

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
5 October 2004**

**Room 578 City Hall
Thomas Sugrue, Chair**

Present

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Chair
Warren Huff
Janet Klein
Bruce Lavery
Hyman Myers, AIA
Harris Steinberg, AIA

Jonathan E. Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also Present

William Maffucci, Esq., Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP
Rosemary Colson, West Central Germantown Neighbors
David Plante, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Laurie Peterson, West Mount Airy Neighbors
Deidre Anderson, Impacting Your World Christian Center (IYWCC)
Pastor Reggie Stewart, Impacting Your World Christian Center (IYWCC)
Sherman Toppins, Esq., Impacting Your World Christian Center (IYWCC)
George Thomas, Civic Vision
Tom Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
Gwendolyn DeLong
James Foster, 86 W. Johnson Street
Ross Wilson, Parkway Corp.
Joe Zuritsky, Parkway Corp.
Fred Maurer
Carol Hancock
Ronald Hancock
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Jonathan Lipner
Christine Tilles, 6439 Cherokee Street
Steven Tilles, 6439 Cherokee Street
Annie Lucille Wheeler, 79 W. Johnson Street
Elliot Battzedek, 6369 McCallum Street
Gloria Boyd
Gillian Speeth, 141 W. Upsal Street
Jean K. Wolf
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
William Youngblood

Thomas Sugrue, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

1309 Noble Street, Lasher Printing Company Building

3607 Broadway Realty Associates, Owner

Date: 1928, Philip Scott Tyre, architect

Standing among a group of imposing Art Deco factories, the Lasher Printing Company Building is an intact industrial building wrapped in Art Deco detailing. Constructed in 1928 by George F. Lasher for his expanding business, the building reflects the modern, streamlined, and technologically advanced ideas embraced at the time. The Lasher Printing Company Building represents a rare example of industrial architecture that should be protected as it meets four criteria of Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City (Criterion A). It embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, namely the Art Deco (Criterion D). It is the work of Philip Scott Tyre, an architect whose work has significantly influenced the architectural and cultural development of Philadelphia (Criterion E). Lastly, it is part of a distinctive area, which should be preserved according to an historic and architectural motif (Criterion G).

Ms. Spina presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Myers commented on the central tower, which he believes may have been a water tower. Ms. Klein suggested using a word other than “stripped” to describe the lack of ornament at the rear; she contended that “stripped” implied that the decoration had been removed. Mr. Steinberg asserted that the building is “magnificent” and “unique” and reported that he has admired it since first discovering it. He noted the “tension” between the structure and applied ornament and claimed that it presaged Robert Venturi’s work, especially the Seattle museum. He also noted the building’s connections to industrial Philadelphia and its transportation systems. Mr. Sugrue remarked that in terms of location, date, and style the Lasher building is a bridge between rail-based and automobile-based industry. Mr. Myers asked why a photograph of an Albert Kahn building had been included in the nomination. Ms. Spina replied that Philip Scott Tyre, the architect of the building, was influenced by Kahn and his automobile showrooms.

Mr. Steinberg moved to recommend the designation of 1309 Noble Street, the Lasher Printing Company Building, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Myers seconded the motion.

William Maffucci, the lawyer representing the owner, addressed the potential designation. He explained that the building was abandoned and in disrepair when the current owner purchased it. The owner had invested in the building, which now operates as a telecommunication center. He stated that the collapse of the telecommunication industry may prompt the redevelopment of the building as residences. He asserted that the designation would not preclude the redevelopment, but will add to the cost and time of redevelopment. It could therefore have a negative impact on the value of the building. He acknowledged that the building satisfies the Commission’s designation criteria.

Mr. Tyler stated that designation may make the building eligible for federal rehabilitation tax credits and other preservation incentives such as a façade easement.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Committee. He noted that his organization had submitted all of the nominations under consideration at the meeting. He explained that the Alliance had received a grant to nominate important buildings not yet designated. He stated that he had a long-term interest in this building and had published it in his Philadelphia architecture guide in the 1980s. He claimed that the Register included few industrial buildings. He also noted the Native American influence. Mr. Gallery asserted that the building lends itself to adaptive reuse. He added that the designation would not impose a financial hardship. Concluding, he stated that he strongly supports the designation.

