf stated that many properties near the one in question are already designated. He contended that the Tulpehocken area has great historical and architectural significance. Mr. Commons stated that other designations in the area had no bearing on his warning. The public will become very concerned if he informs it that loans can be called in if properties are designated. He stated that he is very involved with his neighborhood organization. He added that burdens of owning and maintaining a historic property are great, but there are also public and private benefits. He opined that his neighbors in Tulpehocken would be very much opposed to the creation of a historic district in the area. Mr. Schaaf stated that the Tulpehocken area is extremely significant.

Mr. Cohen stated that minor errors in the nomination should be corrected. He stated that it is incorrect to call the T Square Club members “Arts & Crafts followers.” Where websites are cited, the title, author, and date of access should be provided. He stated that the use of term Tudor Revival should be reconsidered. The presence of half-timbering does not necessarily mean that a building is Tudor Revival in style. This building also includes Flemish elements. Mr. Schaaf stated that the photographs should be dated. Mr. Cohen asked if the building was pictured in *Handsome Homes*. Mr. Danta stated that it was not.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to adopt Ms. Klein and Mr. Lavery's motion to find that the property at 125 W. Walnut Lane reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style (Criterion C); embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style (Criterion D); and, is the work of George Pearson, an architect whose work has significantly influenced the architectural development of the City of Philadelphia (Criterion E); and to recommend that the Historical Commission designate it as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

5340 GREENE STREET

Flavell Family House

Owner: Charles W. & Carol M. Schramek

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Flavell Family House at 5340 Greene 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 E. The Flavell Family House designed in the Queen Anne Style by renowned Philadelphia architect by George T. Pearson and was constructed between 1887 and 1889. It is an extremely important, well-preserved example of Pearson's unique and exuberant interpretation of the Queen Anne Style. The property is located in the National Register-eligible Penn-Knox/Wister Historic District, which was determined eligible in 1992.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 5340 Greene Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.

After looking at historic photographs, Ms. Klein asked if the building had been stuccoed. Mr. Danta explained that the brick had been painted at some point, but that that paint has since been removed. The Committee members concurred that the house is an excellent example of George Pearson's work and is in very fine condition.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the property at 5340 Greene Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

4740 WAYNE AVENUE

Happy Hollow Playground Recreation Center

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Kim Broadbent

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Happy Hollow Playground Recreation Center at 4740 Wayne Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E. Renowned Philadelphia architect George T. Pearson designed the recreation building, which was

constructed in 1910 and 1911. The Happy Hollow Playground Recreation Center was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in September of 2012.

The nomination contends that the gymnasium building at the recreation center, which was designed by architect Norman Rice in 1958, is also significant, but the staff disputes this assertion and contends that it should be treated like a non-contributing building in a district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 4740 Wayne Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, provided the nomination is amended to indicate that the gymnasium is not historically significant.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination does not in any way make the case that the gymnasium building has historical significance. He stated that the building is mentioned as having historical significance, but its history and significance are not documented or elaborated.

Ms. Klein stated that the 1911 Pearson-designed recreation building is the significant resource and suggested that the entire site need not be designated. Ms. Coté stated that the nomination may not make the case that the 1958 Gymnasium building has historical significance, but it does make the case that the site served as the Happy Hollow Playground Recreation Center, which was an important part of the playground movement.

Mr. Cohen asked if any of the Committee members felt that the gymnasium has historical significance. Mr. Lavery stated that it may, but the case is not made. Mr. Cohen stated that Norman Rice was a notable architect. He stated the Rice would always tell his students that he worked with Le Corbusier. The Committee members decided that the nomination could be amended at a later date to reflect the significance of the gymnasium, but that the case was not made in the nomination as it stands.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the property at 4740 Wayne Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, provided that the unsubstantiated claim that the gymnasium is historically significant is deleted from the nomination. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

405-25 QUEEN STREET

Bethel Burying Ground, a.k.a. Weccacoe Playground

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Terry Buckalew

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Bethel Burying Ground, currently the Weccacoe Playground, at 405-25 Queen 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 I. It was the burial ground associated with Mother Bethel Church and likely contains significant archaeological resources associated with the church and Philadelphia's early African-American community. This property is located in the National Register Southwark Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 405-25 Queen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and I and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Terry Buckalew represented the nomination.

