

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

**21 JUNE 2017, 9:30 A.M.
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
EMILY COOPERMAN, PH.D., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair
Janet Klein
Bruce Laverty
Douglas Mooney, M.A.
R. David Schaaf

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

ALSO PRESENT

Harrison Haas
Nathan Farris, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Chris Strom, Esq., Eckert Seamans
Celeste Morello
Kathy Dowdell
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Marc Kaplin, Esq., Kaplin/Stewart
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Fred Baumert, Keast & Hood
Andrew Kaplin, Revolution Development Group
Frank Swift
Josh Grimes, Esq., Grimes Law Offices
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
J.M. Duffin
Donna Rilling
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Shannon Barg, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Martin Rosenblum
Cheryl Cutrona, Good Shepherd Mediation Program
Maria Sturm

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1642 FITZWATER ST

Name of Resource: Tabor Chapel

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Angelo Charles Peruto III

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1642 Fitzwater Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. The staff contends that the nomination does not make a cogent argument for the satisfaction of Criteria C and D. Additionally, the staff notes that the correct address for the church building is 1642 Fitzwater Street, rather than the 1640 Fitzwater Street address that is found on the nomination form and throughout the body of the nomination.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1642 Fitzwater Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the church is significant under Criteria A and J for its association with the African-American church and community in Philadelphia, and as a representation of the physical development of the larger Presbyterian Church through the establishment of mission chapels or congregations by the Philadelphia Sabbath-School Association. The nomination further argues that the Samuel Sloan-designed church is significant as an early example of his commissions, satisfying Criterion E, but little information is provided as to how the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, mentioned in the nomination as Italianate or Italian Romanesque, and how the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by said distinctive architectural style.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Committee consider all of the continuance requests simultaneously. Ms. Cooperman asked if any Committee member wished to comment on the requests. No one offered comments. Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on the requests. No one offered comments.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee for review at its 13 September 2017 meeting.

ADDRESS: 1600-06, 1608-10 E BERKS ST

Name of Resource: Objects in St. Laurentius Church

Proposed Action: Designation of Objects

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: John Wisniewski, Friends of St. Laurentius

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the three reredos and 16 paintings satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate 19 objects in the interior of St. Laurentius Church at 1600-06 and 1608-10 E Berks Street and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The exterior of the property is already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the three reredos/altarpieces and 16 paintings satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. The nomination argues that the objects reflect the heritage of the Polish immigrants, who settled in Fishtown and founded the church. The three

eredos, the nomination asserts, were imported from Munich, Germany and are original to the construction of the building in 1890, and are significant as representations of the Gothic Revival style, as is the exterior of the building. The nomination further contends that the 16 oil-on-canvas paintings, added in 1912, are significant as works of artist Lorenzo Scattaglia and for their depictions of many scenes unique to Polish Catholicism.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee for review at its 13 September 2017 meeting.

ADDRESS: 1401 S WATER ST

Name of Resource: Engine 46 Firehouse

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Cedar-Riverview LP

Nominator: Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1401 S. Water Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1401 S. Water Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former fire station is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H. The nomination contends that the building represents a period in which the City of Philadelphia invested heavily in the expansion of municipal services and in the architectural character of its facilities, satisfying Criterion A. The nomination argues that the Flemish Revival style reflects the environment of the late nineteenth century, satisfying Criteria C and D, and is an early work of John T. Windrim, satisfying Criterion E. Lastly, the nomination contends that the former fire station represents an established and familiar visual feature of the Pennsport neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H. A small portion of a circa 1999 addition stands on the building's historic and current legal parcel, and is considered non-contributing for the purposes of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee for review at its 13 September 2017 meeting.

ADDRESS: 6369 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: "Genteel Two-Story Stone Dwelling"

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6369 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination contends that the property holds significance to the development and heritage of

Germantown and is one of several properties purchased by developer Thomas Reilly following the subdivision of the Chew estate. The nomination further argues that the building, while potentially constructed decades earlier, currently reflects the bracketed mode of the Italianate style popularized in the mid-nineteenth-century and applied extensively to other Germantown Avenue properties. The nomination also suggests that, owing to its inclusion in the National Register's Colonial Germantown Historic District, the property is part of and related to a distinctive area.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee for review at its 13 September 2017 meeting.

ADDRESS: 6365-67 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Residence

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6365-67 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Mill is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, G, and J. The nomination contends that the property represents the less common industrial typology that included domestic, commercial, and residential buildings located on a single parcel and that the property contributed to Germantown's industrial landscape through the manufacturing of rag carpets. The nomination further argues that the store and residence exemplify the Queen Anne style, while the rear mill building serves as an example of Second Empire architecture. The nomination also suggests that, owing to its inclusion in the National Register's Colonial Germantown Historic District, the property is part of and related to a distinctive area.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission table the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee for review at its 13 September 2017 meeting.

ADDRESS: 152 N 2ND ST

Name of Resource: Swift Brothers

Proposed Action: Reclassification from contributing to non-contributing

Property Owner: Swift Brothers, Inc.

Applicant: George Thomas on behalf of the property owner

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reclassify the property at 152 N. 2nd Street from contributing to non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The district inventory dates the building to "c. 1925." The adopted nomination of the Old City Historic District defines its Period of Significance as running from 1676 to 1929. When the Historical Commission designated the

Old City Historic District in December 2003, it debated the endpoint of the Period of Significance as well as the meaning of that endpoint. Ultimately, the Historical Commission decided by resolution that all buildings constructed after 1929 would be automatically classified as non-contributing unless already individually designated. The application contends that the building was dated incorrectly, actually constructed in the early 1930s, after the Period of Significance, and, therefore, must be reclassified as non-contributing.