Mr. Steinburg asked Mr. Maffucci if his client opposed the designation. Mr. Maffucci stated that he wanted to express concern about the designation, but he did not oppose the designation.

Mr. Sugrue reported on the great Art Deco buildings in Detroit that exhibit Native American influences. He suggested that the architect Philip Tyre must have had connections to Detroit, especially in light of his automobile-related designs. Mr. Huff agreed that a residential reuse would be appropriate for the building. Mr. Myers suggested that the designation would increase, not decrease, the value of the property.

The Committee on the Historic Designation voted unanimously to approve Mr. Steinberg's motion, seconded by Mr. Myers, to recommend the designation of 1309 Noble Street, the Lasher Printing Company Building, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, Kirkbride Center

Kirkbride Realty Corporation, Owner

Date: 1854-59, Samuel Sloan, architect with Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride; addition, 1929; service buildings, c. 1920; hospital building, 1959

The movement to improve the treatment of the mentally ill is an important chapter in the social reform movements that swept the United States during the 19th century. Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride and the City of Philadelphia played prominent roles in that narrative, as Kirkbride along with Samuel Sloan designed a hospital for the mentally ill that influenced the construction of similar institutions in thirty-one states. The Kirkbride Center meets four of the criteria for designation as set forth in Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation and is associated with the life of Thomas Kirkbride, a person significant in the past (Criterion A). It is the work of Samuel Sloan, a designer and architect whose work was significantly influenced the historical and social development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation (Criterion E) and contains elements of design, which represent a significant innovation (Criterion F). Finally, the property exemplifies the cultural, social, and historic heritage of the community (Criterion J).

Ms. Spina presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Sugrue agreed with the nominator that the mental hospital presented a model that utterly transformed the treatment of the mentally ill. He noted that the pleasure gardens and deer park depicted on the historic plan signaled that this hospital proffered a radical rethinking of mental illness. He asked for a clarification of the segments of the site considered for designation. Mr. Tyler and Ms. Klein also contended that the Committee must determine precisely what would be designated on this large campus that includes several buildings of varying ages and significance.

Mr. Steinberg moved to recommend the designation of 4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, historically the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, now called the Kirkbride Center, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Myers seconded the motion.

Mr. Sugrue again asked his fellow Committee members how they might assess the many buildings on the site. Mr. Steinberg noted a letter from the Kirkbride Center, the current owner, which mistakenly referred to a building dating to 1840. He asserted that it must, in fact, be the 1859 building designed by Samuel Sloan, which was historically called the Men's Building. He further remarked that the hospital is one of the city's most important sites; it was an epicenter of enlightened scientific thinking and deserves to be designated.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization had intended to nominate the 1859 building and the open space associated with it, not the entire site bounded by Market, 49th, Haverford, and 48th Streets. He stated that the other buildings should not be designated. Mr. Lavery and Ms. Klein asserted that the landscape at the site is significant and should be preserved. Mr. Huff countered that he would not support any recommendation to designate the entire site or one that would limit development on the site. Mr. Meyers and Ms. Klein suggested that the Committee and staff survey the site to determine precisely the buildings and areas to be designated. Mr. Gallery added that the nominator and the owner should be included in the process. Mr. Sugrue recommended delaying the designation until the site could be surveyed; he proposed that a group survey the site with the intention of designating the 1859 building and the surrounding grounds linked to the building.

Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Myers agreed to revise their motion.

Mr. Steinberg moved to recommend the designation of 4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with a committee including members of the Committee on Historic Designation, the Commission's staff, the nominator, and the property owner to determine the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction over the buildings, site, and appurtenances. Mr. Myers seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1307 Locust Street, New Century Guild

The New Century Trust, Owner

Date: c. 1870s; 1906

The New Century Guild building at 1307 Locust Street has served as the organization's headquarters continuously from 1906 to the present. Founded in 1882, the New Century Guild (NCG) was one of the earliest, largest, and most successful of the many

organizations created across the country in the 19th century to deal with the serious problems that arose as more and more women entered the labor force. Although these clubs had several characteristics in common with the middle-class women's clubs of the day, they were unique because they directly addressed employment-related problems. The Guild explicitly stated from the outset that its goal was to address the specific needs of "self-supporting women," a bold step at a time when many Americans believed that no self-respecting woman would work for pay outside the home. Not only was the Guild among the first of such organizations formed anywhere in the United States, but it was also among the most flourishing and long-lived. The NCG meets three criteria as outlined in Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest and value as a part of the development heritage and cultural characteristics of not only the City but of the Commonwealth and the Nation and is associated with the life of persons significant in the past (Criterion A). As a part of the women's movement and the reformation of labor, it is associated with events of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth and Nation (Criterion B). Finally, the Guild exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community (Criterion J).

