

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

**WEDNESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2016, 9:30 A.M.
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
EMILY COOPERMAN, PH.D., CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Anton Michaels
J.M. Duffin
Chris Isaacson
Andrew Miller, Esq.
Jay Milgrom, Pare Group, LLC
Brett Peamasky, Klehr Harrison
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Newton Philson
Dana Fedeli, Kensington Olde Richmond Heritage
Carlos Lopez
K. Herzog Larkin, Esq.
Leona Tucci
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Desay Downing, St. James Pentecostal Church
Loretta Lewis, Union Baptist Church
Kathy Dowdell
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Oscar Beisert
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Arielle Harris
Glen Tyson
Quentin Stoltzfus
Fred Moore
Debbie Klak, All Saints Torresdale
Joseph J. Menkevich
Theresa Pursell
Carlos Lopez
Jason Sherman

CALL TO ORDER

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

1722-40 N HANCOCK ST

Name of Resource: Francis Kelly Waste & Shoddy Manufactory

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Leona Tucci

Nominator: Dana Fedeli

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1722-40 N. Hancock Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Francis Kelly Waste & Shoddy Manufactory complex satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J.

Regarding Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the complex of buildings, constructed in phases between 1889 and 1917, is significant for its association with the textile industry in Kensington. The staff contends that the nomination offers a series of trivial facts and figures related to the evolving business gleaned internet research, but never demonstrates how the complex “has *significant* character, interest or value as part of the development” of the City, Commonwealth or Nation” or how it “*exemplifies* ... the heritage of the community.”

Regarding Criterion C, the nomination invokes William Fairbairn and claims that the complex of buildings is architecturally significant because it “represents an era of the industrial revolution that was characterized by a distinctive architectural style and influence.” The nomination asserts that “a movement of sorts transcended the industrial revolution and its buildings were ‘undecorated’ with a stylistic treatment of simple functional design.” It also claims that complex exemplifies the Rundbogenstil. The nomination concludes that “the influences of both Fairbairn’s ideas and methods and the Rundbogenstil (or round arch style) came to dominate American architecture in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.” The staff contends that the buildings are architecturally unrelated to the Industrial Revolution, which ended more than a half-century before they were constructed, and in no way represent Fairbairn’s ideas or the Rundbogenstil. The buildings are turn-of-century vernacular light industrial structures that evidence aspects of the late Italianate, Queen Anne, and Classical Revival styles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 1722-40 N. Hancock Street satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorneys Leonard Reuter and K. Herzog Larkin and property owner Leona Tucci represented the property owner. Dana Fedeli and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Ms. Fedeli and Mr. Beisert stepped forward and sat at the conference room table with the Committee members. Ms. Cooperman explained that, in the future, nominators, property owners, and members of the public should follow the standard practice and wait until called upon to approach the table.

Ms. Fedeli stated that she found the history of the property to be interesting. She noted that the property is listed on the National Register Kensington Textile Industry Multiple Properties

Documentation Form (MPDF), and claimed that the MPDF indicated that she was not the only one interested in the property. Mr. Beisert agreed, noting that there are many other properties in the area that are not called out in the MPDF. Ms. Fedeli opined that the group of buildings is highly identifiable in the area because many other similar buildings have been lost over the years. She stated that the fact that this group of buildings still stands was interesting to her organization and other people in the community.

Mr. Reuter stated that the owners object to the designation on roughly the same grounds as the staff, which recommended that the nomination did not satisfy the Criteria for Designation. He first addressed Criterion C, opining that the property does not represent any distinctive architectural style from the period of significance. He noted that it is a vernacular building, which is identified in the nomination as the “undecorated style.” He commented that he is not familiar with the so-called “undecorated style.” Mr. Reuter opined that the building is clearly not Rundbogenstil, as the nomination wrongly claims. He noted that another building on the agenda is Rundbogenstil, but asserted that this building does not compare in any way to that building. He noted that Rundbogenstil is a nineteenth-century Germanic interpretation of Romanesque architecture, and this building in no way reflects that style.

Mr. Reuter asserted that designation should not be taken lightly; simply because a property is older and has been around for a while does not necessarily make it historic. Mr. Reuter opined that, for a building to be nominated for its association with a particular industry, its connection or association with that industry or company should be apparent. He suggested that there is nothing in particular about this building that has any significance to the textile industry other than the fact that it happened to have been used by a company that was involved in the textile industry. He asserted that it is not even clear what happened in these buildings; it is not clear whether manufacturing occurred in these buildings. He noted that the buildings were mostly used as storage of materials after the 1920s. He opined that the façade along Hancock Street likely was not constructed until 1913, which was at the tail end of the Kelly Company’s occupation of the buildings. He noted that, according to the nomination, the buildings were not completely assembled into the Kelly-Hughes Company until 1922, which is the same year that the nomination indicates that the company went silent. He noted that the City’s zoning file indicates that the property began use in the furniture industry and storage of upholstery as early as 1928 or 1929. He argued that building in its current state is not what the Kelly Company used for most of its history. He stated that the buildings were never consolidated during the Kelly occupation. He noted that he knows that the Committee does not look at the condition of a building, but that he believes that there have been significant alterations over the years to the point that the original buildings are essentially unrecognizable, to use the nomination’s own words. He stated that the public interest in this building is not significant enough to outweigh the private property rights of an owner, who opposes designation. He noted that listing on the National Register MPDF does not place any restrictions on the property, but provides potential tax credits. He opined that almost any building over 50 years of age could theoretically qualify for listing on the National Register. Ms. Cooperman responded that there are many other criteria and standards that have to be met to qualify for National Register listing, and that there are buildings that are not 50 years of age that can also qualify for National Register listing. She opined that throwing 50 years out as a benchmark does not inform the Committee. Mr. Reuter responded that the bottom line is that the nomination does not prove that these buildings satisfy the Criteria for Designation for the Philadelphia Register.