Mr. Mooney recused himself from the review because his firm has been retained to undertake an archaeological investigation at the site.

The Rev. Mark Tyler, pastor at Mother Bethel AME Church, read a prepared statement to the Committee:

On behalf of the officers and members of Mother Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, I write in support of historic designation and protection of the former Bethel Burial Ground. While we support designation and protection, we do not support the manner in which Mr. Terry Buckalew has gone about getting to this point. His approach of working in a vacuum, without the support and cooperation of Mother Bethel, has made an otherwise exciting venture a constant source of frustration. Due to recent media attention that suggested "tension" between the church and Mr. Buckalew, I felt compelled to enter this short statement to clarify Mother Bethel's position.

Initially, Mother Bethel and Mr. Buckalew had a very good working relationship. There was open communication and sharing of information. Our concern at Mother Bethel has always been two-fold, as it relates to the Bethel Burial Ground which is now the Weccacoe Playground. Our first concern has been, and continues to be, the protection of the burial ground and any possible remains that may still be interred in it. Since a renewed focus on the burial ground has come to light, we have seen it as a way to broaden and deepen our story of African American self-determination during a time when it was not easy to be free. This is not just an African American story, but this is truly an American story. Our second concern has been to be supportive of the local neighborhood association and the friends of the playground in their effort to modernize what has become a vital part of the Queen Village neighborhood. We have sought to work with them so that they would not lose vital funding to renovate the community center and playground, provided their efforts would in no way compromise the burial ground.

There is often tension in these types of projects between history, the present, and the future. For that reason, we organized a unique and dedicated collaboration to ensure that the concerns of all parties would be met. In fact, if it had been successful, it would have been a model for future efforts in Philadelphia. The collaboration consisted of Mother Bethel's Historical Commission (which was represented by Ms. Margaret Jerrido, former Archivist at Temple University's Urban Archives), Mr. Buckalew, the Queen Village Neighborhood Association (QVNA), the Friends of Weccacoe, and our Councilman Mark Squila. Using my connection as a former member of the board of directors for the Preservation Alliance, we sought out the best consultant we could find to help guide this collaboration. We agreed to hire as a consultant a young woman who had extensive knowledge and expertise in working with such projects, having led a similar effort in Virginia. Mother Bethel and QVNA agreed to share the cost of her consulting fee. We had early meetings in which we sought to "get our arms around the story" that Mr. Buckalew was unearthing. There was much anticipation on all sides.

The only thing we asked of all parties was to work in a collaborative manner. That meant not to share information with outside persons or individuals until we were all on the same page. From the beginning, Mr. Buckalew showed signs that he would not abide by this simple request. On at least 2 occasions, Mr. Buckalew scheduled meetings with persons or groups that we all agreed we would not meet with until we were further down the road. It was clear, however, that Mr. Buckalew was not willing to cooperate with us and he demonstrated this by continuing to operate on his own. I found this most strange given the fact that of everyone in the collaboration, Mr. Buckalew was the only person who had no vested interest. He is not a member of Mother Bethel or the African Methodist Episcopal Church, he is not a resident of Queen Village, he has no official office with the city. Yet, he has operated as though this story that he "stumbled on" as he likes to say, belongs exclusively to him and that he is the only person concerned with protecting our ancestors that were buried at the Bethel Burial Ground.