The reclassification application consists of a report by architectural historian George Thomas and a conditions assessment by engineer Fred Baumert.

The Thomas report claims that the extant building was constructed about 1931, coinciding with the establishment of the Swift Bros. restaurant equipment sales company. The report claims that the Swifts purchased the property from family members that year and shifted the family business from the manufacture of store fixtures to the sale of restaurant equipment.

The staff has conducted extensive research into the property and owners. Brothers Samuel and Philip Swift purchased the property at 152 N. 2nd Street on December 1, 1920 (Deed JMH-1010-280). The 1931 sale noted in the Thomas report was a sale for \$1 with the same grantors and grantees and was likely related to refinancing (Deed JMH-3473-564). Newspaper advertisements indicate that the building at 152 N. 2nd Street was used for shoe making and repair until April 1921. Newspaper advertisements indicate that the Swifts, operating as the Penna. Store Fixture Co., began to sell store fixtures and restaurant equipment from the building at 152 N. 2nd as early as May 1921. The Swift Brothers had been selling store fixtures and restaurant equipment from 157 N. 2nd Street, directly across the street, since about June 1918. The brothers did not own 157 N. 2nd, but rented space from James Yocum Jr. By 1922, the Swifts were identifying the location of their business, the Penna. Store Fixture Co., as 152-157 N. 2nd Street in newspaper advertisements. Throughout the 1920s, they advertised their business as located at 152, 157, and 152-157 indiscriminately, using the three addresses interchangeably. The brothers used the name Penna. Store Fixture Co. until 1926 and then shifted to Penn Store Fixture Co., which they used in 1927. By April 1929, they had transitioned to using the name Swift Bros., which can be found in numerous newspaper advertisements. On August 8, 1932, the brothers applied to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to incorporate their business as "Swift Bros. Inc." for "the purpose of manufacture, sale, purchase, distribution and repairs of kitchen, restaurant and hotel equipment and allied products."

The building at 152 N. 2nd is shown as a fourth-class brick dwelling with stores and a shingle roof on the 1860 Hexamer & Locher map. It has a small main block and long rear ell. The 1875 Jones map shows that the rear ell has been infilled or reconstructed so that the building occupies the entire width of the lot from front to back. The 1885, 1895, and 1901 Bromley maps show the same footprint. In 1895, the *Inquirer* reported that contractor William Krause & Son undertook underpinning and alterations at the property. The 1897 Hexamer map is the first to provide the number of stories; it indicates that the building is 2-½ stories at the front and one story at the rear. The 1910 Bromley map is ambiguous, not showing the rear wall of the building. The 1916 Sanborn map shows a two-story front section and a one-story rear section with the same footprint as the previous maps. The 1921 Smith map labels the building with the owners' names, "S & P. Swift," and indicates that the building is three stories. The 1922 Bromley map indicates that the building is 2-½ stories. On November 16, 1923, contractor Clayton Lofland obtained building permit #13327 to construct an addition to the building for Samuel and Philip Swift at a cost of \$6,500. The use of the building before and after construction is listed as a store on the permit. The addition is described as "3-story rear. Rear addition as per plans 13 x 23 ft." The site plan attached to the permit is not detailed but implies that the remainder of the

building was already three stories in height by 1923. The permit states that the work will commence “at once.” An affidavit included with the permit application and signed by Samuel and Philip Swift swears that “they will not permit anyone to be regularly or usually employed above the second floor.” A July 1926 aerial photograph shows that the building has a flat roof extending from front to back and is the same height as or taller than the three-story building to the north. The 1931 revision of the 1927 Smith map describes the building as having three stories.

From the analysis of the maps, photographs, and permit, the staff has concluded that:

- the building at 152 N. 2nd Street was altered from a structure with a 2-½ story front and one-story rear as shown on the Sanborn map in 1916 to a three-story building as shown on the Smith map in 1921 at some point between 1916 and 1921;
- the 1922 Bromley map, which has one notation reading “2-½” stories across the 150 and 152 N. 2nd buildings, is incorrect with regard to 152;
- with the rear addition as described in the 1923 permit, the remainder of the building was enlarged to three stories in height at some point soon after November 16, 1923;
- the 1926 photograph clearly shows that the entire building was three stories in height; and,
- therefore, the building as it currently appears was constructed prior to the end of the Period of Significance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff concludes that the building at 152 N. 2nd Street was altered to its three-story configuration prior to 1929, the end date of Period of Significance, and therefore recommends that the Historical Commission deny the request to reclassify the property from contributing to non-contributing in the Old City Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cooperman recused because she has worked for the developer in this matter on other occasions. Mr. Farnham presented the reclassification request to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney and developer Marc Kaplin, engineer Fred Baumert, and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the reclassification request.