Ms. Spina presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Ms. Klein moved to recommend the designation 1307 Locust Street, the New Century Guild, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Myers seconded the motion.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reported that the building is already listed as a National Historic Landmark. He added that it is significant for social and cultural reasons, not architectural. Ms. Klein informed the Committee that the site has already been acknowledged as highly significant by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, which placed a state historic marker at the Guild. Mr. Sugrue remarked that the site signifies a major movement in American social history. He asked who had prepared the nomination. Ms. Spina replied that the nomination submitted by the Preservation Alliance had been supplemented with material from the excellent National Register nomination written by Dr. Barbara J. Howe of West Virginia University.

Mr. Steinberg commented that the mural depicted moments in women's history on the western former party wall of the Guild was not part of the Guild property and would not be protected by the designation.

The Committee on the Historic Designation voted unanimously to approve Ms. Klein's motion, seconded by Mr. Myers, to recommend the designation of 1307 Locust Street, the New Century Guild, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

221 West Johnson Street, Nugent Home for Baptists

UR Choyce, Inc., Owner

Date: 1896, J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

The George Nugent Home for Baptists at 221 W. Johnson Street on the border of Mt. Airy and Germantown is an important architectural and historical landmark in Philadelphia and is eligible for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Nugent Home fulfills Designation Criteria A, C, D, E, H, and J, which are delineated in the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance. The Nugent Home (A) has significant value as part of the development of the City, and is associated with the life of a person

significant in the past; (C) reflects the environment in an era characterized by its distinctive architectural style; (D) embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style; (E) is the work of an architect who has significantly influenced the development of the City; (H) represents an established and familiar visual feature of the community; and (J) exemplifies the heritage of the community. George Nugent was a convert to the Baptist faith and generously supported the church throughout his adult life. After a successful business career manufacturing cloth, he retired to Germantown, where he devoted himself to benevolent and charitable purposes. He served selflessly and donated munificently to numerous churches and religious societies including a Baptist Retirement Home for indigent parishioners, which he founded in 1869. When Nugent died in 1883, his estate was worth nearly one-half million dollars. In his will, he included a generous legacy for the establishment of a retirement home for Baptist ministers, an institution that was chartered as the George Nugent Home for Baptists in 1887. In 1888, the George Nugent Home for Baptists opened in Nugent's former mansion. Within a few years, the Board of the Nugent Home commissioned eminent architect J. Franklin Stuckert to erect a larger structure to house its retirees. Mason John W. Gilton completed the construction of the Home in 1896. With its steeply pitched hipped roof, complex roofline, elegant masonry, proliferation of dormers, and fusion of Gothic and Renaissance detailing, the Nugent Home exemplifies the Chateausque style. It is a rare and important example of a style that eloquently evokes the Gilded Age. The unique and noteworthy building with its craggy roofline and exquisite detailing is an established and familiar visual feature in the community. The Nugent Home also marks an important point on the trajectory of American socio-economic history. It was an integral part of the historic movement that defined retirement as a distinct period of life and produced a series of institutions to administer it. It therefore exemplifies the economic, social, and historical heritage of the community. A model of Christian charity, George Nugent willed his material possessions to improve the spiritual lives of others. The Home is a monument to that altruism and faith. Moreover, it is a monument to significant points in our shared architectural and socio-economic histories. The Nugent Home is eligible for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Steinberg commended the Alliance on the nomination. He noted that the building clearly meets the criteria for designation, not only for architectural reasons, but, along with the Presser building, for its social significance. He stated that it shows how Philadelphia led the social movement for a more compassionate treatment of the elderly.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance referenced *Philadelphia Architecture: A Guide to the City*, a book he authored in the 1980s. He stated that he had recognized the significance of this building at that time. He noted his surprise when he recently discovered that it was not already listed on the Philadelphia Register. The building played an important role in the social reform movement. Its combination of social significance and stunning architecture is a unique union.