Ms. Fedeli rebutted Mr. Reuter, stating that, according to fire insurance records, it seems that the properties were consolidated, as there were internal connections between the buildings. She stated that the reason she found the property interesting is that many textile buildings were built

in sections as companies expanded; as they needed more space, they acquired more property. She noted that the fact that the property was built in stages is completely consistent with the time period. Ms. Fedeli opined it is an elitist statement to say that the buildings are just textile buildings, and that she is personally insulted because her relatives worked in the textile industry. Ms. Cooperman thanked Ms. Fedeli for her clarification on the technical point, but suggested that Ms. Fedeli and Mr. Reuter refrain from a back-and-forth conversation, and limit their arguments to the technical merits of the nomination. Mr. Reuter responded that he is not disputing that there were breaches between the walls, but that the tax parcels were never consolidated during the period of significance. He explained that no one is disputing the historical significance of the textile industry in Philadelphia, but that that does not mean that every building associated with the textile industry is important. Ms. Fedeli said that these buildings are interesting.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor Theo Mullin expressed his support for the nomination, noting that he and his partner recently purchased a house across the street from this property. He noted that the aesthetic of the building under consideration is what attracted them to the neighborhood. He opined that it was frustrating and heartbreaking to hear that the property might be demolished to build something that has no significance. He stated that he is passionate about the property being preserved.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance believes that the buildings do satisfy the Criteria for Designation set forth in the nomination. He stated that he supports the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf spoke to the staff recommendation, noting that he also does not believe that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and C. However, he continued, he does believe that the building satisfies Criterion J, and suggested that the Committee explore Criterion J. Mr. Cohen agreed, opining that the Committee is tasked with evaluating two things: the worthiness of the nomination as written, and the worthiness of the building. Others disagreed, contending that the nominator has an obligation to make the case in the nomination. The task is to determine whether the nomination demonstrates that property satisfies the Criteria, not to search for ways in which the property might satisfy the Criteria. Mr. Cohen agreed that the claims about Fairbairn and the Rundbogenstil are incorrect and were merely cut and pasted from another nomination. He noted that there is an industrial vernacular architecture that would fall under Criterion J, and is articulate about the neighborhood. He agreed with the staff that the case is not well made that the design was influenced by Fairbairn or Rundbogenstil, but opined that the form of the building is characteristic of the history of the neighborhood and roots the evolution of the neighborhood in physical form. He noted that the argument is not well made in the nomination for why it is a distinctive characteristic form, but asserted that the building merits that kind of consideration.

Responding to Mr. Reuter's arguments, Mr. Cohen noted that the term "industrial vernacular" better describes the property than the "undecorated style." He opined that buildings such as this one speak articulately about the heritage of the community. Mr. Cohen strongly disagreed with Mr. Reuter's assertion that the front wall dates to 1913, and stated that there would have to be evidence to support that claim. Mr. Cohen noted that Mr. Reuter had stated that he was not an architectural historian, and yet had asserted certain things about the architectural history of the property. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Reuter to provide evidence of his assertions. Mr. Cohen disputed the assertion that the character of the property is no longer recognizable, and argued that the property speaks directly about the industrial character of the neighborhood, and its history is legible in the fabric of the building.

Speaking to the nominators, Mr. Cohen commented that he appreciates the research that went into the nomination, but recommended several ways to improve this and future nominations. Mr. Cohen recommended that the nominators number the figures they provide in the nomination, and integrate the numbering into the text. He also recommended including photographs of each part of the building with the architectural description of that portion of the building, as it is very difficult to discern which building was which when all the photographs are clustered together. Mr. Cohen emphasized the need to write for the reader. He asserted that this and other nominations by these nominators are difficult and tedious to read. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that a simple graphic in which each building was labeled so that it was immediately identifiable would be an enormous help to the reader. Mr. Cohen also suggested that the maps be turned the same directions, and spread throughout the narrative history of the property. He also recommended circling or somehow indicating where the property is on the maps.

Mr. Cohen reiterated his support for the designation of the property under Criterion J. He noted that he wished the nomination made a better argument for A and C, but opined that it does not.

