

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

**WEDNESDAY, 19 JULY 2023
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	X		
Suzanna Barucco	X		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.	X		
Bruce Lavery	X		
Debbie Miller	X		
Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.	X		

The meeting was held remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Daniel Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons attended the online meeting:

- Allison Weiss, SoLo/Germantown Civic Association
- Ashley Zimmerman
- Brett Mapp
- Christina Radley
- C.W. Lewis
- Dave Nepley, Byberry
- David Traub
- Deborah Gary, Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia African American Assets
- Dennis Carlisle
- Devon Beverly, Esq., Ballard Spahr
- Evan Hall
- Francis Petricionne
- Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance

Helen Cunningham
Isaac Elmakis
Jackie Taylor
James Benner
Janice Woodcock
Jay Farrell
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
John Calvitti
Kae Brockington
Kate Schoener
Ken Weinstein, Philly Office Retail
Kim King
Lecie Solomon
Lucy Davis
Amy Lambert, University City Historical Society
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr LLP
Mike Merkam
Nancy Pontone
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Zarwin Baum
RuNett Ebo-Gray
Russell Fulton
Ryan Wise
Sherman Aronson
Sonia Benner
Sophia Chihlas
Stacey Wright
Steve Potter
Steven Peitzman
Suzanne Ponsen
The Paul Robeson House & Museum
Yvonne Haskins, Esq.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 150 AND 160 W WASHINGTON LN

Name of Resource: Cranford

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: 150: G13 Residences, LLC; 160: Sapphire Corp.

Nominator: The Keeping Society

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate two properties, 150 and 160 W. Washington Lane, as historic, listing them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property at 150 W. Washington Lane includes a Colonial Revival brick house constructed in 1893 and expanded in 1909. The property at 160 W. Washington Lane is an undeveloped parcel surrounded by a stone retaining wall. The nomination argues that the properties are significant under Criteria A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the properties are significant for their association with Charles F. Jenkins, a prominent Quaker businessman,

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

historian, and publisher, who impacted the cultural and social development of the Germantown community and larger Philadelphia area. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the properties represent a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival style.

The nomination, which was submitted under a combined address of 150-160 W. Washington Lane but updated by the staff, does not appear to accurately reflect the history of the parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane, instead conflating it with that of 150 W. Washington Lane and identifying it as a side yard and garden. The undeveloped parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane was part of Edward Cope property that fronted on W. Tulpehocken Street and extended along Greene Street to W. Washington Lane until Cope's death in 1911. At that time, the parcel was conveyed to Cope's daughter, Maria C. Jenkins and her husband Charles F. Jenkins, who had purchased a portion of the property that would become 150 W. Washington Lane from Cope and a portion from David H. Livezey in 1893 and constructed the house in question at 150 W. Washington Lane. Charles and Maria Jenkins sold the property with the house at 150 W. Washington Lane to Elizabeth and E. Naudain Simons in 1917, and the undeveloped parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane to the same in 1919. While the Jenkins family may have used the parcel at 160 W. Washington Lane as a garden prior to the death of Edward Cope in 1911, the nomination does not provide evidence to support this claim. The only historic reference to a garden at the Jenkins property is a 1902 photograph of a sundial, whose location is not identified in the nomination. The nomination does not discuss the stone retaining wall that runs the length of the 160 W. Washington Lane parcel. It is likely a remnant of the Edward Cope property. The stone wall abuts a Colonial Revival brick retaining wall along 150 W. Washington Lane, and corresponds to historic maps, none of which are provided in the nomination.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 150 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D but does not demonstrate that the property at 160 W. Washington Lane satisfies any criteria.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:38

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Cooperman presented a continuance request to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Attorney Yvonne Haskins represented the property owner for 160 W. Washington Lane. No one represented the property owner for 150 W. Washington Lane.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman noted that the nominators submitted supplemental materials relevant to the nomination the night prior to this meeting. She argued that, given the late submission, there are various technical questions and that it may be appropriate to continue consideration of the nomination to a later meeting as determined by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Beisert addressed the late submission of supplemental materials, explaining that they were essentially in response to the staff overview and recommendation that mentioned that the nomination did not include photographs, maps, or descriptions. He noted that he does not have strong feelings about the garden/side yard of the property particularly, but because it was called out as a deficiency and additional information was provided by the staff, he wanted to make that clarification. He suggested that it was up to the Committee on Historic Designation to decide if it

- wanted to consider the supplemental materials or not. He argued that it seems like the lot was always a side yard to the property, given the orientation of the porch.
- Ms. Haskins stated that she is the attorney for 160 W. Washington Lane, the so-called side yard, but does not represent the owner of 150 W. Washington Lane. She requested that the review be continued to allow for time to review the supplemental materials.
 - Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that she would like to be able to give consideration to the supplemental materials and allow the property owners to review the materials, given that both parcels are part of the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nominator provided supplemental materials during the afternoon prior to the meeting, which did not allow the owners, Committee on Historic Designation, or public sufficient time to review.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination should be continued to the next Committee on Historic Designation meeting to allow all parties sufficient time to review the supplemental materials.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination for 150 and 160 W. Washington Lane be continued to the September 2023 Committee on Historic Designation meeting.

ITEM: 150 and 160 W. Washington Lane					
MOTION: Continue to September 2023 CHD mtg					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1523-29 BAINBRIDGE ST

Name of Resource: Hotel Brotherhood USA

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: The Hotel Brotherhood of the USA

Nominator: Historical Commission staff

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1523-29 Bainbridge Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the purpose-built garage and meeting hall, constructed in 1920 for the Hotel Brotherhood USA and reconstructed in 1937 after a fire, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property has significant value as part of the development and cultural characteristics of the City and Nation, as the headquarters of the Hotel Brotherhood USA, one of the earliest unions representing Black workers in the United States which was founded in Philadelphia in 1883 to provide medical and death benefits for Black hotel workers. Under Criterion B, the Hotel Brotherhood USA is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City and Nation, the 1885 protest organized by the Brotherhood against wage discrimination for Black hotel workers that led to a retraction of the proposed pay differential by the hotel proprietor. This marked the beginning of the Brotherhood as an organization structured along labor union lines for the advancement of Black hotel workers and later restaurant wait staff, and then private and domestic servers in the United States.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1523-29 Bainbridge Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:18:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Ms. C.W. Lewis, historian for the Hotel Brotherhood, USA, represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lewis summarized the historic significance of the Hotel Brotherhood, USA and its property at 1523-29 Bainbridge Street.
- Ms. Milroy asked if the entablature and dedication stone date from the 1937 reconstruction, or from the earlier 1920 building.
 - o Ms. Lewis explained that the building's first floor was originally used as a gas station, with two garage openings. She highlighted the significance of the hotel workers not only being waiters, but also involved in entertainment. She explained that Michael Jones, the president of the Bainbridge Club, has kept this component alive.
- Ms. Cooperman asked for clarification of the building's use.
 - o Ms. Lewis responded that the first floor was a garage used to generate income, and the second floor was a meeting space for training of new waiters. She explained that the Bainbridge Club was established as a way to keep the Hotel Brotherhood, USA alive. It hosts educational and cultural activities and was a way to reach out to a community in which some thought the Hotel Brotherhood, USA was a hotel. The Bainbridge Club was a way of branding the facility to allow for its transition.