Mr. Kaplin stated that he represents an entity called 160-164 North Second Street LLC. He stated that the entity is the equitable owner of 152 N. 2nd Street and the owner or equitable owner of seven properties in the immediate area. He stated that he also represents the current owners of 152 N. 2nd Street, the Swift Brothers. He stated that it is his intention to redevelop the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets. He stated that he was puzzled when he learned that the property at 152 N. 2nd Street is classified as contributing in the Old City Historic District. He explained that he engaged engineer Fred Baumert and preservation consultant George Thomas to determine whether the classification was correct. He explained that Messrs. Baumert and Thomas generated reports on the property. He noted that the Historical Commission’s staff conducted additional research, for which he is appreciative. He contended that the staff’s addition information supports his consultants’ conclusions. He stated that the staff did not examine the building or undertake an engineer analysis of the building. Mr. Kaplin claimed that the staff concluded that the 1923 building permit for the 13-foot by 23-foot rear addition must have included the construction of the extant three-story façade. Mr. Kaplin stated that Mr. Baumert has conducted a detailed examination of the building. Mr. Kaplin stated that his consultations have come to a conclusion that is “almost inescapable,” that the building “was built, reconstructed, changed around in four or five sections or phases.” The last phase was constructed in 1933 and 1934, which coincides with an announcement made by the Swift Brothers in the newspaper that they were open for business in their new four-story home at 152

N. 2nd Street. Mr. Kaplin stated that Mr. Baumert would discuss the various phases on construction, which confirms the conclusion of Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas displayed images from 1916 and 1931 maps and asserted that the building in question has the same footprint on both maps. He then showed a map from 1944 and pointed out that the building had been extended to the west since the 1931 map to “essentially” the footprint that exists today. Mr. Kaplin emphasized that the 1916 and 1931 maps show a building extending back across 75% of the lot, while the 1944 map shows that the building occupies nearly the entirety of the lot. Mr. Thomas then referred to the 1923 building permit discovered by the Historical Commission’s staff. He noted that it describes a “rear” addition. Mr. Thomas stated that it is his belief that the rear addition referred to in the 1923 permit was an addition on top of the one-story rear section that extended out from the 2-½-story, eighteenth-century, front section of the house. Mr. Kaplin again pointed out that the 1916 and 1931 footprints, before and after the 1923 addition, were the same. Mr. Thomas displayed the 1926 aerial photograph looking east, discovered by the Historical Commission’s staff, that shows the roof of the building in question and contended that it verified his timeline. Mr. Thomas displayed a photograph of the building in question taken in 1915, showing its historic configuration with a gambrel roof and front dormer. He explained that it is similar in height and configuration to the building to the south at 150 N. 2nd Street. He noted that the two buildings are always shown as the same on maps before the alteration to 152 in the 1930s. He noted that they are described as two-story buildings on the 1916 map and as three-story buildings on the 1927 map. In 1916, they only counted the masonry stories. In 1927, they included the attic. He asserted that the building at 152 was like the building at 150, which retains its 2-½-story height to this day, until the mid 1930s. He stated that the 1931 map shows the buildings at 150 and 152 both as three stories. He stated that the footprint changes dramatically between 1931 and 1944. He noted that the buildings at 150 and 152 as depicted in atlases diverge in height for the first time in 1944. He stated that the footprint shown on the 1944 map is “basically” the footprint that is there today. Mr. Thomas displayed a photograph of the building and its surroundings taken in 1960. Next, Mr. Thomas displayed images from city directories and newspapers related to the various Swift family businesses including the Pennsylvania Store Fixture Company, which was located at 152. He stated that Swift Brothers was first located at 157, across the street. Mr. Kaplin emphasized that Swift Brothers business was located initially on the east side of N. 2nd Street, not the west side. Mr. Thomas stated that the Historical Commission’s staff found that the Swift Brothers registered their business with the state in 1932. Mr. Thomas showed images from 1927, 1929, 1932, and 1934 city directories and claimed that the Pennsylvania Store Fixture Company became Swift Brothers during this period. He displayed advertisements for Swift Bros. including one from 1935 that stated that “We have moved to our new home where we have 4 floors.” Mr. Thomas concluded that there was a transfer of the parcel at 152 within the Swift family in 1931 and, within a couple of years, the building on that parcel becomes the Swift Bros. store fixture business that continues today. He stated that the extant building was constructed about 1934 for the business. He presented a diagram showing his understanding of the evolution of the building in plan and section. He stated that a rear addition was added in 1923, but the extant front façade and full three-story building was not erected until about 1934. Mr. Kaplin stated that the diagram tells the story of the building more clearly than any other. Mr. Kaplin stated that the main point of contention with Mr. Farnham of the staff is where the 1923 addition was constructed and whether the gable roof was removed at that time. Mr. Kaplin asked whether the industrial-looking front was constructed in 1923. Mr. Thomas noted that the 1923 building permit does not address a new front façade, which would have constituted a significant amount of work. The building permit was strictly for a rear addition. Mr. Thomas asserted that the 1923 permit covered work that filled in behind the gable roof but left the gable intact and is what is visible in the 1926 photograph provided by the staff. Mr. Thomas concluded

that the “major redo of this building that filled it out its full length and probably rebuilt the façade and is the building that is there therefore is between 31 and 44 and likely ties into the 1934-35 reconfiguration of the building for the Swift Brothers’ new business.”