Mr. Reuter responded that the nomination itself on page 20 indicates that the “current façade may have been constructed as a result of Permit No. 4913 in June 1913, which described plans to ‘put up a new brick front,’ among other improvements. This was likely an attempt to unify the facades aesthetically after Francis Kelly acquired the building along with Building No. 3 in 1912.” Mr. Cohen asked if Mr. Reuter believes that that indicates that all of these buildings were constructed in 1913. Mr. Reuter responded that what the nomination demonstrates is that the unity of the front façade dates to 1913. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman disagreed. Mr. Cohen stated that, as an architectural historian, he would not believe the façade dates to that time. Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination is not asserting that the whole façade was changed, but that some alterations were made. Ms. Cooperman noted that it is important to pay attention to visual evidence. Mr. Reuter responded that the Committee should be determining whether the nomination makes the case; the Committee must not look beyond the nomination at the building alone. The nominator is obligated to make the case in the nomination. Ms. Cooperman reiterated Mr. Cohen’s earlier assertion that the Committee is tasked with looking both at the nomination as well as whether the property merits designation. Mr. Reuter disagreed. The nominator has an obligation to make a case for satisfaction of the Criteria in the nomination. If the Committee was tasked with simply considering the building, the nomination would be unnecessary. Mr. Reuter asserted that this nomination does not make the case that the buildings satisfy any of the Criteria.

Mr. Schaaf countered the earlier assertion that it is not clear what activities occurred in these buildings. He opined that the nomination explains how shoddy was manufactured in these buildings. He noted that it is an interesting phenomenon and that he had not been aware of this early recycling effort. He further noted that one of the maps shows that these buildings are directly across the street from a woolen mill, and obviously this manufactory was taking advantage of the waste of neighboring factories. Mr. Reuter responded that he was not suggesting that he does not know what shoddy manufacturing is, but that it is not clear what role this company had in shoddy manufacturing. He noted that zoning records indicate it was used as upholstery storage after the late 1920s. Ms. Cooperman responded that the nomination makes a case that shoddy was often used in upholstery, so that was something that makes sense. Mr. Reuter commented that it is not clear whether the building was storage or manufacturing for the textile industry, but that, either way, not every building that was associated with the textile industry is necessarily significant. Ms. Cooperman thanked him for his opinion.

Ms. Klein commented that the Historical Commission designates buildings that contribute to the history of Philadelphia. She noted that this property represents a contribution, but is in no way sufficiently historic to merit designation by itself. She opined that the property is not as significant by itself as other buildings of this nature.

Ms. Cooperman opined that she found the discussion of shoddy fascinating, and noted that she had not previously been familiar with shoddy. She stated that this property falls within a range of textile industry buildings; at one end is the enormous Bromley Carpet mills, and at the other are the small manufactories of this scale that are indicative of the full breadth of the textile industry in Philadelphia. Ms. Cooperman opined that minor buildings are still part of the history of the textile industry.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1722-40 N. Hancock Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

1910 FITZWATER ST

Name of Resource: Tabor Chapel

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: The First Colored Wesley Methodist Church

Nominator: Oscar Beisert

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1910 Fitzwater Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Union Baptist Church, constructed in 1915, is significant under Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination contends that the church is significant for its association with the Union Baptist Church, founded in 1832, and once the largest African Baptist congregation in America. The nomination also argues that the church is significant for its association with the world-famous contralto Marian Anderson, a member of the Union Baptist congregation, who regularly sang at the church during her youth.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1910 Fitzwater Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Church members Loretta Lewis and Theresa Pursell represented the property owner. Oscar Beisert and James Duffin represented the nomination.

Ms. Cooperman asked if the nominators would like to add any comments to the staff overview. Mr. Beisert commented that Mr. Duffin and others had been advised that this church should be nominated after the former home of the Union Baptist Church on 12th Street was demolished. Mr. Beisert noted that this building is important for its association with Marian Anderson as well as for being one of the largest and oldest African Baptist congregations at the time the building was constructed.

Ms. Cooperman commented that, while it is flattering to see her name in nominations, Mr. Beisert cited the wrong person when he included her name in this nomination. She noted that

Matthew Hopper, not she, wrote the historic context for the Multiple Property Documentation Form that Mr. Beisert referenced throughout the nomination.

Mr. Beisert remarked that too many buildings related to African American history have been lost, and he does not want to see one of this magnitude also lost.

Ms. Cooperman asked if members of the congregation would like to address the Committee. Ms. Lewis commented that Union Baptist was established in 1832, 30 years before the Civil War, by free men. She noted that the building in question is the third building of the congregation; the congregation has built every building it has occupied. This building was built in 1915, and the congregation moved from 12th and Bainbridge, from a church that has since been demolished. She commented that she appreciates Mr. Beisert's interest, noting that they have been compiling a history of their church so that they can be recognized nationally. She noted that Marian Anderson was one of the church's members, attending the church as a child. The church supported her, and helped her with her lessons, but she was just a little girl in the choir, who grew up and remained in the neighborhood. Ms. Lewis explained that, while they revere her, she was just a church member.

Ms. Pursell thanked the nominators, noting that she is a member of the church as well as the community. She reported that her entire family was raised in the neighborhood, and it is a very special church. She explained that there were many churches in the neighborhood that have been demolished and replaced with houses, and she would not want to see that happen to this church. She stated that they want to see the church stand to represent its history and Marian Anderson. She noted that there are new members of the community who are interested in the church, and will help support it.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance believes the building satisfies the Criteria for Designation cited in the nomination. On a personal note, he continued, he lived at 20th and Kater Streets from the late 1980s to the early 1990s, and is also a member of the Marian Anderson home on Martin Street. He also noted that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has erected a state marker outside the church in honor of Marian Anderson. Mr. Steinke opined that it is tragic that the former Union Baptist Church was demolished just a year ago, and that this neighborhood is ground zero for the tear-down epidemic that is spreading through the city, and which the Alliance and its allies are seeking to quell.