- Mr. Cohen stated that he is curious about the building, despite a well-researched and well-written nomination. He stated that the building is an ambitious and sophisticated design. He noted that the location given for the Continental Hotel in the nomination is incorrect, and the hotel was at S. 9th and Chestnut Streets.
- Mr. Lavery commended the Historical Commission's staff on the nomination, agreeing that the Hotel Brotherhood, USA was significant in labor history in Philadelphia and the nation.
- Ms. Cooperman asked about the period of significance, noting that it is proposed to end in 2023. She stated that she understands that the Bainbridge Club is still significant and is still operating out of the building but stated that this end date to the period of significance could pose problems when reviewing work to the building's exterior. She noted that the building is coated in non-historic stucco over brick.
 - o Ms. Milroy agreed, and asked if a date in the 1960s or 1970s would be more appropriate.
 - o Ms. Miller objected, noting that the Bainbridge Club is still using the building, and has significance in the Black community through present day.
 - o Mr. Lavery noted that the façade pattern and fenestration remains relatively unchanged, but the stucco is newer.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Deborah Gary commented in support of the nomination.
- Jay Farrell commented in support of the nomination and pointed out a view of the front façade on Google from 2009, shortly before stucco was applied.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property at 1523-29 Bainbridge Street is a purpose-built garage and meeting hall, constructed in 1920 for the Hotel Brotherhood USA and reconstructed in 1937 after a fire.
- The stucco coating on the façade dates to circa 2010 and was applied over brick.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property has significant value as part of the development and cultural characteristics of the City and Nation, as the headquarters of the Hotel Brotherhood, USA, one of the earliest unions representing Black workers in the United States which was founded in Philadelphia in 1883 to provide medical and death benefits for Black hotel workers, satisfying Criterion A.
- The Hotel Brotherhood, USA is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City and Nation, the 1885 protest organized by the Brotherhood against wage discrimination for Black hotel workers that led to a retraction of the proposed pay differential by the hotel proprietor, satisfying Criterion B.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1523-29 Bainbridge Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and B, with the circa 2010 stucco coating to be considered a non-contributing element of the building.

ITEM: 1523-29 Bainbridge St MOTION: Designate; Criteria A and B MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Lavery					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 6670 KEYSTONE ST

Name of Resource: Vacant Lot (formerly St. Leo the Great Roman Catholic Church)

Proposed Action: Rescind Individual Designation

Property Owner: Paul Street Real Estate LLC

Individual Designation: 5/10/2019

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application requests the rescission of the individual designation of the property at 6670 Keystone Street. The property was individually designated on 10 May 2019, under an incorrect address of 6658 Keystone Street, which Commission staff has corrected as a clerical error. At the time of designation, the former St. Leo the Great Roman Catholic Church, which had closed in late 2018, stood on the site. On 9 May 2021, the church building was destroyed by arsonists and what remained of the structure was demolished. The property is currently a vacant lot.

Section 5.14.b.1 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations authorizes the Commission to remove entries from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places when the qualities that caused the original entry on the Register have been lost or destroyed. In this case, the building was designated for its architect and for exemplifying the heritage of the community. Those qualities were lost with the demolition. There is no longer a basis for the designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 6670 Keystone Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:55:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the rescission to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee on Historic Designation members expressed sadness over the loss of the St. Leo the Great Roman Catholic Church building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property was individually designated on 10 May 2019. At the time of designation, the former St. Leo the Great Roman Catholic Church stood on the site. The building was designated for its architect and for exemplifying the heritage of the community.
- On 9 May 2021, the church building was destroyed by arsonists and what remained of the structure was demolished. The property is currently a vacant lot.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- There is no longer a basis for designation because the qualities that caused the original entry have been destroyed owing to the fire and subsequent demolition of what remained on the site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 6670 Keystone Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed.

ITEM: 6670 Keystone St					
MOTION: Rescind designation					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Miller					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 4949 AND 4951 WALNUT ST

Name of Resource: Paul Robeson House and Museum

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: West Philadelphia Cultural Alliance

Nominator: University City Historical Society, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, and West Philadelphia Cultural Alliance

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 4949 and 4951 Walnut Street and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the two rowhouses satisfy Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. The nomination contends the dwellings meet Criterion A through their association with acclaimed African American activist and entertainer Paul Robeson. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues the properties are a representative example of middle-class, speculative development in an eclectic mix of revival styles at the turn of the last century. The nomination maintains the properties satisfy Criterion E through their association with prolific rowhouse architect E. Allen Wilson. The period of significance begins in 1910, the year the buildings were constructed, and ends in 2015, the year Frances Aulston, the founder of the West Philadelphia Cultural Alliance and champion of the Paul Robeson House and Museum, passed away.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates the properties at 4949 and 4951 Walnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, D, and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:59:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Amy Lambert and Hanna Stark represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Janice Sykes-Ross was having technical difficulties with Zoom and was unable to join the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Miller supported the nomination and noted that the accomplishments of Paul Robeson were astounding and stated the importance of telling the stories of underrepresented communities.
 - o Ms. Barucco agreed and echoed Ms. Miller's comments.
- Ms. Milroy supported the nomination and said she was familiar with the important work that has been done and is being done to preserve this house.
- Mr. Laverty supported the nomination and noted his appreciation for the architectural description as well as the mention of E. Allen Wilson. He remarked that the staff summary described the properties as rowhouses which is incorrect as the properties form a twin.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that she would like to see nominations stop using bibliographic citations as footnotes even though it has no bearing on the content or overall worthiness of the properties.
- Ms. Cooperman expressed regret that Janice Sykes-Ross was having technical difficulties in joining the meeting and hoped Ms. Sykes-Ross would be able to attend the Historical Commission's meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the nomination.
- C.W. Lewis supported the nomination. She recalled the outreach and cultural events organized by the late Frances Aulston.
- Deborah Gary spoke on behalf of the Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets in support of the nomination. She noted the museum's inclusion on the Sankofa Path which encourages people to visit small African American museums located across the city of which there are around 10.
- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society, commented in support of the nomination.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, notified the Committee on Historic Designation that Janice Sykes-Ross, the executive director of the West Philadelphia Cultural Alliance and the Paul Robeson House and Museum was having trouble connecting to the Zoom meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Acknowledging the work of Frances Aulston, founder of the West Philadelphia Cultural Alliance and champion of the Paul Robeson House and Museum, is an important aspect of this nomination.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the Paul Robeson House and Museum is associated with the highly significant Paul Robeson, satisfying Criterion A.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion D through it being an example of middle-class speculative development in an eclectic mix of revival styles at the turn of the last century.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion E through its association with E. Allen Wilson, a prolific rowhouse architect.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 4949 and 4951 Walnut Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, D, and E.