Mr. Kaplin introduced his structural engineer, Mr. Baumert, who stated that he investigated the building thoroughly including the masonry walls and floor and roof joists. He stated that he sought to understand the sequence of construction. He stated that he identified four to five phases of construction at the building. Mr. Kaplin distributed paper copies of Mr. Baumert’s presentation because the projected images were small and poor in quality. The first photograph was taken inside the building and showed the diagonal joint between the side wall and a later addition to the side wall. The older wall is thicker than the newer wall. Mr. Thomas added that the later wall was part of the three-story building to the north. Mr. Baumert stated that the 1923 addition started at the back of the gable roof of the addition to the front part of the building. Mr. Kaplin contended that the 1923 rear addition extended toward 2nd Street but “never reached the gable.” Mr. Baumert pointed out the rear gable addition on building evolution section diagram. He moved to his next photograph, which showed the south wall, opposite the location of the previous photograph. He stated that some openings to 150 N. 2nd had been infilled. He moved to his third photograph, which showed the third-floor interior looking from rear to front. He noted the change in texture on the side walls. Some sections of the walls have been parged, others have not. Four of the five phases of construction can be seen in this space. He noted the pitch of the roof. It slopes down to the west at the front and down to the east at the rear, with the lowest point at the midpoint. He explained that his fourth photograph shows the point inside where the back wall of the 1923 addition was removed to expand the building. He noted several changes in the wall. He apologized that the trash cans in the photograph block most of the view. He showed a photograph of a wall with a chimney and explained that the wall is part of the 1923 addition, but the chimney is later. Mr. Baumert stated that the sixth photograph shows the joint where the last section of the building was added. Mr. Kaplin stated that he did not understand his expert. He asked if the wall shown in the image was the north wall. Mr. Baumert stated that it is the north wall. Mr. Kaplin stated that the section to the left would be to the west. Mr. Baumert agreed. Mr. Kaplin stated that the section of the left is the section to the west that was added between 1931 and 1944. The seventh photograph was taken on the second floor at the front of the building and shows that the brick of the front wall is different from the brick of the far rear addition. Mr. Kaplin added that the front-façade brick is also different from the 1923 addition. Mr. Kaplin claimed that Mr. Farnham’s thesis is that, when the 1923 addition was constructed, the front façade was also changed, getting rid of the gable. Mr. Baumert stated that the front façade is “just jammed up against” the party wall. There are no ties between the front façade and the side party walls. Mr. Baumert showed his eighth and final photograph. He explained that the diagonal mark on the wall is the ghost of the original front pitch of the roof. The vertical at the top of the diagonal is the line of the old chimney. The brick above the diagonal and in front of the chimney is the panel that was added later. He claimed that the joists at the very front of the building match the joists at the very rear of the building. He contended that the raising of the front occurred simultaneous with or just later than the final rear addition. He added that the front wall is not tied into the side wall, which indicates that they were not constructed at the same time. He asserted that the front façade must be later than the side infill. Mr. Kaplin concluded that the construction of the extant front façade must have taken place after the end of the period of significance.

Mr. Schaaf asked if there is a building permit from the 1930s for the construction. Mr. Kaplin replied that neither they nor the staff found one. Mr. Thomas contended that people often undertake construction without permits. He pointed out again that the 1923 building permit does not mention a new front façade. He stated that the other changes occurred between 1931 and

1944, which correlates to the change in the business. Mr. Lavery noted that Mr. Baumert claimed that the brick of the front façade does not match the brick at the rear and therefore must date to a different time. Mr. Lavery observed that it is possible that the front and rear were done at the same time in different bricks because it is common for more expensive brick to be used on the street façade and other brick at the rear. Mr. Baumert agreed, but then asked why the front façade is not toothed into the side facades. Mr. Kaplin submitted a photograph of the building in question and adjacent properties. He called them “a group of unattractive buildings” that do not fit into the historic district. He asserted that the building at 152 N. 2nd Street is “the least attractive building to be designated as contributing.” He added that they are not presenting evidence about the condition of the building, but it is in Mr. Baumert’s original report.

Kathy Dowdell noted that this building is called out on page 27 of the nomination for the Old City Historic District as a good example of the Tapestry Brick Style. She also noted that the Statement of Significance in the nomination observes that buildings in the Tapestry Brick Style are good indicators of the light manufacturing that was occurring in Old City in the early twentieth century. She stated that the buildings to the south are also contributing, while the buildings to the north are non-contributing. She contended that the building in question appears to fit with the contributing buildings, not with the non-contributing ones. She remarked that the applicants have presented a great deal of “forensic” information about the building, but still have not proved when the façade was erected. She noted that, as an architect, she has examined many old masonry building and has often found that the front façade is not tied into the side facades. She stated that the star bolts one sees all over town are indicative of facades not adequately tied into the structure at construction. She suggested that the Committee should recommend denial of this request without a firm date for the construction of the front façade.

David Traub of Save Our Sites distributed a photograph and stated that the building in question is almost 100 years old. It was clearly built before World War II. He asserted that its exact date of construction is irrelevant. Mr. Traub claimed that tourists who ride down the street in horse-drawn carriages want atmosphere. Mr. Traub described the building as “handsome” and claimed that industrial sash are “in vogue.” “Proud brick soldier-courses march over the big stretches of windows.” He stated that “at the top of the building, on either side, the two party walls reach higher than the parapet otherwise, lending the structure a special dignity.” Mr. Traub stated that the contributing buildings in the historic district are just as important as the significant buildings. Save Our Sites opposes strenuously the downgrading of classifications in historic districts.

Mr. Thomas noted a mistake made by Mr. Traub. Mr. Traub claimed that the parapet has a “special dignity,” but it is, in fact, non-historic. Mr. Thomas pointed out with photographs that the parapet was originally taller than the party walls, but was partially demolished in the 1960s or 1970s, leaving the non-historic condition one sees today. Mr. Traub sang the praises of the beautiful historic parapet, but it is not historic. The current parapet results from the demolition of the original one. Mr. Thomas noted that many of the architectural elements of the original building have been removed including the storefront.

Mr. Schaaf noted that the Period of Significance of the historic district runs from the late seventeenth century to 1929, a very long period. He asked Mr. Farnham to explain the consequences for the classification if the front façade was constructed after 1929. Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission was very clear when it designated the Old City Historic District that any buildings built after 1929 must be classified as non-contributing unless already individually designated. He stated that the Commission adopted a resolution declaring that all buildings constructed after 1929 were to be classified as non-contributing. He noted that

the Commission considered other possible endpoints for the Period of Significance including 1976 and World War II, but settled on 1929, owing to a belief that there was very little investment in the area during and after the Great Depression. Mr. Farnham concluded that he contends that the Commission is bound to reclassify the building as non-contributing if it definitively determines that primary, public portions of the building were constructed after 1929.