Mr. Cohen noted that it is too bad that the other buildings are gone, but this building is an eloquent, visual monument of a community, and it is important to preserve it.

Regarding the nomination, Mr. Cohen suggested that Mr. Beisert proofread his work prior to submitting it. He noted that the frequent errors throughout Mr. Beisert's nominations decrease their credibility. Mr. Cohen recommended correcting the nomination prior to review by the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that a site this important is worthy of the additional attention in proofreading the nomination. Mr. Cohen noted that it also feels like more of a nomination for the 12th Street church rather than this property. The nomination for the demolished church appears to have been cut and pasted into this nomination. He suggested correcting the nomination, and he asked the nominators to really consider what is important to the argument, and what is merely filler or fluff. He asserted that much of this nomination is just filler. Ms. Cooperman agreed, stating that one of the things that is crucial to remember about a nomination is that it is an argument; it is not only a history of a property. The history of the property is only there to serve the argument, she emphasized. All of the material that is

gathered on the history of a building should not be front and center; the argument has to be in the foreground in order for it to be persuasive. She noted that sometimes the best way to achieve that is to write the whole nomination, and then come back and put the argument right at the top. For instance, she noted, the entire history of the Great Awakening did not need to be included in this nomination; it only needs a sentence. She stated that it tries the patience of the reader when there is so much extraneous information that is not necessary to the argument. Mr. Cohen recommended that some of the extraneous information could be included in an appendix, but too much superfluous information dilutes the argument, and weakens the nomination. Mr. Cohen also noted that not all of the captions fit the images, and recommended that this would be obvious if Mr. Beisert were to go through the nomination as a reader at least once prior to submitting it.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1910 Fitzwater Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

2117 E YORK ST

Name of Resource: Weisbrod & Hess Brewery

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Autowerkstatt LLC

Nominator: Andrew Fearon

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2117 E. York Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Weisbrod & Hess Brewery loading room, condenser and storage/boiler, and the wash house buildings, constructed between 1890 and 1899, are significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the buildings are significant as part of the formerly much-larger Weisbrod & Hess Brewery complex, as well as for their association with Christian Hess, a prominent citizen in the German-American communities in Philadelphia and Atlantic City, NJ. The nomination also argues that the buildings are architecturally significant as representative designs of the Rundbogenstil style, which was used for German-owned breweries in Philadelphia and across the United States. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the property is significant as a work of German-American architect Adam C. Wagner, who designed more than 50 breweries during his lifetime.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2117 E. York Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, but that the nomination does not make a cogent argument for Criteria A and J; it simply provides a history of the company and its owner without identifying the significance of the company in the broader context of the neighborhood or the city. The staff also recommends correcting references to the Industrial Revolution, which dates from the late eighteenth century to about 1840 in the United States. The nomination appears to confuse the Industrial Revolution with what might be broadly called the Industrial Age.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the continuance request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Carl Primavera and property owners Anton Michaels and Chris Isaacson represented the property owner. Dana Fedeli and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

The Committee members discussed the continuance request and verified with the staff that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction would persist through the continuance period.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission continue the review of the nomination for 2117 E. York Street for not more than 90 days and remand the nomination to Committee on Historic Designation for review at its December 2016 meeting.

4101-05 LUDLOW ST

Name of Resource: Monumental Baptist Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. James Pentecostal Church

Nominator: Oscar Beisert

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4101-05 Ludlow Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, I, and J. The nomination argues that the Monumental Baptist Church provided a religious anchor to the West Philadelphia African-American community, functioning as the place of worship for the second oldest African-American Baptist congregation in Pennsylvania.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4101-05 Ludlow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, but not Criterion I. The staff contends that the area of potential archaeological artifacts identified in the nomination is largely located outside the proposed boundary for the designation. The staff also asserts that the nomination does not sufficiently demonstrate that there is a likelihood of finding archaeological artifacts present at the site.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Church trustee Desay Downing represented the property owner. Elizabeth Stegner and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert commented that the University City Historical Society nominated the property, because it stands as one of the oldest and most important building, with high value to the African-American community.

Mr. Downing stated his opposition to designation, reasoning that the building is in disarray. He indicated that he had approached the University City Historical Society about the building in the past, but did not get response. Why is the organization interested now when it did not even bother to respond to his earlier request for assistance? Mr. Downing argued against Mr. Besiert's claim that the building is one of the oldest in the area. Ms. Stegner asked Mr. Downing when he contacted the University City Historical Society. Mr. Downing answered that he contacted the society in 2001. Ms. Stegner stated that only within the last year and a half has the society become more engaged in nominating properties for historic designation. Mr. Downing stated that he was under the impression that the University City Historical Society could provide assistance to stabilize the building. Without receiving a response from the society, he added, the church did its best to maintain the building. Mr. Downing commented that the church is growing and needs a larger meeting space, which is why the building is currently for sale. Once the property was placed on the market, he continued, members of Monumental

Baptist Church, the former property owner, approached University City Historical Society to nominate the building. Mr. Beisert asserted that no members of Monumental Baptist Church contacted the historical society. He added that he reached out to the organization but did not get a response. Ms. Stegner added that the historical society does not offer funds for restoration projects, although she indicated that Mr. Downing should have received a response.