ITEM: 4949 and 4951 Walnut St MOTION: Designate; Criteria A, D, E MOVED BY: Lavery SECONDED BY: Milroy					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 4811 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Adamson Mansion; St. Michael of the Saints Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Germantown Revitalization

Nominator: Germantown Revitalization Now Two, LP

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 4811 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former campus of St. Michael of the Saints Roman Catholic Church which includes the Adamson Mansion, the Church, the Convent, and the Grotto, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, H, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the Adamson Mansion was home to William Adamson, an important manufacturer and philanthropist who contributed greatly to Germantown and the larger City of Philadelphia. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the Adamson Mansion, built between 1874 and 1876, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire style. Under Criterion H, the nomination points to the property's visually commanding site location which comprises an established and familiar visual feature of Lower Germantown and the larger Germantown neighborhood. The nomination contends that the satisfaction of Criterion J is twofold. First, it contends that the Adamson Mansion of the Adamson family, who made significant contributions to the Germantown and Philadelphian communities, satisfies the Criterion. Second, it contends that the contributions of St. Michael of the Saints to the historic Italian immigrant community of Lower Germantown, Nicetown, and the vicinity, satisfy the Criterion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed portion of the property at 4811 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, H, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:15:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Hendrickson presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Ken Weinstein, of Philly Office Retail, represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman inquired about a building that appeared to be included in the proposed boundary but was cut in half and unidentified in the nomination.
 - o Ms. Miller wondered if it was the one at the back of the lot and Ms. Cooperman responded in the affirmative.
 - o Mr. Beisert clarified that the building was no longer there but still shows up on the map.
- Ms. Cooperman asked about the building at the rear of the tax parcel, outside of the proposed boundary.
 - o Mr. Beisert responded that it was the former school that was associated with the property.
- Ms. Cooperman inquired why the school building and the northeastern portion of the lot were not included in the proposed boundary.

- o Mr. Beisert commented that the school was built in the 1950s and the property owner wished to exclude it from the nomination at this time.
- o Ms. Cooperman commented that she wanted to know more about that building and why that part of the property was excluded, especially having been associated with the church.
- Mr. Cohen remarked that the nomination was well researched and a site that had significance in different dimensions. He wondered if the Adamson Mansion could have been designed by James Windrim in a mode for which he was not well-known. Mr. Cohen commended the nominator for using clever resources. He asked how much of the Grotto was visible from the public right-of-way, and if they should reconsider having it in the proposed boundary.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee on Historic Designation's job is to consider the historic significance of the property and whether it meets the criteria.
 - o Mr. Weinstein commented that the rear building was built in 1950 and used by Germantown Charter School when it was there. Mr. Weinstein stated he did not know if it was ever used by the church. He commented that the look and architecture of the rear building is very different than the building they have included in the nomination, which is at the front of the property. He explained that the rear portion of the property was excluded for those reasons, and it was currently being used as an adult daycare. He stated the building that is no longer standing at the rear was also built around the 1950s and was of cinderblock construction and was in poor shape and demolished.
- Ms. Cooperman asked the location of the Grotto.
 - o It was indicated that the Grotto was just to the right of the image on screen, at the front of the property.
- Ms. Milroy wondered when the mansard roof was removed from the tower.
 - o Mr. Beisert responded that he was unsure, but it was not recently. He speculated that it was perhaps removed in the 1950s, while the church still owned the property.
- Ms. Milroy questioned whether Criterion I would be applicable, being on top of Negley's Hill and differed to Ms. Miller.
 - o Ms. Miller agreed that Criterion I was applicable for this property and in her opinion, the nomination proved that there was potential for archaeological resources. She explained that there was the potential for resources not only along Germantown Avenue where there were a variety of structures that went up the hill starting in the eighteenth century, but also because of the property's location in proximity to various waterways, which could create further potential for Native American sites. Ms. Miller stated that the land on the property behind the 1850's buildings was pristine land with intact ground surfaces. She also pointed to the front of the property where the land had been infilled, capping potential archaeological resources which could be under the infill. She expressed her disappointment that Criterion I was overlooked when it was clearly illuded to throughout the nomination. She argued that even if it were taken back to the Lenape or to the Battle of Germantown where the Light Dragoons camped less than 100 yards from this property or the Second Battalion that was at the bottom of the hill, Criterion I must be included in the designation.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that unfortunately, they were bound by the boundary as presented which did not include the back lot.
 - o Ms. Miller stated that there was still plenty of archaeological potential in the boundary as presented.

- Mr. Lavery noted his intrigue by the inclusion of Native American tribes climbing Negley's Hill and pausing at the top of the hill for a year in the narrative. He noted there could be many resources left behind in a year in the 1820s.
 - o Ms. Miller commented that more research could also flesh out the idea of the Lenape occupying this area. She added that down the hill at Stenton in 1736 and 1742, hundreds of people from the Iroquois Nation came there to trade with James Logan and stayed for months with their families. She noted that it was unknown where they stayed, but Stenton's boundaries at the time stretched to Logan Street, which included this property. She also noted that there was much potential to learn about these groups which people give credence to but continue to overlook in the broader history of Philadelphia.
- Ms. Milroy highlighted that elevated locations were important in ceremonial sites, and that Philadelphia had potentially lost one of the other major ceremonial sites when the top of Fairmount was cut off.
- Ms. Cooperman indicated that the most important point the Committee on Historic Designation was making was based on the information in the nomination, which was important when considering Criterion I.
- Ms. Milroy commented on the stylistic continuity of the buildings despite the property being used by different groups of people over time. She noted that it was a very interesting example of a stylistic conversation.
 - o Mr. Cohen agreed there was a consciousness of what was there before in each successive design.
 - o Mr. Lavery noted that the congregation was proud of the design.
 - o Ms. Milroy wondered if any of the congregants were involved in quarrying the Wissahickon Schist used in the construction.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that it was likely, as many of the quarry people in the late nineteenth century were Italian.
- Ms. Miller commented that properties such as this embody Philadelphia, cover a wide swath of history, and are visible proof of changing and evolving people and neighborhoods. She noted this property was an example of adaptive reuse from long ago.
- Mr. Cohen referenced the Lorraine House and how that added another dimension to this narrative.
- Ms. Barucco questioned the period of significance, and wondered if it should be a continuous period of significance.
 - o Ms. Cooperman stated she believed there were no regulations preventing the period of significance as it appears in the nomination.
 - o Ms. Milroy said she understood the eight-year hiatus as the time the Adamson Mansion stood vacant.
 - o Ms. Barucco stated she thought the period of significance should be c. 1874/76 to c. 1982.
 - o Ms. Miller added that the first date should be pushed back. She also wondered why the period of significance could not include the present time.
 - o Ms. Cooperman replied that it is a question of what is being regulated.
 - o Ms. Milroy expressed hope that future developers would be as sympathetic to the site as people in the past had been.
 - o Ms. Cooperman asked for a motion.
 - o Ms. Barucco wondered if they needed to address the period of significance.
 - o Ms. Cooperman suggested it be pushed back to the Woodland Period, 1000 BC to AD 1000.