Neil Sklaroff, Esquire, attorney for the owner of the property, said that his client does not challenge the scholarship of the nomination. He did remind the Committee of the discussion of the Presser Home. He stated that his client's position on the designation had been entered into the record at the previous Committee and Commission meetings on the Presser nomination.

Sherman Toppins, Esquire, attorney for Impacting Your World Church, the equitable owner of the property, also conceded that his client would not dispute the technical aspects of the nomination. He noted that the church has hired an architect to investigate how the designation would affect the development of the property. He expressed concern that the designation would add considerable cost to the rehabilitation of the property, but that the church was interested in working with the various community groups. Mr. Tyler reminded the audience that designation would not necessarily increase the costs of redevelopment.

Pastor Reggie Stewart of Impacting Your World Church said that the church desired to develop the property at a reasonable cost. He stated that the church would preserve as much of the buildings and site as was feasible.

Mr. Tyler noted that the Commission and its staff review rehabilitation projects on a daily basis and that the Commission is sensitive to budgetary restrictions.

Elliot Battzedek, who lives across the street and represented several near neighbors, testified that the Nugent Home is an important landmark in the community. She declared that the imposing building defines the surrounding area, making it a vital and noteworthy residential community.

Lori Peterson, Executive Director of the West Mount Airy Neighbors, strongly supported the designation.

Mr. Huff moved to recommend the designation of 221 West Johnson Street, historically the Nugent Home for Baptists, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Rescission of 930 Adams Avenue, a.k.a. 800 Adams Avenue, Greenwood Knights of Pythias Cemetery

Greenwood Cemetery Company, Owner

Mr. Tyler presented the rescission application to the Committee on Historic Designation. He stated that the nomination that led to the designation of the cemetery in August 2000 was rife with errors. The majority of the argument for designation presented in the nomination rested on the claim that Benjamin Rush, a noted eighteenth-century doctor and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, had lived at the site. Mr. Tyler contended that Rush had never lived at the site, but had owned the property for a short time as an investment. Mr. Tyler noted that Rush had numerous other investment properties throughout the commonwealth. He concluded that the insignificant Rush connection did not warrant designation. Designating this property because of its link to Rush would be tantamount to designating any site in Pennsylvania because it had once belonged to William Penn.

Moving to the cemetery, which was designed by Thomas Levy about 1870, Mr. Tyler remarked that the nomination had argued that it was an example of the Rural Cemetery type, an important type in the history of cemetery development. He explained that Mt. Auburn Cemetery outside Boston and Laurel Hill and the Woodlands in Philadelphia, all of which date to the 1830s and 1840s, are excellent examples of the Rural Cemetery type. The type was prevalent from the 1830s to the 1850s and was based on the

Romantic, rambling, picturesque English garden. Greenwood Cemetery was established on cleared, graded farmland that did not resemble the rolling, natural landscape of the typical English garden. The area around Greenwood Cemetery may have been rural in 1870, but Greenwood was not a Rural Cemetery, as the nomination argued.

Finally, the nomination argued that the farmhouse on the site is a significant example of eighteenth-century vernacular architecture. Mr. Tyler reported that he and Mr. Farnham had analyzed the house from the basement to the attic and had undertaken extensive research to substantiate the competing claims made about it. He stated that map research shows that a structure of the appropriate size and location existed on the site as early as 1839. He also stated that information garnered from the numerous deeds is inconclusive. Two lengthy site visits have produced no evidence to support an eighteenth-century date for any portion of the structure. Mr. Tyler concluded that the house meets the criteria for designation, but that the justification for designation is not presented in the original nomination. He asserted that more research should be conducted and an updated nomination prepared.

Committee members asked who had prepared the nomination. Gloria Boyd of the Friends of Greenwood Cemetery stood and identified herself and Joyce Halley, now deceased, as the preparers of the nomination.

Mr. Huff stated that he is disturbed by the rescission application. He asserted that the Commission has not focused sufficient attention on Northeast Philadelphia. He concluded that he would vote against the rescission because the Northeast has lost "every shred" of its history.