Paul Steinke, executive director of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, stated that he believes the building satisfies the Criteria as presented in the nomination. He added that the neighborhood is at the forefront of mounting development pressure, and this building should be considered threatened as a result. Mr. Steinke suggested Mr. Downing contact Partners for Sacred Places for assistance with the challenges with the building he had identified. Mr. Steinke explained that the area around 41st and Ludlow Streets served as a very early free black settlement in Philadelphia, and the church is emblematic of that settlement.

Mr. Downing responded that there was a Baptist church at 40th and Sansom Streets that was allowed to be demolished after it was sold. He noted that the church was of a similar age to St. James Pentecostal Church. At 38th and Market Streets, he continued, a building is currently being preserved by allowing new construction around the perimeter of the building. He added that neither building was nominated to or listed on the Register. Ms. Cooperman responded that there is no comprehensive plan for designating properties in the city. She opened the floor to public comment directed specifically at the content of the nomination.

Mr. Cohen stated that designation is absolutely merited, and the nomination argues well for the Criteria. However, he questioned the inclusion of Criterion I and asked Mr. Mooney for his opinion on the site's archaeological potential. Mr. Mooney stated that the nomination needs to be revised, although the site contains strong archaeological potential across the entire property. He argued that the boundary should encompass the entire parcel and stated that evidence of an early cemetery and burials may exist on part of the property. The cemetery, he contended, is a unique resource and warrants protection, and any former privy on the site could produce archaeological resources related to the early African-American community.

Mr. Schaaf asked for clarification of the archaeological boundary, which appears largely outside the property boundary in the nomination. The Committee concluded that the boundary for archaeological potential was likely meant to be placed over the open side yard immediately south of the building. Mr. Mooney remarked that the boundary showing archaeological potential should be the same as the property boundary and clarified that the adjacent lot acquired by the church more recently may have functioned as the cemetery. Ms. Cooperman stated that the site's archaeological potential merits further research and clarification and recommended that the nomination be revised before the Historical Commission meeting. She added that the location of the burial ground is the key question that needs to be addressed. Mr. Mooney added that outhouses and privies were often sealed beneath basement floors and could contain a wealth of information. Mr. Beisert commented that he is not trained as an archaeologist and has limited time to write nominations. He asked for assistance from a qualified archaeologist in addressing Criterion I.

Mr. Cohen noted many errors contained in the nomination and asked that they be corrected.

Mr. Schaaf inquired whether the 1845 building was completely demolished or if it was repurposed. Mr. Downing replied that the earlier building burned. Ms. Cooperman clarified that the building was replaced and not repurposed.

The Committee asked Mr. Farnham to explain the options for formulating a recommendation for a nomination that contained deficiencies. Mr. Farnham stated that the Rules & Regulations address the issue and allow a nomination deemed deficient by the Committee to be returned to the nominator, revised, and subsequently resubmitted. With this option, Mr. Farnham noted that there would be a lapse in the Commission's jurisdiction over the property. A second option, he continued, is to recommend that the nomination satisfies certain Criteria and to request that the nominator resubmit a nomination with the corrections related to Criterion I. The nomination, Mr. Farnham explained, could move forward to the Commission without the recommendation of satisfaction of Criterion I, and the designation could be amended at a later date to include the Criterion.

The Committee agreed that the property itself meets and should be designated under Criterion I and discussed a strategy on how to proceed with a recommendation that addresses the nomination's deficiencies in arguing the criterion.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4101-05 Ludlow Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

227 E ALLEN ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: The Business Known As 227 E Allen, LLC

Nominator: Andrew Fearon & Oscar Beisert

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 227 E. Allen Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame dwelling is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

Prior to the nomination's April 2016 submission date, the owner had obtained a building permit for exterior alterations. The permit for this work was issued in October 2015. The work authorized under that permit may be undertaken without the Historical Commission's intervention or oversight.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 227 E. Allen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J in its current form, but may not satisfy any Criteria after the ongoing construction project is completed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Andrew Miller and development manager Jay Milgrom represented the property owner. Dana Fedeli and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert stated that he worked with several individuals to survey the wooden houses in the Fishtown/Kensington area. At the time, he concluded that nine wooden houses remained immediately adjacent to the waterfront, and he currently approximates that four or five exist. This property, he asserted, retains its original sheathing under the modern siding and is unusual for its central chimney.

Mr. Miller commented that the staff overview was accurate, and added that the nomination presents a policy decision regarding whether the Committee's time should be devoted to reviewing nominations for properties that are ineligible. Ms. Cooperman responded that the property's ineligibility owing to the issuance of permits is not their decision. Mr. Miller observed that, after listening to the discussions of previous nominations, there is some concern about policies, procedures and rule-making. He asserted that it was unfair and an abuse of the Committee's time to consider the designation of a property that is already subject to permits that negate historic designation. It is a tax on the Committee's time and property owner's time, he continued, for these nominations to be made in bad faith, where the permits for demolition or work that negate the nomination have already been applied for or are pending.