- Ken Weinstein commented that as a for-profit developer, they went out on a limb to nominate their own property. He asked that the nomination be limited to what was included in the nomination. He noted there are currently no plans for the front of the property but that they would like flexibility in the future. He explained that he encourages other for-profit developers to nominate their properties and did not want to create a disincentive by the Historical Commission going beyond what they asked for.
 - o Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee on Historic Designation only gives a recommendation and does not designate. She said she believed it was important for the Committee to provide its professional guidance to the Commission, which has the power to designate. She further explained that Criterion I was the only means of knowing and finding out about many people of the past that had no access to a written record. She stated that to excavate and remove that evidence erases the opportunity to find out about these people and their lives. Ms. Cooperman noted it was part of the Mayor's Task Force recommendation that archaeological resources be better protected, which in her opinion has not happened.
 - o Mr. Laverty opined that the strength of the nomination was the description of the Native American activity in the 1820s, which put them on the site in question. He stated he would be more comfortable with that as a start date.
 - o Ms. Miller opposed this line of reasoning and the notion that archaeology is a burden. She stated that people make it a burden because it is not already included in development projects.
 - o Ms. Milroy noted that sites which are targeted for development are surveyed every day.
 - o Ms. Miller noted that survey is not digging up entire lots but could be as simple as a shovel test every 10 feet to look for cultural material.
- Ms. Barucco noted that if the beginning date for the period of significance was 1820 with the addition of Criterion I, any archaeological material that is found will be kept even if it is from before 1820, so the argument was not worth debating.
- Ms. Milroy emphasized the point of the discussion was that Criterion I is often overlooked and expressed a desire to change that.
- Ms. Cooperman ended by saying that archaeology does not stop development, does not cause delays, and does not cost a huge amount of money.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in support of the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman spoke in support of the nomination.
- Deborah Gary of the Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets spoke in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The proposed boundary includes the front portion of the tax parcel and recognizes four resources on this portion of the property, the Adamson Mansion (c. 1874-76), St. Michael of the Saints Roman Catholic Church (1951-52), the Convent (1955-56), and the Grotto (c. 1950s).
- The proposed boundary excludes the rear portion of the tax parcel, on which sits a c. 1950s building.

- Another c. 1950s building, which the boundary appears to cut through in Figure 2 of the nomination, was demolished previously.
- The nomination includes information on the Native American occupation of the property but does not explicitly argue for Criterion I.
- The addition of Criterion I and archaeology does not stop development, contrary to many developers' beliefs.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion A, owing to its association with William Adamson.
- Under Criterion D, the nomination demonstrates the Adamson Mansion embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire style.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion H, owing to its visually commanding site location.
- Under Criterion J, the nomination points to the contributions of the Adamson family and St. Michael of the Saints.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion I, owing to the potential of subterranean material culture which could yield information important in pre-history or history.
- The period of significance should be pushed back to the Woodland Period to account for the Native American occupation of the property.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 8411 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, H, and J, with the addition of Criterion I, and with the period of significance to be adjusted from the start of the Woodland period in 1000 BC to c. 1982.

ITEM: 4811 Germantown Ave					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, D, H, J, I, amend period of significance					
MOVED BY: Milroy					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 401 N SALFORD ST

Name of Resource: Wilt Chamberlain Childhood Home

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Latiechrie White

Nominator: Historical Commission staff

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination contends that the property at 401 N. Salford Street, known as the Wilt Chamberlain Childhood Home, is historically significant and should be listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination asserts that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation A; it “is associated with the life of a person significant in the past,” Wilt Chamberlain, one of the all-time greatest basketball players. Wilt Chamberlain was born in 1936 and moved to the house at age 3 in 1939, when his parents purchased the twin to accommodate their growing family. He resided at 401 N. Salford Street until leaving to attend the University of Kansas in 1955. Called “Dipper” by his friends, Wilt Chamberlain was a basketball star at Overbrook High School who went on to rewrite the National Basketball Association’s record books and forever redefine the game.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 401 N. Salford Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A for its association with basketball legend Wilt Chamberlain.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cohen stated that he appreciated the information about the background on the development of the neighborhood and property in the nomination.
 - Ms. Milroy agreed and noted how fast this section of West Philadelphia developed around the turn-of-the-century.
- Ms. Milroy stated that she appreciated the information tying this story to the Great Migration.
 - Ms. Cooperman agreed.
- Ms. Miller conceded that she did not know that Wilt Chamberlain was a native Philadelphian and noted that she learned a lot from the nomination.
 - Mr. Laverty noted his surprise and indicated that Wilt Chamberlain is incredibly important in the history of Philadelphia.
- The Committee on Historic Designation members agreed that the nomination was well written and made a very strong case for the significance of the property.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society voiced his support for the nomination. He asked if residents of the neighborhood were aware of Wilt Chamberlain’s connection to the house.
- Deborah Gary of the Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets supported the nomination. Responding to Mr. Beisert’s question, she stated that older residents were aware of the property’s connection to the famous basketball player, but younger residents might not be.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination and suggested that the Historical Commission develop a plaque program to publicize the historical significances of historic sites.
 - o Ms. Gary stated that her organization is seeking to develop a plaque program for African American historic sites but needs to find funding sources.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Wilt Chamberlain moved to the house at 401 N. Salford Street at age 3 in 1939 and resided there until leaving to attend the University of Kansas in 1955.
- Wilt Chamberlain is considered one of the all-time greatest basketball players.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation A; it “is associated with the life of a person significant in the past,” Wilt Chamberlain, one of the all-time greatest basketball players.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 401 N. Salford Street satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