Mr. Mooney observed that, regardless of the date of the front façade, some parts of this building date to the Period of Significance. The older building seen in the 1915 photograph was not completely demolished, but was altered and added to. Some parts of the building date to the eighteenth century. He asked at what point an old building becomes a new building. Is there a percentage of replacement that serves as that marker? He noted that virtually every historic building was modified after 1929. How does one date such buildings? Mr. Farnham concurred that it is a difficult question. He noted that one could legitimately decide that this building predates the end of the Period of Significance because some parts of this building unquestionably date to the Period of Significance, allowing the building to be classified as contributing. However, he observed that the Historical Commission is charged with protecting the public's access to historic resources and one could therefore cogently argue that the date of the building for classification purposes should be the date of the publicly accessible portions of the building, primarily the front façade. He concluded that, with the evidence we have now, there is room for the Committee and the Commission to decide this matter either way. Mr. Mooney disagreed, asserting that he is not convinced that the applicants have made the case that publicly accessible portions were built after 1929. Mr. Schaaf stated that there is still a colonial house embedded in the building. Mr. Mooney responded that, more importantly, there are visible portions of the building that predate 1929. Mr. Schaaf stated that he is not convinced that the building was modified between 1931 and 1944. He noted that people were sleeping on the floor in Suburban Station during the Depression. Development all but ceased. He asserted that, if this building were significantly rebuilt at that time, we would have the building permit to prove it. He stated that there are still pieces of the puzzle that are missing. Mr. Lavery agreed. He stated that there is no building permit after 1923. There is no smoking gun. Mr. Lavery contended that one might make a change at the rear without a building permit, but one could not replace a front façade without a permit. He stated that, without real evidence of the date of the front façade, he is reluctant to recommend the changing of the classification.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission deny the reclassification request and retain the classification of the property at 152 N. 2nd Street as a contributing to the Old City Historic District.

ADDRESS: 18 & 20 E JOHNSON ST

Name of Resource: Samuel Harting House, Office, and Stable

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Igor and Nadeshda Jablovkov

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 20 E. Johnson Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The staff contends that the property at 18 E. Johnson Street does not hold sufficient significance to warrant individual listing on the Philadelphia Register under any Criteria.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 18 and 20 Johnson Street as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Samuel Harting House, Office, and Stable are significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. The nomination contends that the properties hold significance to the development and heritage of Germantown and together comprised one of several properties purchased by developer Thomas Reilly following the subdivision of the Chew estate. The nomination argues that the structure at 20 E. Johnson Street represents the bracketed mode of the Gothic Revival style, and that all three buildings represent the house, office, and stable typology historically prevalent in the city. The nomination further assigns significance to the properties' former owner Samuel Harting, a prominent local contractor and builder who lived in the Gothic Revival structure and operated his business out of the adjacent office.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Attorney Josh Grimes and Nicholas Jablovkov represented the property. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

Despite the staff recommendation, Mr. Beisert contended that the site is significant as a rare surviving complex of buildings that includes a house, office, and stable. He explained that Samuel Harting moved to the property in 1907 and built an office at the front corner of the property and a stable behind it. He further described Harting's business, adding that he worked for many major architects of the area and completed small and large projects, as well as suburban developments. The office building, Mr. Beisert continued, served as Harting's real estate office. He then directed the Committee to pages 38 to 47 of the nomination, stating that an entire typology of office buildings existed throughout Philadelphia. He remarked that he began his discussion with Stephen Girard's building and showed his large house and little counting house at the side. He then showed other urban examples of houses with one-story offices, he explained. He recalled for the Committee that the Historical Commission had designated a house potentially designed by Frank Furness. One noteworthy feature, he added, was that building had a one-story office attached at the side. He explained other examples in the nomination with attached and detached offices, such as the Freas House at 5155 Germantown Avenue, the Ashmead House at 5430 Germantown Avenue, an example at Tulpehocken Street and Germantown Avenue, a coal company office on Germantown Avenue near Cresheim Valley Drive, and an office on Pelham Road. Of the last example, Mr. Beisert commented that the building similarly served as a real estate office, though he asserted that the Harting office on Johnson Street is more interesting because of its Flemish bond brick. He argued that the building holds significance, adding that there are not many of these one-story office buildings left and that more examples could have been provided of buildings that have been demolished. Many, he noted, are related to industrial sites. He added that one could argue that the reason Samuel Harting constructed the building in the manner he did, with the type of

brickwork used, was to show off his work. He claimed that the brick office with the stone stable behind demonstrate the different types of revivalist buildings in the contractor's portfolio.