This story is not just about what historical figures did when they were alive, when they died, and where they were buried. This story is also about attitudes toward African Americans that drove Bishop Richard Allen to purchase a separate burial ground in the first place. It was the daily disrespect that African Americans lived within their world that even followed them in death. Yet, here we are 124 years after the Bethel Burial Ground has been sold, and still our voice about our own story is not important. It's as if others think they know best about us, and what needs to be done, as though we are not capable of doing it on our own. You can't talk about standing up for the rights of dead African Americans while showing disrespect to those of us who are living. We appreciate Mr. Buckalew's effort to protect our past, but we would have appreciated it more if he would have taken into account more seriously the voice of us who are still living.

The Rev. Tyler stated that he had an opportunity to read the nomination that morning. He stated that he was concerned that the nomination would encourage unnecessary archeological investigations at the site because the nomination claims that there is archeological potential that could yield information about burial practice. He stated that he did not think the Mother Bethel congregation would be amenable to using the site as a research project. He asked that the Committee postpone the review of the nomination to allow for Mother Bethel to review the nomination, conduct research, do some fact checking, and to understand the full implication of the request.

Mr. Lavery asked if any remains were disinterred when the church sold the ground to the City. The Rev. Tyler responded that Mr. Buckalew claims that the remains have not been moved; however, Sarah Allen, Richard Allen's second wife, was relocated to the church. Mr. Lavery asked if there is any marker or above-ground memorial indicating the burial ground. The Rev. Tyler stated that the church is in collaboration with The Friends of Weccacoe and the Queen Village Neighborhood Association as they rehabilitate the playground site. He stated that the Friends of Weccacoe has presented its plans for the playground to the congregation. He informed the Committee that there was discussion about placing a placard at the center of the playground, but the church has suggested finding another location toward the edge because it is an active playground. He stated that they want to place some sort of commemorative marker in a location where those on walking tours could view it without disturbing the children at play.

Jed Levin of the Philadelphia Archeological Forum stated that the Forum is concerned that this very important site may not be protected, particularly in light of the proposed playground renovations. He stated that the Forum strongly supports the nomination. He also stated that he

believes that remains survive at the site. He stated that the Forum would like to see the site designated to provide protection and ensure that the remains are disturbed a little as possible.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee does not have the authority to grant the Rev. Tyler's request to table the nomination to allow Mother Bethel to conduct its own research. The committee may only make recommendations on the merits of the nomination. He stated that the Historical Commission has the authority to table the review of the nomination and would likely grant such a request. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff conducted minimal research when reviewing the nomination, owing to its staffing limitations. He opined that any additional research could be very valuable. He noted that the Historical Commission does not conduct archeological excavations, but instead designates archaeological sites to ensure that resources remain protected in place. He stated that the best way to protect archeological resources is to leave them undisturbed. Mr. Levin clarified that the Philadelphia Archeological Forum is not seeking archeological excavation at the site, but concurs that the best protection for these resources is to leave them in the ground. He stated that archeological research can inform construction projects, allowing them to avoid archaeological resources. He stated that artifacts should only be exposed and removed if their disturbance is unavoidable.

The Rev. Tyler stated that the plans to renovate the playground appear to be appropriate. He stated that the Friends of Weccacoe and the Queen Village Neighborhood Association are approaching this as if the site is already designated.

Mr. Buckalew stated that he came across the name of the Bethel Burying Ground a number of years ago when working on another project. He stated that five years later he had collected over one thousand names of people who had been buried there. He informed the Committee that he found no evidence that the bodies were ever removed. He stated that he assembled the information and presented his findings to Mother Bethel, the Queen Village Neighborhood Association, and the Friends of Weccacoe. He stated that he began the project intending to provide information to genealogical researchers, not to inform a nomination. He stated that he became aware of plans to renovate the playground that involved excavation for water lines and plantings. He stated that he expressed his concerns about the impacts on the Burying Ground to Mother Bethel, the Queen Village Neighborhood Association, and the Friends of Weccacoe. He stated that, after attending a meeting a few years ago, he believed that the site would be designated. He later learned that he was mistaken and undertook the nomination himself. He stated that he will be more inclusive as this process moves forward. He stated that he encourages people to utilize his research and provides it online.