ITEM: 401 N Salford St MOTION: Designate, Criterion A MOVED BY: Cohen SECONDED BY: Milroy					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 731 S BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Provident Home Insurance Home Office

Review: Designation

Property Owner: Philadelphia Area Labor Management Committee

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission Staff

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, theodore.maust@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 731 S. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building, constructed as a house in 1879 and converted for commercial use in 1947, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The property was the headquarters of the Provident Home Industrial Mutual Life Insurance Company from 1947 to 1974, one of the state's largest Black-owned companies. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J for exemplifying the social and economic history of the city. The nomination further argues that the distinctive architectural elements of both the original structure, which is visible along Fitzwater Street, and the renovated façade on S. Broad Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C and D.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 731 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:23:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Maust presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Francis Petricionne represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cohen expressed gratitude for the nomination and noted that the history of African American insurance companies is due more attention. He wondered about the original occupant, John Cochran and whether examining his network might yield an architect who designed this building, which he characterized as the work of an architectural "persona."
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the polychromic brick is also sculptural in nature.
- Ms. Barucco highlighted the interesting way in which the original building and the 1947 façade are juxtaposed in this property.
- Mr. Cohen and Ms. Milroy spoke to the legacy of the residential architecture along S. Broad Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites spoke in support of the nomination, commenting that the subject building is well composed and features such as the decorative brick and the angled bay give it distinction.
- Deborah Gary of the Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia's African American Assets commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Provident Home Industrial Mutual Life Insurance Company is an important part of Philadelphia's history.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The Fitzwater Street façade of 731 S. Broad Street, characterized by decorative brick and an artful bay, is a distinctive work of architecture without easy comparison in Philadelphia.
- The S. Broad Street elevation of the building is simple but elegant and worthy of architectural notice.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, as an important site for the history of Philadelphia's African American insurance companies.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, reflecting distinctive architectural styles of the late nineteenth and mid twentieth century within the S. Broad Street corridor.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 731 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

ITEM: 731 S BROAD ST					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C, D, and J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Miller					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 37-39 N 2ND ST

Name of Resource: Surface parking lot

Proposed Action: Rescind Individual Designation

Property Owner: 37 N. 2nd Street Philadelphia (USLCF I) LP

Applicant: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rescind the individual designation of the property at 37-39 N. 2nd Street. At its 6 January 1977 meeting, the Historical Commission individually designated several dozen buildings in Old City, including the property at 37-39 N. 2nd Street, which at the time included a four-story, nineteenth-century commercial building, known historically by various names including the Second Street House, Madison House, and Gould & Co. Furniture/Union Depot. In April 1985, the property was ravaged by a six-alarm arson fire, and subsequently declared Imminently Dangerous and ordered demolished by the Department of Licenses. The building was demolished soon thereafter, and the property has been used as a surface parking lot since 1985. The property was a vacant lot at the time of the Old City Historic District designation in 2003 and is classified as non-contributing in the district inventory.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 JULY 2023

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, PRESERVATION@PHILA.GOV

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations, the Commission may rescind the designation of a building and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register if:

- a. The resource has ceased to satisfy any Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed;
- b. Additional information shows that the resource does not satisfy one or more Criteria for Designation; or,
- c. The Commission committed an error in professional judgment when it determined that the resource satisfied one or more Criteria for Designation.

In the case of 37-39 N. 2nd Street, the individual resource that was designated in 1977 has ceased to satisfy any Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost. The property remains in the Old City Historic District with a classification of non-contributing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 37-39 N. 2nd Street, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, as the resource has ceased to satisfy any Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been removed through demolition.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:36:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the recission request to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Matt McClure represented the request and the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McClure explained that his client acquired the property a few months ago, and that it has been a surface parking lot for 38 years. He noted that under the pre-1984 preservation ordinance, the individual designation would have automatically been removed when the building was demolished.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the property would remain in the Old City Historic District with a classification of non-contributing.
- Mr. Farnham explained that the request is to rescind the individual designation, which was made when a building was still standing, and that this is essentially a request to correct the record and indicate that the property is no longer significant for that building. He noted that the Historical Commission would review future new construction on the property as it reviews any new construction on vacant lots in historic districts.
 - o Ms. Barucco asked whether this means that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction would be limited to review and comment.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded affirmatively.
 - o Ms. Barucco opined that she wished there was a way to better address new construction on vacant lots in historic districts. She argued that the whole point of historic districts is continuity.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that even though the Commission's jurisdiction would be limited to review and comment, the design would still be reviewed at a series

of public meetings, and everyone will be heard who wants to comment. She noted that, while zoning matters are not within the Historical Commission's purview, they are also important.

- Ms. Miller asked whether the Old City Historic District is inclusive of archaeological resources.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that it depends on how a property was inventoried. She noted that since the property at 37-39 N. 2nd Street is classified in the inventory as non-contributing, no archaeological significance is included. She also noted that the pre-1985 individual designation did not include archaeology.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Neighbor Sonia Benner commented that she lives behind the parcel and owns a small business across the street and asked whether the property is in a historic overlay.
- Deborah Gary of the Society for the Preservation of Philadelphia's African American Assets commented that it makes sense to remove the individual designation on a vacant property, but that if it is in a historic district, some consideration should be given that it not be completely removed from the district. She argued that the design features of future development should be compatible with the historic district. She opined that it is not good at properties can be removed from the historic register if they are demolished owing to fires.
- Neighbor Helen Cunningham asked whether there is any way to bind the developers to a historically relevant façade for a future development project.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- A four-story building at 37-39 N. 2nd Street was individually designated in 1977.
- The building was destroyed by fire in 1985 and its demolition ordered by the Department of Licenses & Inspections.
- The property at 37-39 N. 2nd Street was a parking lot at the time of the Old City Historic District designation in 2003 and is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District inventory.
- If the individual designation is rescinded, the property remains in the Old City Historic District with a classification of non-contributing.
- No archaeological significance is ascribed to the property in the Old City Historic District inventory.
- Discussion of new construction projects is beyond the purview of the Committee on Historic Designation.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The qualities that caused the original individual entry for 37-39 N. 2nd Street in the Philadelphia Register have been removed through demolition.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission rescind the individual designation of 37-39 N. 2nd Street, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations, as the resource has ceased to satisfy any Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been removed through demolition.