Mr. Grimes introduced himself as the attorney representing the estate of Igor Jablovkov and introduced Nicholas Jablovkov, one of the heirs to the estate. Mr. Grimes explained that Igor Jablovkov was the property owner but passed away on 21 March 2017, four days after receiving notice of the nomination in a letter addressed to him and his late wife. He noted that both Mr. and Mrs. Jablovkov lived at 20 E. Johnson Street, adding that the estate and its heirs oppose the nomination for various reasons. First, he explained, the nomination could not come at a more difficult time for the Jablovkov family, since Mr. Jablovkov passed away only three months ago to the day. The estate, he added, simply has not had ample opportunity to consider all the ramifications of the nomination of their parents' home. Mr. Grimes asserted that, irrespective of the possible benefits of designation, the heirs do not wish to encumber the properties with the additional layer of regulation without fully appreciating all of the ramifications. He contended that the family would prefer that the designation process not proceed until the property is transferred to a permanent owner who can better consider its future uses. He also asked the Committee to consider that the nomination was not properly made, arguing that it nominates two separate and distinct properties, 18 E. Johnson Street and 20 E. Johnson Street, on one application. Mr. Grimes stated that the nomination itself indicates that the properties each have their own tax account numbers and OPA account numbers. This is significant, he argued, because Section 5.5 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations contemplate that each historic resource with a separate address and account number should be considered separately. In this case, he continued, there are also practical reasons for the Committee to consider the two properties separately. He argued that the house at 20 E. Johnson Street is of a different time period and is very different than the office and stable, which were built 40 years later. He further contended that the house's condition differs greatly from that of the office building. He stated that it was his suspicion that the nomination was completed in such a way so as to lump the more valuable property together with the office and stable, which are less significant, in order to have all properties considered simultaneously. That lumping of properties into one nomination, he asserted, was not the proper way to nominate the buildings. Mr. Grimes argued that the nomination is long on the history of Germantown, prior owners, and period architecture; he contended that it lacked facts pertaining to the specific properties which would justify the nomination. For example, he continued, the statement of significance provides ample discussion of Cliveden in an effort to document that the house at 20 E. Johnson Street holds significant character or value and is part of Germantown's heritage. In terms of Criterion A, he asserted, the home site may have once been part of the Chew estate like Cliveden, but today there is little connection except for geographic proximity. Mr. Grimes argued that the 20 E. Johnson Street building is opposite a Cliveden side wall with no visibility of the Cliveden house. He noted that trees and overgrown bushes obstruct the views to the home from the Cliveden estate, emphasizing that the buildings on the site have little connection to Cliveden.

Mr. Grimes distributed a set of photographs. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Grimes to make one set available to the public, and Mr. Grimes obliged. He then explained that the photographs are Google Maps images of the site and show the house and some of the surrounding context. He asserted that the photographs are valuable because the nomination paints a picture of the neighborhood that may not be accurate. In support of designating the property, he continued, the nomination states that the block of E. Johnson Street has remained relatively unaltered since the early twentieth century. He commented that the photographs demonstrate that this statement is only partly true and clarified that of the approximately nineteen lots on the east side of Johnson Street, three are vacant, including two properties immediately adjacent to 20 E. Johnson Street. He described several properties as having parking lots, even of gravel, to

replace the front yards and asserted that, though the houses are there, they hardly appear unaltered since the early twentieth century. Mr. Grimes then noted that both 18 and 20 E. Johnson Street were rezoned CMX2 by the city in 2012 and are at the very edge of the CMX2 district in that area, which includes storefronts on Germantown Avenue. He asserted that the zoning change meant that the city determined that the properties are part of a mixed-use district rather than a purely residential one. He then claimed that the zoning change means that the home and stable parcel should not remain solely as a residence, but should include a non-residential use on the ground floor that promotes an active use to the property at the street level. If these properties were designated today, he insisted, the city's zoning requirements would make it difficult to adapt the house and stable for any productive reuse allowed by the zoning code also permitted for a historically designated property. Mr. Grimes stated that, regarding Criteria C and D, the nomination alleges that the house, office, and stable are examples of domestic and commercial buildings on a single parcel and thereby demonstrate an important architectural typology of Germantown and Philadelphia's past. While it is true that the three buildings are contiguous, albeit on two different parcels, he continued, it is not true that they were built together and that the office at 18 E. Johnson Street was even in existence during much of the period cited in the nomination describing examples of distinctive properties. Mr. Grimes remarked that, according to the nomination, the house was built between 1863 and 1871, while the office and stable were not built until around 1908. For over 40 years, during a critical historical period cited in the nomination, he argued, the house stood alone. He contended that the office at 18 E. Johnson Street is not very historic and that the staff's recommendation that the office does not warrant designation reflects that lack of significance. Mr. Grimes described the metal bars covering the windows and noted that the front door does not appear to be original. He argued that there is very little historical distinction to the property aside from its age. Further, he added, in an attempt to satisfy Criterion J, the nomination claims that the properties exemplify the heritage of Germantown through the life and business of Samuel Harting, who was allegedly an important local contractor and builder. Mr. Grimes argued that Harting was not a major figure in Philadelphia's history and observed that the nomination, in its discussion of Criterion J, states: "This nomination does not pretend to inflate the significance of Samuel Harting and/or Samuel Harting & Sons as being of exceptional significance or having a major influence on the larger built environment of Philadelphia." Harting was a contractor. Mr. Grimes then noted that the nomination reports that Harting lived in several other residences in the area, none of which are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He clarified that Harting did not build the 20 E. Johnson Street house and only occupied it for a time. As a professional building, he continued, Harting built many offices and residences around Philadelphia; however, he asserted that the nomination makes no claims that stable and office as they appear today have any distinctive features evocative of Harting's style. He suggested that the office, today in an altered state, offers few significant features and that there is very little distinction with respect to the Harting property to make it worthy of designation. Mr. Grimes stated that the estate appreciates the Committee's consideration of its position and reiterated that the properties at 18 and 20 E. Johnson Street are in transition owing to Mr. Jablovskov's very recent death. He alleged that 20 E. Johnson Street is dilapidated and that significant repairs may not be financially feasible. It is an old house, he added, but not very distinctive. Mr. Grimes claimed that the office at 18 E. Johnson Street is considerably altered and has no historic value. The zoning changes, he continued, demonstrate that the city wants these properties put at least in part to commercial use and not to preserve them solely as residences. He asserted that the estate and Mr. Jablovskov's heirs respectfully request that the Committee consider these issues and recommend that these properties not be designated. He then thanked the Committee for their attention, adding that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Cooperman explained that Mr. Grimes is referring to the inopportune moment in which notice of the nomination coincided with the property owner's death. She stated that it is conventional for the Committee, as well as the Commission in general, to grant continuances if they are requested by either the nominator or the property owner. She asked whether the property owner would like to request a continuance. Mr. Grimes replied that the nomination was supposed to be reviewed on a prior agenda and that they requested, and the Commission granted, a continuance to the present meeting. He added that a further continuance was not honored. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee's role is advisory to the Commission but that it can recommend to the Commission that the review of the nomination be further continued. Nomination reviews are routinely continued, she added.