Ms. Fedeli stated that she had received a number of complaints from area residents who felt victimized by offers made for their homes. She claimed that she was asked to represent property owners who owned homes identified in the wooden house survey.

Mr. Menkevich argued that no nominator submits a nomination in bad faith.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the merits of the nomination need to be considered.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commented that he supports the nomination and contended that the building meets the Criteria identified. The presence of more recent alterations on a historic building, he continued, does not negate the fact that a property is historic. He added that alterations can be reversed.

Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee is making no judgment about the potential effect of the alterations on the eligibility of the property. She added that the Committee's task is to assess the nomination. Mr. Miller argued that existing permits should be considered and noted that the staff overview acknowledged these permits. He reiterated that the permits negate historic designation.

Mr. Mooney asserted that the nomination needs to include an argument for Criterion I and remarked that current excavations have uncovered important finds in the area. Any property in the Fishtown/Kensington neighborhood with an open backyard, he added, warrants designation under Criterion I.

Mr. Cohen commented that the Committee would like to see historic resources preserved and that the argument has been well made that this property is a valuable historic resource. He added that designation could convince the developer that the building possesses historic character worth incorporating into redevelopment plans. He then complimented the nominators on the complicated deed research and asked if there were comparable examples of wooden structures with central chimneys. Mr. Beisert responded that he could only locate examples of brick buildings and not wooden houses with central chimneys. Mr. Cohen suggested that Mr. Beisert review fire insurance surveys, and the Committee discussed whether an owner of a wooden house could have historically obtained fire insurance. Mr. Cohen recommended excluding extraneous detail, such as citizenship and the height of individuals, and including more detailed plans from Hexamer surveys. The Committee requested more research to find a typical plan of this building type.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission could use the benefit of the Committee's expertise in determining whether or not the building would still satisfy the Criteria at the completion of the permitted project. Ms. Cooperman responded that it would be hard to make that assessment

without reviewing a full set of plans. Mr. Farnham expressed his concern over how the Commission will review the nomination and indicated that they may need to postpone the designation process until the work is complete.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 227 E. Allen Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

228 RICHMOND ST

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Carlos Lopez

Nominator: Andrew Fearon & Oscar Beisert

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 228 Richmond Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. This nomination argues that the Jacob Deal frame half-gambrel house is a rare surviving example of the wooden houses associated with the early development of maritime Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 228 Richmond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Property owner Carlos Lopez represented the property owner. Dana Fedeli and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert commented that the owner did not receive a copy of the nomination. Mr. Farnham clarified that the notice letter mailed to both the property owner and the property itself directs the recipient to the Historical Commission's website and to the electronic version of the nomination. If the property owner had notified the Commission that he does not have access to the internet, a hard copy would have been provided.

Mr. Lopez stated that he has owned the property for a number of years and saved the building, as well as other buildings, from demolition. He added that he has no plans to sell or demolish the building, but voiced his opposition to having the property designated. Mr. Lopez indicated that he has restored the building himself and would find designation to be intrusive and would not want to seek permission for new work. He remarked that original material remains beneath the stucco, and he has plans to work on the façade at a future date, but would like to do so without restriction.

Ms. Klein observed that Mr. Lopez's dedication to and care of the building is extremely admirable, but only as long as he remains the property owner. She questioned what the building's fate would be if the property were left undesignated and Mr. Lopez no longer owned it. She noted that designation would not greatly impact the amount of effort required when improving aspects of the building and added that designation would safeguard the building in the future.

Mr. Schaaf remarked that the Commission would not require any work completed previously by the owner to be undone. Mr. Lopez responded that the notification letter he received listed the

types of work that require permission, including pointing, roofing, and the installation of a new front gate or doorway. Following designation, Mr. Schaaf confirmed that when the owner wishes to change details to the exterior of the building, he would need to consult with the Historical Commission's staff. Mr. Lopez argued that these types of requirements are why he chooses not to live in a condominium or under a homeowners' association. He reiterated that he finds external oversight to be intrusive. He stated that he is opposed to any designation and asserted that he is more than capable of caring for his property in an appropriate manner.

Ms. Cooperman commended Mr. Lopez for saving historic properties, but contended that designation is the only mechanism the City has to protect its heritage. She opined about what would happen to the property if Mr. Lopez was no longer the owner and stated that the building is valuable to the city. The risk of losing the resource, she continued, compels the Committee to ensure that the building survives beyond its current ownership. Mr. Lopez responded that he would not be opposed to a stipulation that would allow the property to be designated when he sells it, but again argued against designation during his ownership owing to the intrusion it creates. Mr. Cohen asserted that the regulations would likely align with Mr. Lopez's work and would not be so intrusive. Designation, Mr. Cohen contended, needs to be applied equally, since it would be poor public policy to exclude a few owners from the process owing to their good stewardship.

Ms. Fedeli interjected that her organization is struggling with the designation of the property owing to Mr. Lopez's sincere efforts in maintaining the property and his desire not to have the building placed on the Register. Mr. Beisert concurred, but added that there are so few wooden houses in the neighborhood that he believed they should all be protected. He noted that if he were to withdraw this nomination, he felt the others could not be protected through the designation process.