Mr. Laverty stated that he found the language describing Jacksonian democracy in the Statement of Significance to be unnecessarily inflammatory. Mr. Dilworth stated that that section of the nomination is not necessarily relevant to the significance of the site.

Theresa Stuhlman of the Philadelphia Parks and Recreation Department stated that the Department has initiated a Phase I archeological investigation at the site and are conferring with both the Philadelphia Historical Commission and the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. She informed the Committee that the plans for the playground are in the design phase and the Phase I archeological investigation is intended to help guide the design and construction phases.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the property at 405-25 Queen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and I and should be

designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4301 LANSDOWNE DRIVE

Shofuso Japanese House and Garden

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Philadelphia City Planning Commission

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Shofuso Japanese House and Garden as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation B, D, E, F, G, H, and J. The garden was designed by Y. Muto in 1909. The Shofuso designed Junzo Yoshimura and constructed in 1953 at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. In 1957 and 1958, it was relocated and reconstructed in Fairmount Park. It is one of the best examples of tradition Japanese architecture in the United States. The Japanese house is classified as a contributing resource in the Fairmount Park National Register Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at Shofuso Japanese House and Garden satisfies Criteria for Designation B, D, E, F, G, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Samantha Kuntz, the City Planning Commission intern who authored the nomination, represented it.

Theresa Stuhlman stated that the Philadelphia Parks and Recreation Department supports the nomination.

Ms. Kuntz stated that it was a last minute decision to include the entire site in the nomination and not only the building itself. She stated that the building, site, and landscaping tell the story of the Japanese legacy in Fairmount Park. Mr. Lavery commended Ms. Kuntz on the nomination. He stated that it certainly made the case for the layer upon layer of Japanese influence.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the property at Shofuso Japanese House and Garden satisfies Criteria for Designation B, D, E, F, G, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6942 WOODLAND AVENUE

Paschalville Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Paschalville Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia at 6942 Woodland Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and H. The Carnegie branch library building was designed by Henry C. Richards and constructed in 1915. It is an excellent example of a Carnegie library.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 6942 Woodland Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and H and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and Jon Vimr represented the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the Committee has reviewed nominations for other Carnegie Libraries. He stated that his building has all the Beaux Arts architectural elements of the other Carnegie Libraries, which have been designated, and this one should be placed on the Register as well.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved to recommend that the property at 6942 Woodland Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and H and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1713-27 NORTH STREET

Owner: Phoenix Partnership

Application: Rescind from or Reclassify in Spring Garden Historic District

Applicant: Leonard F. Reuter, Esq. for 1711 North Street LLC and 1720 Fairmount Avenue LLC

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rescind the property at 1713-27 North Street from the Spring Garden Historic District or reclassify it from contributing to non-contributing in the district. The property stands on the boundary of the historic district.

The district inventory claims that this building was constructed c. 1875 and that its façade was altered in 1925. In fact, this building was reconstructed in 1937, seven years after the end of the district's Period of Significance, which runs from 1850 to 1930. Moreover, the district's Statement of Significance defines this district as a residential district. It contends that residential structures including rowhouses and apartment buildings as well as commercial and institutional structures that directly supported the residents, such as corner stores, churches, and schools, qualify as Contributing to the district. It makes no claims that warehouse or industrial buildings can qualify as Contributing. The building in question housed a regional parcel delivery service and then various light industrial firms. Therefore, this building cannot be considered Contributing to a historic district to which it has no relationship except one of coincidental proximity. It was constructed after the Period of Significance and played no role in the area's significance as defined by the Statement of Significance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff contends that additional information shows that the resource does not qualify for a classification of Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District; and the Historical Commission committed an error in professional judgment when it classified the property as Contributing to the district. The staff recommends that 1713-27 North Street should be either removed from the Spring Garden Historic District and rescinded from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; or reclassified as Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, pursuant to Section 5.14.b of the Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the rescission/reclassification request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Leonard F. Reuter represented the equitable property owner.