Mr. Grimes stated that he would like to explain his request. Fully sympathetic to the Commission's goals and objectives of making the right decisions, he continued, the property is in transition and the estate has no intention of keeping the house, although the parents lived there for 50 or more years. He asserted that, irrespective of the benefits and burdens of designation, it is an encumbrance to have the designation officially pending. Ms. Cooperman explained that the purview of the Committee on Historic Designation is to review the merits of the nomination and not the designation per se. It then makes a recommendation, she added, but focuses solely on the nomination's merits. Mr. Grimes countered that Ms. Cooperman had asked him if he would like a continuance and that he is trying to explain what he is actually requesting, which is for the Committee to recommend against designation, because it is an encumbrance on the property. Ms. Cooperman stated that she understands.

Ms. Cooperman then asked Mr. Jablovskiy if he would like to comment. Mr. Jablovskiy answered that he would not like to comment but that he appreciates the Committee's time.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. James Duffin noted that he helped with the research of the nomination and was familiar with the site, since he had lived in that part of Philadelphia for some time. What struck him about the office building, he continued, was how incredibly well done it was. He explained that the building is not simply a utilitarian one-story office building and once he understood its history, it became clear that the building was intentionally constructed in a high style with nice features to show off the work of the builder, Samuel Harting. He described features such as the Flemish bond brick and the overhang above the door as being incredible, adding that the structure is striking for a plain office building of that period. Mr. Duffin contended that there are no other similar examples in Northwest Philadelphia and that the closest example would be the old Pelham office, though that was just a stucco, utilitarian building for Wendell & Smith. With that building, he continued, the company's purpose was to sell real estate and not to show off what they could build. Harting was a builder, he asserted, and the purpose of the office is to show off his skills as a builder.

Ms. Klein remarked that it seems both 18 and 20 E. Johnson Street are historically very important and that the use of the office building fits the style of its owners. She contended that both buildings satisfy each Criteria for Designation identified in the nomination, including Criteria A, C, and D.

Mr. Mooney asserted that the nomination lacks, and desperately needs to include, Criterion I. He explained that the properties fall within what is known as the "Battleground Lots," and that the potential for having archaeological resources associated with the Battle of Germantown is huge, including the potential for burials associated with the battlefield. British soldiers, he continued, were certainly buried on the battlefield, and he believed there were British burials identified when Johnson Street was laid. He reiterated that there is high potential for graves

associated with Revolutionary War soldiers and asked whether that information would suffice in recommending that Criterion I be included or if more justification would be required. Ms. Cooperman replied that the Committee can recommend the inclusion of Criterion I.

Mr. Beisert commented that he asked archaeologist Debbie Miller to analyze the site but that her justification took longer than he had hoped, so he submitted the nomination prior to obtaining her statement. He noted that he has information pertaining to archaeology and could supply it if necessary. Ms. Cooperman replied that the Committee would need to make a recommendation at the present meeting. She then opined that Johnson Street was not cut through until the lots were sold during the subdivision of the Chew estate and that the battle would not have been confined strictly to Benjamin Chew's property. The Committee members discussed the process for recommending that Criterion I be included in the designation of the properties.

Mr. Schaaf added to Ms. Klein's observations about the office building and stated that he found the materials, Flemish bond, and hooded doorway to be exceptional qualities of the building. He elaborated that the building's siting is justified nearly to the street line, just like a commercial building would be on Germantown Avenue, and that siting announces its presence as a mercantile or business building. The type of building at 20 E. Johnson Street, he continued, is a wonderful, familiar type of two-story gabled-roof house ubiquitous in Germantown and Northwest Philadelphia. He noted a similar type on the corner of Germantown Avenue and Johnson Street, as well as several others on Germantown Avenue and Allens Lane, adding that it is a recognizable Northwest type. Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Schaaf, adding that the building type characterized the environment of that particular era in that portion of the city.

Mr. Lavery expressed his appreciation for Mr. Beisert's research of the mid-nineteenth-century division of the Chew lots. He commented that it assists this particular nomination and several others. However, Mr. Lavery continued, he was not at first convinced of the office building's significance, but the nomination's explanation of Harting and his business as a builder offers some evidence. He noted his reservation about the value of the stable/garage building, adding that, although it is part of the same parcel, it is the weakest of the three buildings, as well as the site itself. The house, he continued, is straight out of Downing's book and stands as a picture-perfect example.

Ms. Cooperman observed that the porch has been altered, although she noted it is a very typical historic alteration to add the front porch and Tuscan columns. Of the nomination, she commented that she appreciated the tighter organization and that the Criteria were addressed directly, which makes for a strong nomination. She commented that it is a little tenuous to take the store and dwelling back to Stephen Girard, but that she found the other examples in Germantown compelling, in particular, the juxtaposition of mansion houses and attached or nearly attached offices. She stated that the form is very interesting and clearly relates to Germantown and the pattern of development in that part of the city. She opined that she had seen these buildings her entire life but had not registered them until reading Mr. Beisert's nomination. She elaborated that this example differs, because of its location off Germantown Avenue. Ms. Cooperman remarked that, in her reading of the nomination, it did not seem that Mr. Beisert argued that the property holds significance owing to the subdivision of the Cliveden property. She asserted that the building is simply an example of its period, adding that the nineteenth-century building is a picture-perfect Downing cottage.