ITEM: 37-39 N. 2nd St MOTION: Rescind individual designation MOVED BY: Barucco SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 12965 TOWNSEND RD

Name of Resource: Byberry Store

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Universal Loan Company LLC

Nominator: David Nepley, Byberry Monthly Meeting

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 12965 Townsend Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criterion for Designation J. The nomination explains that the property is situated at the juncture of old roads that historically formed the crossroads community of Byberry, and, in its multi-functional use as a store, post office, blacksmith shop, and dwelling, the property operated alongside the neighboring Byberry Meeting (1808) and Byberry Hall (1847) as the core of the Byberry community and played a central role in the lives of residents of the rural community, satisfying Criterion J.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 12965 Townsend Road satisfies Criterion J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:55:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- David Nepley represented the nomination.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco and consultant Janice Woodcock represented the property owner. Mr. DeMarco noted that the property owner was also in attendance.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. DiPasquale noted that there is an error on page 10 of the nomination, which states that the Walton brothers purchased land in the third quarter of the seventeenth century along Poquessing Creek. This should be fourth quarter, and the parcels were roughly between today's Bustleton Avenue and Roosevelt Boulevard, rather than along the creek.

- Ms. DiPasquale also noted that the Commission received a report and request from the property owner's representative that the frame additions at the side and rear be considered non-historic. She explained that these were constructed outside of the period of significance, which ends in 1980, and would be treated as non-historic by the staff when reviewing building permit applications to the property.
- Mr. Nepley of the Byberry Friends Meeting explained that they found out last year that the property had sold and saw that the listing identified the building as having been constructed around 1950 and "likely a teardown." He noted that that made them nervous, as they were aware that the building was much older and had significance as the Byberry store. He acknowledged that portions of the building were constructed later, but that the main block of the building is significant to the Byberry community in the Far Northeast. He noted that it was constructed when Byberry was its own community and was just part of Philadelphia County. He explained that as of 1830 it was also a post office. He noted that the Friends Meeting has concerns about the preservation of the building itself but also potential new construction on the parcel.
 - o Ms. Cooperman replied that future development and new construction proposals are not under the purview of the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Mr. DeMarco explained that his client agrees with the staff. He noted that they are not concerned with future development, and that demolition and new construction are not reasons to designate a property. He noted that his client does not oppose the nomination, but that they would like the right to remove the existing non-historic additions in the future. He noted that the investigation led by Janice Woodcock revealed that the shed and rear additions post-date the period of significance and asked the Committee to explicitly note that the additions are non-contributing to the historic stone building, which is partially obscured by those additions. He explained that the owner understands that the Commission would have jurisdiction over any attachments to the building in the future.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if the owner wished to speak.
 - o Mr. DeMarco responded that he does not believe the owner wishes to speak but could raise his hand if he would like to.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned the location of the meeting house in relationship to the subject property.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale displayed an aerial view showing the location of the property relative to the meeting house.
- Ms. Milroy commented that it was a fascinating nomination with interesting and thorough research. She remarked on the surviving landscape, explaining that the significance of these properties is not just the buildings themselves but what connects them. She opined that the fact that so much of the Byberry crossroads still exists is fascinating. She noted that the nominator has suggested that the property be designated under Criterion J, which is fine, but questioned whether other criteria should be included.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee on Historic Designation could suggest other criteria that they feel are applicable based on the research in the nomination and their own expertise, and that the Commission can designate under any criteria it judges as important.
- Ms. Milroy questioned the potential applicability of Criteria C or D as a distinctive, albeit vernacular style, noting that the nomination does not address the design and style of the building and what it is that tells that it was a commercial building. She

- noted that there is an interesting placement of doors, with one to the front and one to side, the latter of which she suggested potentially indicates its commercial history.
- o Ms. Barucco noted that she had the same question.
 - o Ms. Cooperman explained that the second door is on the gabled southwest side elevation facing Southampton Road. She commented that the front elevation is very domestic rather than commercial. She noted that she appreciates Ms. Woodcock's report about the rear and side additions being non-historic.
 - o Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the side and rear additions replaced previous frame construction in the 1980s.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that the domestic form of the building does not mean that it was not a store, as buildings in remote locations often had more than one use.
 - o Ms. Milroy noted that inns oftentimes had doors located in similar locations.
 - o Mr. Cohen replied that most buildings have more than one door.
 - o Ms. Miller opined that one does not have to think of it as literally as a store in the conventional sense. She noted that stores in rural areas in the eighteenth century were often more on a peddler type basis and selling out of a shed or wagon, and that mail came en masse, and that people often lived and worked in the same building.
 - o Ms. Milroy opined that it would have been interesting to understand the style and construction as it related to the history of the building.
 - Ms. Miller noted that there was a lot of talk in the nomination about earlier buildings and additions that were on the property and in the Byberry community, including a log structure. She questioned whether those structures were on this site or where they were in relationship to the Byberry community.
 - o Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Cohen pointed out several detailed maps in the nomination, including figures 24 and 25.
 - o Mr. Cohen noted that figure 25 is quite good although he is not sure it correctly dimensions the masonry part.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that that would not be unusual.
 - o Mr. Cohen explained that the maps show that there were several wooden buildings including three that are marked as stables or barns on the subject property. He noted that they show how wide the addition was to the side and to the back that is represented as being larger than the stone part. He explained that it would be unusual to have that large of a frame addition except for a commercial purpose.
 - Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination provides a fascinating look at some of the rural places in Philadelphia County that do not seem much like typical Philadelphia and complimented the nominator for digging up the information presented. He noted that the nomination mentions "subsistence farms" in the area but clarified that these were more than subsistence farms. Farmers were not only farmers; they ran shops, etc. and were lucky farmers on very fertile land next to people who could not grow their own food. He explained that almost everyone in this area would have been part of a marketplace of food production and distribution locally or into the city. He argued that the term "subsistence farms" suggests something else, that people were scraping by and consuming all their own goods, but, in reality, this would have been a more diverse and thriving economic landscape.
 - Ms. Miller argued that the nomination demonstrates that Criterion I is applicable to the property. She explained that not only is the property situated in a pristine cultural landscape, but the historic documentation presented in the nomination that shows that there were other structures on the site in the past. She noted that, aside from the

built environment, the property is situated at a crossroads, a place where people were gathering. She remarked that, even though the built environment might have been limited to stables and other outbuildings, given the abolitionist activities that were taking place here in the nineteenth century, she sees a tremendous amount of activity across the site, and would be interested to see what evidence is in the ground and what remains of the earlier structures that were identified in the nomination.