Ms. Cote displayed photographs of the building as well as a Sanborn map and building and zoning permit information that indicate that the building was reconstructed in 1937. She provided information about the district's Statement of Significance and boundaries.

Mr. Reuter explained that his client has the permission of the current property owner to seek the rescission or reclassification. He summarized the permit information regarding the reconstruction of the building in 1937. A very large fuel tank was added to the property in 1938. He also explained that the roof was removed and rebuilt in steel and concrete in 1944 to accommodate the storage of tires. He asserted that the building does not contribute to the historic district. He explained that the current building replaced a stable or livery that was constructed in the late 1860s. He stated that this was not a private stable or carriage house that would have been associated with an individual house, but was a large-scale commercial stable for street car horses. Neither it nor the 1937 reconstruction had any relation to the district as it is defined in the Statement of Significance of the district nomination. Mr. Reuter stated that he is requesting a rescission because this building stands on the boundary of the district. He stated that the Commission has not routinely drawn boundaries around Non-contributing buildings. He stated that removing this property from the historic district would not create a negative precedent; in fact, leaving it the district would create a negative precedent. The Commission has not ever used Non-contributing properties as a means of creating buffers at the edges of historic districts. This building was mistakenly included in the district. If the Commission had been aware of its history at the time of the creation of the district, it would have left it out of the district. He stated that zoning and other protections exist to allow the community to participate in the decision-making about the redevelopment of this parcel. The Registered Community Organization will have an opportunity to comment on the design at the zoning hearing. The Commission should not retain jurisdiction solely to retain jurisdiction over its redevelopment. Mr. Reuter stated that he would not have requested the rescission of the designation of this property if it were located in the interior of the district, away from the boundary. He noted that the boundary of the district is jagged or saw-toothed, indicating that the Commission was seeking to include Contributing buildings only on the boundary. If it had sought to pad the boundary with Non-contributing properties, it would have drawn a smooth line along Fairmount Avenue. However, it did not; it routed the boundary in and out to include Contributing and exclude Non-contributing sites. Therefore, this site should be withdrawn from the district. Mr. Dilworth stated that the jagged line indicates that the Commission made decisions as it drew the boundary. Mr. Lavery observed that the drawing of district boundaries is difficult and mistakes can be made. He stated that he believes that a mistake was made in this instance. He agreed that the jagged line indicates that the Commission was attempting to differentiate between historic and non-historic properties as it drew the boundary. Mr. Lavery concluded that "we screwed up."

Mr. Farnham explained that either removing the property from the historic district or reclassifying it as Non-contributing would correct the mistake from a legal standpoint. He stated that the staff recommends either option to correct the mistake. Mr. Dilworth asked if the staff is indifferent to the choice of option for correcting the mistake. Mr. Farnham remarked that the two options have different implications for the property owner and the district. If the property is rescinded, the Commission gives up all authority over the site; if it is reclassified, the owner can demolish the building without a hardship or public interest finding but the Commission would retain full jurisdiction over any redevelopment because the site was "developed" at the time of designation. Addressing the merits of the request, Mr. Farnham stated that the nomination clearly defines the period of significance as 1850 to 1930. The inventory entry for this property dates it to 1875 with alterations in 1925, both within the period of significance, and then classifies it as Contributing. However, if the date of construction is, in fact, 1937, as the new