Mr. Sugrue stated that he would vote to recommend designation if an accurate nomination were presented to the Committee. He recounted that the Knights of Pythias, the cemetery, and the house all have significance. He asked if the staff could be charged with preparing a better nomination. Mr. Tyler explained that the Committee must vote on the application before it. He stated that a new nomination could be considered at a later date. Mr. Laverty contended that the designation should not be rescinded, but that the nomination should be corrected.

Ms. Klein made a motion to table the rescission application for a period not to exceed six months pending the review of an amended nomination to be compiled by the staff, with all new information to be submitted by interested parties to the staff on or before 5 January 2005. Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

Ronald Hancock, whose wife owns a majority of the shares of the cemetery, disagreed with Mr. Huff, stating that it would be wrong to reject this application simply because the property is in the underserved Northeast. He asserted that the nomination was originally contrived to prevent the sale of the cemetery to his wife. He also outlined the court battle over control of the cemetery. He stated that any Commission's decision would have a profound effect on the property because the court had stipulated that the disputing parties had to accept it without appeal. Carol Hancock stated that Gloria Boyd and others had manipulated the Commission, Orphans' Court, and the Zoning Board of Adjustment to attempt to prevent her from realizing her plans for the cemetery. She said that she only wanted to return the cemetery to its former glory, but the Friends had tried to force her out. She warned the Committee that they had been misled by the original nomination.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the site would have been designated on its merits. The nomination may have been faulty, but the site appears to meet the designation criteria. Mr. Steinberg asked the Hancocks if they would support a designation of the site based on an accurate nomination. Mr. Hancock did not answer the question, but stated that they have an agreement with the City Councilperson and the local civic association to maintain the site. He also noted that his rescission application had been submitted in August 2003, but not scheduled for a hearing for almost a year. Mr. Steinberg asked him how the designation would impact the Hancock business. Mr. Hancock explained that the cemetery's funds that should have been used to restore the house had been depleted fighting the lawsuit. He claimed that there was no money for restoration. Ms. Hancock contended that the nomination was not based on fact. She added that she did not want to demolish the farmhouse as some had claimed.

Jean Wolf introduced herself as a consultant hired by the Friends of Greenwood Cemetery. Contradicting Mr. Tyler's assertion, she claimed that Greenwood was a Rural Cemetery. She also recounted the history and significance of the Knights of Pythias fraternal organization. Finally she asserted that the farmhouse dated to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Fred Maurer, a resident of the neighborhood, requested that the Committee hear his testimony. Mr. Sugrue welcomed Mr. Maurer and stated that the Committee would appreciate his testimony. Mr. Maurer requested an opportunity to be heard. Mr. Sugrue again asked Mr. Maurer to present his testimony. Mr. Maurer declared that he would not be silenced, but would be heard. Mr. Sugrue stated that the Committee welcomed his input and asked him to proceed. Mr. Maurer claimed that official signs announcing the hearing had not been posted at the property 60 days in advance as required by law. He also claimed that the Hancocks were not the owners of the cemetery and therefore had no right to make the application. The staff explained that no posting is required for an individual designation application like this one. A 30-day notice to the owners is required by the Commission's ordinance; that notice was made as prescribed by the ordinance. Also, anyone, including but not limited to the owner, may submit a rescission application. Mr. Maurer summarized his 12-page written statement, which provides an alternate history for the site. He concluded that "Rush's trinity will become Rush's Presbyterian hell fire pot."

The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to approve Ms. Klein's motion, seconded by Mr. Huff, to table the rescission application for a period not to exceed six months pending the review of an amended nomination to be compiled by the staff, with all new information to be submitted by interested parties to the staff on or before 5 January 2005.

Re-classification of 1706 Rittenhouse Square

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Mr. Tyler summarized the application for re-classification. He explained that the row along the south side of Rittenhouse Square was not built together, but an organic development of houses converted to carriage houses that were then returned to residential use. The diverse composition of well-to-do residents mixed with the service

class proved necessary for the survival of both classes. This mix forms a major part of the significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

The changing of the façade of the building is also typical of changes found throughout the district. Many buildings in the neighborhood have had the front facades changed by famous and not-so-famous architects over time, using tile, stucco, and brick materials. Again, these changes also formed a major part of the significance of the historic district.