- Ms. Miller opined that when the staff reviews nominations, they need to be thinking of Criterion I. She bemoaned the fact that two nominations on the agenda were “no-brainers” for archaeological potential and argued that the Committee would not have to have long drawn-out conversations if everyone started thinking about archaeological potential as significant. She reiterated that this property is in a pristine landscape with intact ground surfaces that represent several centuries of history. She commented that the fact that this tiny crossroads area is so intact is incredibly remarkable.
- Ms. Barucco questioned the applicability of Criterion G, because of its crossroads location, remarking that the little community is an extraordinary survivor.
 - o Ms. Milroy agreed, commenting that she would like to see the bounds of Criterion G pushed. She opined that too often people think it has to be a designed park or landscape but suggested that the fact that this property is at a crossroads qualifies as a distinctive area, and that the nomination effectively makes that point.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that Criterion G has two parts, and both must be addressed. “Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural, or architectural motif.” She questioned how the last part would apply.
 - o Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Farnham how Criterion G has been defined in the past.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that he had an opportunity to ask his predecessor Richard Tyler who was part of the ordinance writing and adoption in 1984, and he said it was intended to allow for the designation, for example, of buildings facing onto a square, where the buildings themselves may not be all that architecturally or historically significant but worked to create the backdrop to a city square, where perhaps a property does not have great significance itself but is part of a whole.
 - o Ms. Milroy responded that the problem is what to do with a situation like this, where Criterion G is still privileging the building over the landscape and the forms.
 - o Ms. Cooperman replied that the City does not typically designate landscape activities.
 - o Ms. Barucco suggested that the cultural motif is the crossroads community.
 - o Mr. Cohen agreed, opining that a motif can be big, and that one can think of a landscape that has a historical and cultural identity.
 - o Ms. Milroy commented that the architecture has a defining influence on the place.
- Mr. DeMarco objected to the addition of Criteria G and I. He explained that the owner does not oppose nomination as submitted, but if the Committee is going to start adding criteria that is not in evidence, he will be compelled to oppose the nomination. He argued that the property is not part of a park. He noted that he thought this was going to be a situation where the Committee was in full agreement with the staff as to what they deemed to be historic. He reiterated that the owner does not oppose

- designation of the building, and that the investigation by Ms. Woodcock showed that the existing additions, which obstruct the historic block and date to after the historic period, are not historic. He asserted that if the Committee adds additional criteria, they will have a contested scenario and he will have to present extensive testimony in opposition.
- o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee is doing its job in discussing the nomination and making a recommendation, noting that otherwise the staff could simply make a recommendation to the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. DeMarco replied that it is not the Committee's job to add criteria and that the owner has rights.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee is commenting on the information that is in the nomination.
 - Ms. Woodcock complimented the author of the nomination, explaining that she did not do any additional research for her report. She noted that she did visit the site and look carefully at the existing additions, which are contemporary construction and diminish the historic character of the site. She noted that the front façade of the building faces Old Townsend Road, which is part of the crossroads. She opined that this is the more significant view of the property, even though the rear has nice trees. She also noted that the zoning records show that the modern additions replaced earlier structures and additions on the site.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the information in the nomination, including in figures 25 and 26, show pieces of the building projecting to the southwest. She commented that, although the proportions may not be rendered completely accurately, the fact that a volume projects so clearly to the southwest, approaching the road, is significant. She argued that it is inaccurate to read this property solely as the main block of a conventional domestic building. She explained that figure 14, the 1964 photograph, shows the side porch clearly.
 - o Ms. Cooperman took no issue acknowledging that the current secondary frame volumes date to the 1980s and are non-historic but commented that the southwest elevation is not secondary. Historic components of the property extended to the southwest, and map evidence and historic photographs in the nomination run contrary to that assertion.
 - Ms. Cooperman opined that the addition of Criterion G is not appropriate, but that Criterion I is certainly applicable. She noted that instead of a park, the crossroads area is a small historic district that has not yet been designated as one.
 - Mr. Laverty opined that this is a significant property in an important area that tells the entire story of Philadelphia. He noted that in the aerial image, it shows that the property is adjacent to Parkwood Manor, one of Edmund Bacon's greatest successes or failures, depending on how one looks at it, which was built simultaneously to Eastwick and Society Hill. He shared that between 1975 and 1981, he lived about 700 feet east of the subject property, in that neighborhood. He explained that while he knew there was a Quaker meeting house and some old houses on Townsend Road, he had not been aware of the depth of the history until much later. He shared that the new development had been constructed very quickly with great minds at work behind the development, but when it got to things on the ground Mr. Bacon did not take into consideration that anyone might put up a chain link fence and not want to share their space with their neighbor or have more than one car changed the complexity of that. But that development, he noted, is right next to that is this incredibly important area that should be a park in terms not only in terms of the history of Philadelphia but also the abolitionist movement. He

commented that in the map in Figure 15 of the nomination, it shows that Robert Purvis had owned the land that his teenage home had been built on in Parkwood Manor, which is sad and ironic because Parkwood in the 1960s and '70s was an area of white flight. He explained that Robert Purvis moved up to Byberry in 1842 after having to defend himself on his front step from Irish mobs who were threatening to burn his house down and kill his family, and that the first thing Purvis did in Byberry was to establish a library and meeting place, which is the same thing he did behind the Athenaeum in the church that Absalom Jones established. Purvis was an incredibly significant person, who among his other activities, created the Library Company of Colored People in 1833. Mr. Laverty stressed that the subject property and the surrounding crossroads is a special place that has survived in what is now an incredibly built-up area in terms of residential development to the east and industrial development to the west.

- o Ms. Milroy commented that Edmund Bacon's family was from this area and was part of this meeting but were slaveholders in the eighteenth century.
- o Ms. Milroy noted that the discussion is building off the information provided in the nomination and the history that was told in the nomination. She explained that as historians and practitioners, when they are given a body of evidence in a good nomination, it creates an opportunity for discussion and expansion. She argued that this nomination and others can recognize pieces of our history that have not come together as effectively in the past.
- Ms. Barucco returned the discussion to Criterion G.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the addition of Criterion G does not make a difference.
 - o Ms. Barucco disagreed, opining that it does, because it shows that the property was part of something larger.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded affirmatively but opined that that larger entity is a district that has yet to be created.
 - o Ms. Milroy noted that the boundaries in the nomination do not make it a district.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that a portion of what could be a larger district has been "boogered up" by later construction, but the crossroads remains.
 - o Mr. Cohen commented that it would be great in the future if there were criteria that were more responsive to landscapes.
- Mr. Cohen clarified that the information in the nomination already demonstrates that the property merits Criterion I, and that the Committee is not asking for more evidence. He explained that if designated under Criterion I, all it means is that if there are expansions on the site, attention is paid to possible archaeological evidence.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination. He noted it is in a remote part of the city that many people who do not live in the area do not frequent, but has a number of wonderful historic buildings, including the adjacent Byberry Friends Meeting. He advocated for the preservation of the building.
- Deborah Gary of Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets (SPPAAA) supported the nomination. She noted that it is a property that is related to the Byberry community and Byberry Meeting, which is working closely with SPPAAA on the Byberry Township African American Burial Ground, just up the street from the subject property. She explained that being able to research the entire history of the story of the Byberry community is important to the history of the burial ground and will undoubtedly have connections to this store and post office, as well as the

meeting house, and they do not want to lose part of the story while continuing to research it further.