documentation clearly suggests, then the building could not possibly contribute to the significance of the district. The error in misdating this building is the error in professional judgment referred to in the Rules & Regulations that allows the Commission to amend or rescind the designation. Moreover, above and beyond the date of the building, the use of the building as garage, storage, and light industrial is not a use that is identified in the Statement of Significance in the district nomination as related to the history of this district. The district is explicitly defined as a residential district in the nomination. In addition to the residences themselves, the nomination argues that commercial and institutional buildings such as corner stores, churches, and schools that directly supported the residents contribute to the district's history. The nomination makes no claim that an industrial building contributes to that history; therefore, this building cannot be classified as Contributing, regardless of its date.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Farnham to identify the Commission's error in professional judgment. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission committed two errors when it classified this building as Contributing. First, it dated the building incorrectly. Second, it determined that this building contributed to the district's history as defined in the Statement of Significance. Mr. Dilworth stated that it committed a third error, based on the two earlier errors: it drew the district boundary to include this property. Mr. Dilworth contended that, if this property does not contribute to the district, it should be rescinded rather than reclassified. He noted that numerous properties are adjacent to the district and new construction at those properties could have impacts on the district, yet the Commission has no authority over them. He contended that it would be unprecedented for the Commission to seek to control a non-historic property on the boundary of the district. He contended that the boundary of this district was drawn to include historic properties and exclude non-historic properties. Mr. Reuter stated that the Commission does not have a practice of creating "buffer" zones of non-historic properties around its districts to protect the districts. He added that the Commission should not restrict the owner's reuse of the property unnecessarily, but should limit its authority to that which is necessary to protect historic resources. Therefore, the Commission should rescind, not merely reclassify. He again noted that the developer will need to collaborate with the community through the zoning process. He stated that his client would accept either decision, rescind or reclassify, but observed that a reclassification only will result in higher development costs for the project, owing to the additional level of review. He noted that "time is money." He also informed the Committee that his client would like to build four-story townhouses, not a "bomb factory." Mr. Schaaf noted that the building to the west of the subject building is "a very fine property."

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance observed that some properties at the corner of 23rd and Spring Garden Streets are on the boundary of the historic district, yet are classified as Non-contributing. Mr. Lavery noted that the entirety of Spring Garden Street itself was included within the historic district because the Commission deemed the central gardens in the median of the street to be important historic resources. Therefore, properties on the north side of Spring Garden Street are not on the boundary of the district. Mr. Leech observed that the property he mentioned on the west side of 23rd Street is on the boundary of the district. Mr. Leech stated that the Preservation Alliance agrees that the classification of the building as Contributing is in error, owing to the 1937 construction date. He stated that the Alliance "feels strongly" that the property should be reclassified, not rescinded from the district. To bolster his claim, he asserted that the footprint of the 1937 building reflects the earlier building that stood on the site. He also asserted that the façade of the 1937 building does maintain the street wall and therefore has some value. Mr. Dilworth countered that the Commission likely would not have included this property within the district if, at the time of designation, it had had the information that we have today. It would have drawn the boundary to exclude this property. Ms. Klein stated that the Committee has sought to avoid "saw-tooth" boundaries where possible, but the boundary in this

area is “saw toothed.” She claimed that there must be a reason for the jagged boundary. She asserted that, if the Commission had included Non-contributing properties in this district on the boundary, it simply would have drawn the boundary along the south side of Fairmount Avenue; but it did not. Mr. Leech countered that there are no instances in Spring Garden where the corners of a block are in a district and the middle is out. A rescission in this instance would create such a situation. Mr. Lavery disagreed and pointed to a nearby block on the map of the district. Mr. Dilworth agreed with Mr. Lavery. Mr. Lavery concluded that, if the Commission makes a mistake, the owner of the property should not pay for that mistake. It should be corrected to the benefit of the owner.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to find that additional information shows that the resource does not qualify for a classification of Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District; and the Historical Commission committed an error in professional judgment when it classified the property as Contributing to the district; and to recommend that 1713-27 North Street should be removed from the Spring Garden Historic District and rescinded from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and the boundary redrawn to exclude this property from the district, pursuant to Section 5.14.b of the Rules & Regulations. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Dilworth moved to adjourn at 12:42 p.m. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.