Mr. Tyler emphasized that the local historic district did not have an end date for its period of significance, and that the classifications were based on the building's historic use, massing, scale, and rhythm. He noted that the building had been altered at the first floor in the 1950s, but unlike the National Register, the local register does not have a 50-year rule.

Lastly, Mr. Tyler expressed concern that to re-classify this building would set a dangerous precedent for this district. It would put at risk any building that had undergone changes in the last 50 years.

Ms. Klein objected to George Thomas's use of the term "unsavory" to describe the working-class area.

Thomas Witt, Esquire, attorney for the owner, argued that this would not set a precedent since the Commission evaluates each building on a case-by-case basis. He defined "contributing" as a building that reflects the character of the district and opined that since this building has been altered it no longer reflects the district's character.

Regarding the question of the difference between the National Register and the local district, Mr. Witt noted that the National Register nomination served as a guide for the local nomination, but that no real study of this particular building had been undertaken at the time the local district inventory was compiled. The National Register designation is not a detriment to the property, only an advantage in form of tax credits; therefore, if a building is given a higher grade on the National Register, no serious consequence results. However, local designation limits the rights of the property and greater care should be given to the local-register classification of the buildings.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged that when he prepared the National Register nomination for the Rittenhouse area he did not survey and research every property within the district. When he classified the buildings for the National Register, he simply said: "What the heck." Next, he outlined the history of the building. He claimed that the property was rebuilt in the 1920s by Carl Otto and the first floor was again altered in the 1950s by Ray Carroll. When the medical bookstore occupied the site, the owner installed large steel beams to handle the load. He contended that the front-façade, upper-story bays were added in the 1950s. The stainless steel storefront was installed in the 1980s. Finally, the façade was painted black. Concluding, he stated that "the merits are slim if any." It "looks like a house of horrors." Committee members disagreed with Mr. Thomas on his assessment of the bay windows, when appeared to date from a period much earlier than the 1950s. Mr. Myers contradicted Mr. Thomas, asserting that the stainless steel was added long before the 1980s. He testified that he had purchased a book in the store in the 1970s and the stainless steel was in place at that time.

John Gallery opined that this would set a precedent; however he believed that the building should not be considered contributing. He recalled the other two times the Committee and Commission had revisited their classifications, citing 2019 Green Street, a one-story remnant of a four-story building, and 328-30 Delancey Street, two properties entirely rebuilt in the 1950s, except for a piece of one wall. He then noted that the owner has an application for demolition for the property to develop this property along with the vacant lot for a condominium complex. The portion of the complex that would be on this part of the site would have the same height and massing as the building now standing. Mr. Gallery noted for the record that his request in writing for confirmation that the Commission retains full jurisdiction over new construction on sites where it had approved complete demolition had gone unanswered.

Mr. Lavery commented that he would not want to be in Mr. Thomas's shoes because Mr. Thomas had been called upon to defend his contradictory classifications of this property for the two registers. He also stated that the Committee should look at the streetscape of the block and, noting the parking lot at the corner, opined that if this particular building were missing, it would not impinge the streetscape. Ms. Klein also asserted that this building does not contribute to the streetscape in the district.

Mr. Huff made a motion to re-classify 1706 Rittenhouse Square from contributing to non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 4 to 1. Mr. Myers dissented.

Mr. Steinberg excused himself from the meeting and Mr. Myers chaired the remainder of the meeting.

3700-3800 Hamilton Walk, Richards Medical Building and Goddard Biology Building at the University of Pennsylvania

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Date: 1957-65, Louis I. Kahn, architect

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination. He explained that Kahn's design was an alternative to the rigid modernism of the day. The Museum of Modern Art in New York featured the building in an exhibit soon after it was completed, testifying to its great significance.

John Gallery stated that this building is often seen as a companion to Guild House and that Robert Venturi and Louis Kahn are two of the most prominent architects of the twentieth century.

Ms. Klein moved to recommend the designation of 3700-3800 Hamilton Walk, Richards Medical Building and Goddard Biology Building at the University of Pennsylvania, to the Philadelphia Register. Mr. Huff seconded motion, which passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina and Jonathan Farnham
Historic Preservation Planners