Mr. Lopez asked if the designation process began suddenly with the filing of permits for the property at 227 E. Allen Street, which abuts this property at the rear. For years, he added, no importance was placed on either building. Ms. Cooperman stated that the City has never completed a full survey of its historic resources, so protection has always been done piecemeal owing to limited support and resources. The lack of designation in the past, she added, does not mean the building carries no importance or was overlooked.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee on Historic Designation has a fairly narrow purview to evaluate nominations and that Committee members hold technical expertise in history, architectural history, archaeology, and other areas. The Historical Commission itself, he continued, will make the final decision on this and the other properties under consideration for designation and enjoys a much broader purview. Mr. Farnham added that the Commission determines whether the property satisfies the Criteria that allow it to be designated. It also makes policy decisions, he continued, and determines whether or not a designation is in the public interest. He indicated that the property owner's concerns are better raised to the Historical Commission than this Committee.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated his support for the nomination and asserted that the property should be designated. He also commended Mr. Lopez for his stewardship.

Mr. Mooney recommended that the nominator amend the nomination to include Criterion I. He added that the Kensington/Fishtown neighborhood has the greatest archaeological potential with 10 Native American sites identified in and around the neighborhood. The oldest of these sites, he continued, has been carbon dated to 3,600 B.C.

Mr. Cohen commented that the case presented in this nomination is similar to the case presented at during the 227 E. Allen Street review. He asserted that the nomination documents the building type well and contains convincing arguments that the once-common building type is now rare. However, Mr. Cohen asked that the document be edited and questioned the use of the term “pizza shop stucco.” Mr. Beisert defended its use.

Mr. Schaaf remarked that he found the discussion on the building’s construction interesting.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 228 Richmond Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

2437-49 FRANKFORD AVE

Name of Resource: Frankford Avenue Baptist Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Frankford Avenue Holdings LLC

Nominator: Oscar Beisert, Andrew Fearon, and Amy Miller

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2437-49 Frankford Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the 1889 church building, designed by architect Issac Pursell, is significant as a representation of the development of the Baptist denomination in Kensington and Philadelphia, and as a representation of a Romanesque Revival church with Gothic and Tudor Revival influences.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2437-49 Frankford Ave satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J, but does not make a cogent argument for Criterion E, that it is the work of an architect whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner. Dana Fedeli and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Mr. Cohen stated that Issac Pursell is an important architect, and questioned the staff’s recommendation. It was noted that the staff was not contending that Pursell is unimportant, but was contending that the nomination did not make a cogent case for his importance. Mr. Cohen then agreed that the section on Pursell’s career could be expanded to better make the argument. Mr. Schaaf commented that Pursell worked in the office of Samuel Sloan. Mr. Cohen commented that the wrong term is used in the nomination when referring to the windows, which are not pointed. He suggested that Mr. Beisert utilize a proofreader to correct the many obvious typographical errors found in this and his other nominations.

Ms. Cooperman commented that the church form is significant and characteristic of this period, and one finds an interesting group of churches with towers at the street corners in this period. Owing to their configurations, the churches are neighborhood landmarks. Mr. Schaaf commented that it was interesting to read that this could have possibly been a brick church

originally, which was expanded and re-clad later. Mr. Beisert confirmed that there was definitely an earlier church on this site, but it was unclear if it was entirely removed.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2437-49 Frankford Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

4908-14 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Wachsmuth-Henry House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Wilkins & Constance Hatton

Nominator: Oscar Beisert

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4908-14 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, and J. The nomination argues that the circa 1760 Federal style house evolved to its present appearance as it changed ownership over time, representing the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of Germantown, and was associated with the lives of several significant Philadelphia families.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4908-14 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J, but not Criterion G. The staff suggests that Criterion G, which reads “Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif,” should be reserved for squares, parks, and visually unique and distinctive areas. National Register designation alone does not automatically qualify a property for significance under Criterion G.

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

Mr. Beisert opined that this is an important house to Germantown Avenue. Regarding Criterion G, he asserted that Germantown Avenue was the second historic district created by the National Park Service in the United States, signifying that it is a distinctive area.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports the nomination.

Mr. Beisert asked about two images in his nomination that did not appear in the printouts provided to the Committee members. Ms. Broadbent responded that the electronic image file sizes provided by Mr. Beisert were too large and would not display or print appropriately owing to their excessive sizes.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination was well-researched, and was a pleasure to read. Mr. Beisert responded that someone edited the nomination for him. Mr. Cohen responded that he noticed that it had been proofread, but stated that some sources are still not properly cited, and the figures should be numbered.

Mr. Mooney suggested that the nominator amend the nomination to include Criterion I for the site's archaeological potential.

Mr. Cohen suggested that the stone perimeter wall running around the property at the sidewalk could be the work of architect George Pearson. Mr. Duffin responded that the stone wall was likely constructed when the street was cut through in 1890s.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4908-14 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, and J.