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination and the Byberry Meeting's efforts to preserve the property, which he opined feels like it is part of an early nineteenth century "vignette" compared to everything that is around it. He commented that it is a remarkable survivor and should be designated.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building at 12965 Townsend Road was constructed circa 1810 at a historic crossroads that formed the center of the rural Byberry community, which played a critical role in the abolition movement.
- The property served a multi-purpose function, as a residence, store, and post office, among other uses, and played host to and was surrounded by abolitionist activity.
- The property historically had larger frame additions and other outbuildings extending to the southwest and southeast of the existing building.
- The existing frame additions at the side and rear are not historic, having been constructed in the 1980s, after the end of the period of significance.
- The property is part of a pristine crossroads landscape with intact ground surfaces that represent several centuries of history and may contain archaeological resources.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion J.
- Although the nomination does not explicitly identify Criterion I, the documentation in the nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion I.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 12965 Townsend Road satisfies Criteria for Designation J and I.

ITEM: 12965 Townsend Rd					
MOTION: Designate; Criteria J and I					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Miller					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

HOUSE OF ST. MICHAEL AND ALL ANGELS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Various

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a historic district consisting of three parcels on the southeast corner of N. 43rd and Wallace Streets in West Philadelphia. The three parcels are comprised of two consolidated Italianate twin houses and a brick church building and are identified in the inventory as five resources. The church building was individually designated on 10 November 2017. The nomination argues that the House of St. Michael and All Angels Historic District is significant under Criteria for Designation A and J. The period of significance for the district begins in 1887 with the creation of an organization founded to provide medical and social services to African American children with physical disabilities and ends in 1938 with its dissolution. Under Criteria for Designation A and J, the nomination argues that the House of St. Michael and All Angels was one of the first institutions of its kind established in the nation. It further argues that, collectively, the properties represent a rare surviving historic campus of an institution that exclusively served the African American community in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the House of St. Michael and All Angels Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:43:28

PRESENTERS:

- Alex Till presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Beisert expressed his enthusiasm for having worked on the nomination with the University City Historical Society. He informed the Committee on Historic Designation that they spoke with the property owner before the nomination was submitted and they did not receive any objections at that time. He added that the site is very important and many African American institutional sites from the nineteenth century have not survived. Even though this one is small and partially lost, it was one of the earliest intuitions devoted to helping disabled African American children.
- Ms. Cooperman commented on the sad history that disabled children faced at the time this institution was active and how today the medical field treats the same population differently. She stated that it is important to recognize the care offered here in relation to the time period. She added that the nomination includes an interesting set of domestically scaled buildings used in an institutional manner.
 - o Mr. Cohen commented on the size of the twins and how they were preexisting buildings that reflected rising middle-class housing of the time. He described them as a “paternalistic landscape with a noble cause.” He added that Pauline Henry was involved in many philanthropic efforts at the time and founded other hospitals.
 - o Ms. Miller added that she related to the discomfort of the topic and has worked with lots of objects related to race-based histories. She emphasized that it is

important to remember that at the time, the mission of this organization was a radical idea and though it was entrenched in racism and paternalism in a modern sense, it was a big step historically. It is important to document and preserve what was being done here and its focus on the African American community and its disadvantages.

- Ms. Cooperman added that it is hard to separate the history from our present ideas or morality. She added that the historical photographs included in the nomination are excellent.
 - o Ms. Milroy added that this is a case of buildings and institutions located in a fascinating part of town. The history of the Mill Creek area shows a number of other institutions and schools focused on the Black community and its interaction with white communities in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and those topics are only now being explored. She previously worked on a project last spring focusing on how the neighborhood south of the Centennial grounds was developed with several Black-owned businesses in a period that was perhaps earlier than many people would expect. It is very important to recognize that history here.
 - o Mr. Cohen asked when exactly the Black-owned businesses were there.
 - o Ms. Milroy responded that it started happening around the same time as this institution was founded in the 1890s and into the turn of the century. She added that there was a significant Black community here that needs more study.
 - o Mr. Cohen added that the included maps show that there was a “philanthropic footprint” in this area and that it is hard to determine a proper way to appreciate and situate philanthropy in this historical setting.
- Ms. Milroy expressed curiosity about the large twin houses and whether they are related to architect Samuel Sloan or an imitator. Other Committee members agreed that the twins look like Sloan’s designs.
 - o Mr. Cohen commented on the design of the twins and described them as large 1850s Italianates that do not have a front facing front door but instead wrap-around porches that lead a person to the middle of the side to approach the buildings. He added that there are standout details on the church building designed by William Masters Camac, an elite architect who worked in Frank Furness’s office. He described a stepping up of the base and relatively modest materials with an elevated design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Deborah Gary of the Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American Assets thanked the nominators for their work and offered her support for the nomination. She added that it is good to have African American history recognized in the city and this particular institution was one of the few in the nation designated to help disabled children at the time.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites expressed his thanks and support for the nomination. He pointed out the building’s oversized character and monumentality and praised the architectural design in addition to emphasizing the important history associated with the African American community.
- Amy Lambert of the University City Historical Society commented that she spoke in person to a Nancy Moy, secretary to John Price, owner of the twins. She was told in person that they are supportive of the nomination and are aware of the proposal.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The properties were owned and run by The House of St. Michael and All Angels from 1887 until 1938, an organization founded to provide medical and social services to African American children with physical disabilities.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the properties satisfy Criterion A for their connection to the House of St. Michael and All Angels, one of the first institutions founded to provide medical and social services to African American children with physical disabilities in the nation.
- The nomination demonstrates that the properties satisfy Criterion J because, collectively, they represent a rare surviving historic campus of an institution that exclusively served the African American community in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Philadelphia.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the House of St. Michael and All Angels Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

ITEM: House of St. Michael and All Angels Historic District					
MOTION: Designate; Criteria A and J					
MOVED BY: Milroy					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:05:40

ACTION: The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory Committees are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- (i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.