3322 WILLITS RD

Name of Resource: Lower Dublin Academy

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Richard and Linda Gutman

Nominator: Joseph Menkevich

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3322 Willits Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, I, and J. The site for Lower Dublin Academy dates back to Thomas Holme, who served as surveyor-general to William Penn and laid out the 1682 plan for Philadelphia. The site is located on land granted by Penn to Holme. Under direction of Holme's will, a log schoolhouse was built on the site, which was replaced about 1803 by the current building. A fire in 2006 significantly damaged the building, which now sits vacant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3322 Willits Rd satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, I and J, but does not make a cogent argument for Criterion B, that it is associated with an *event* of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner. Joseph Menkevich, Fred Moore, Debbie Klak, Oscar Beisert, and Jason Sherman represented the nomination.

Ms. Broadbent stated that Councilman Al Taubenberger had sent a letter of support for historic designation of Lower Dublin Academy.

Mr. Menkevich questioned why the staff suggested that Criterion B was not satisfied. He explained that July 4th celebrations were held at the property with 5,000 to 10,000 people attended, including the Governor of Pennsylvania, which must be considered at event of national importance. Mr. Cohen suggested the staff was reacting to the case made in the nomination, but perhaps not explicitly reacting to this event. Mr. Menkevich commented that the information about the event may have been placed in an appendix, owing to his editing of the document. He noted that he proofreads his nominations carefully. He thanked Mr. Farnham for his nomination of Box Grove, which was referenced in the current nomination. Ms. Cooperman commented that the site satisfies enough Criteria without Criterion B to merit designation. She suggested dropping Criterion B. She stated that Mr. Menkevich did a good job of moving information into appendices, but he could do more. She suggested placing a clear argument at

the beginning of the statement of significance, and placing supporting documentation in an appendix. She explained that a nomination is not the entire history of a property, but rather is an argument supported by aspects of the history. She suggested that documents do not always speak for themselves, so the nominator needs to explain to the reader why each document is cited. Mr. Cohen commented that Mr. Menkevich did a good job, but just included too much. Mr. Menkevich responded that a nomination for this building was rejected years ago as being insufficient, so he wanted to make sure the same thing did not happen again. Mr. Cohen commented that the nomination includes great research and makes the case for historic designation. Ms. Cooperman commented that the nomination includes an extremely impressive collection of historic photographs. Mr. Menkevich noted that he initially thought this building would make a great brewery. He stated that he spoke with the property owner recently and was told that the owner has received several offers for the property over the years, but does not want to sell to someone who will demolish the building. He stated that the community is discussing a fundraiser to purchase the property and put the building back into use as a community center or something else.

Mr. Moore showed the Committee a Lower Dublin Academy minutes book for 1794-1894, and commented that the valuable book will always be more valuable if the building remains standing.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports the nomination.

Ms. Klak reported that All Saints' Torresdale Episcopal Church, founded in 1772, is the final resting place of many of the trustees of Lower Dublin Academy including Edward Duffield. She stated that she fully supports the nomination.

Mr. Sherman stated that he has been filming a documentary about historic buildings for the better part of a year. This building was featured as one of the most prominent, historically significant buildings in the area, so he is pleased that it will potentially be designated.

Ms. Cooperman opined that she is slightly concerned about the amount of fabric that has been lost. Mr. Cohen countered that it does not disqualify this building, stating that sufficient fabric remains to tell the important story.

Mr. Mooney observed that Criterion I is rightfully included in the nomination. Mr. Menkevich noted that there was a well and likely a privy on the site. Mr. Mooney agreed.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3322 Willits Rd satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, I, and J.

ROMAIN ST BETWEEN DEAL ST AND ADAMS AVE

Name of Resource: Romain Street – historically paved with red brick

Proposed Action: Amend Historic Street Paving District to include this block

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, Streets Department

Nominator: Philadelphia Streets Department

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: In 1988, the Historical Commission designated the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, a collection of several hundred blocks of streets in the city that retain their historic street paving materials. The Commission amended the district in 1999, adding a few streets that had been initially overlooked, and again in 2014, when a larger series of additions and removals were made to the district inventory based on a survey and report commissioned by the Streets Department.

Shortly after these modifications were complete, Streets Department staff located one additional segment, which had been overlooked, Romain Street between Deal Street and Adams Avenue in Frankford. The block is paved in red brick. With the exception of some concrete patching, the street is in good condition and retains a high level of integrity, and had it not been overlooked, likely would have been included in the recent amendment to the district. The Streets Department proposes that this change be made at this time, allowing Romain Street to be included in the Department's long-range planning related to maintenance of this historic resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission amend the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District as proposed in the following document, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the amendment application to the Committee on Historic Designation. No one represented the property owner or amendment application.

Mr. Menkevich commented that he is familiar with this neighborhood, and there are other blocks paved with red bricks. Ms. Broadbent noted that those blocks may already be designated as historic.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports the amendment and commends the Streets Department for nominating this block.

Ms. Klein commented that she would like to have more information about the red bricks. Mr. Cohen asked if the original nomination contained more information. Ms. Broadbent explained that the district inventory lists blocks simply as "red brick," but that the nomination itself may offer additional information about red bricks.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission amend the inventory of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District to include the block of Romain Street between Deal Street and Adams Avenue, pursuant to Section 5.14 of the Rules & Regulations.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

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