Ms. Klein asked if Ms. Cooperman was opposed to including Criterion A. Ms. Cooperman replied that she was not.

Mr. Beisert stated that he thought Harting chose that lot owing to its proximity to Germantown Avenue. Ms. Cooperman added that property offers a transitional form from the kind of attached offices that were depicted along Germantown Avenue in the nomination. She asked whether the stable/garage is attached to the office building. Mr. Beisert answered that the two buildings are not attached. He opined that the stable may have functioned as Harting's workshop. Ms. Cooperman inquired whether there is any documentation to show that the stone portion existed previously. Mr. Beisert responded that Harting built both buildings.

Mr. Beisert elaborated that many of Harting's designs had a side driveway rather than a front driveway, and that element was retained at this property, since there is no evidence of a front driveway. He described the driveway between the stable and office. The office, he continued, was added to over time, including the addition of a lunch shed. He commented that he had met with the Harting family and that they explained how the site had been used.

Mr. Lavery asked for the derivation of the term "lunch shed," stating that he is unfamiliar with the term. He asked if the Hartings told Mr. Beisert there was a lunch shed on the property. Mr. Beisert stated that he could not remember where he heard the term.

Mr. Grimes asserted that he had not appeared in some time before the Committee, but he is concerned that the Committee is taking testimony from the nominator. He urged the Committee to make a decision based on the merits of the nomination as submitted, because that is the document to which he responded. He contended that it is unusual to take additional testimony during the Committee's discussion period, adding that he could not respond to the additional testimony, because it was not presented in the nomination. Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Grimes if he would like to respond now. Mr. Grimes replied that he is not an architect or a historian and that Mr. Jablovsky does not have that expertise. He reiterated that he would urge the Committee to base its decision on what was presented in the nomination, not on casual claims made during the meeting. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Committee also considers its members' knowledge about the historical and architectural environment of the city. Mr. Grimes replied that he respects that the Committee members can employ their own knowledge. In this case, he argued, the Committee is accepting as fact testimony from somebody who is not a member of the Committee. Ms. Cooperman countered that the Committee had a technical question about whether the building was attached, which was not clear. The conversation did devolve, she added, and she expressed her appreciation for Mr. Grimes' comments.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 18 and 20 E. Johnson Street satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, I, and J.

ADDRESS: 1801 E HUNTINGDON ST

Name of Resource: Textile National Bank

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: SLT 1801 LLC

Nominator: H.R. Haas

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1801 E. Huntingdon Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and E, but not Criterion H; the staff contends that the elevated train tracks largely obscures building, leaving the primary elevation only partially visible.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1801 E. Huntingdon Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the Textile National Bank is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and H. The nomination contends that the building is significant for serving as the only bank to specifically promote its services to textile manufacturers and for its association with longtime bank president Harry Brocklehurst, who was responsible for the construction of thousands of working- and middle-class houses across Philadelphia, including those of Girard Estate. The nomination also asserts that the building serves as an example of the neoclassical style by prolific Philadelphia architect Herman Miller and that its unique location adjacent to the Huntingdon Station of the Market-Frankford El heightens its status to neighborhood landmark.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. H.R. Haas represented the nomination. No one represented the property.

Mr. Haas stated that he would be happy to answer questions, should the Committee have any.

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

Mr. Haas asked to respond to one item the staff presented. He commented that the staff recommended against Criterion H, adding that if one looks at the photograph the staff presented in their presentation, it is hard to understand the building as a landmark. However, he continued, the front page of the nomination shows how the building serves as a backdrop to the eastbound side of the Market-Frankford line. He emphasized that it creates a dramatic backdrop. Mr. Haas clarified that the building was constructed before the elevated train, and argued that, as it stands today, there is a clear argument that the building is considered a landmark.

Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Haas to clarify the text that states that the building is listed in the National Register. She noted that she could not find any evidence of its listing. Mr. Haas responded that the building is listed in the Kensington National Register District written by Powers & Company. He added that he referenced the document in one of the footnotes. He then offered to look into the issue. Ms. Cooperman responded that it did not appear in the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission's CRGIS database and there is no district noted in that area. District aside, she also indicated that there was no individual listing for the building.

Oscar Beisert clarified that the building is mentioned in a multiple-property documentation form. Ms. Cooperman explained that the inclusion on that form indicates that the building is not listed in the National Register. She thanked Mr. Beisert for the clarification, adding that a multiple-property documentation form enables individual listings, but until a nomination is actually prepared, submitted, and reviewed, it is not listed.

Mr. Schaaf asked Ms. Cooperman whether a term is assigned to that status. Ms. Cooperman answered that a building of that status would be a potentially eligible property listed in a multiple-property documentation form. That form, she continued, is a scattered site document that allows for the relatively streamlined listing of properties that are not necessarily contiguous but relate to a theme, in this case Kensington's textile industry. She reiterated that no one has nominated or listed this individual building, although it was identified as one that presumably could be listed.

Mr. Lavery observed that, in the nomination, Mr. Haas mentions that the Textile National Bank was the only bank in the world devoted to the textile industry. He asked whether that meant the bank did not serve outside customers. Mr. Haas replied that Mr. Lavery's question gets into banking history and that he had based that claim on the claims that were made when the bank first opened. Mr. Haas clarified that he believed the bank was meant to serve the textile manufacturers. Based on his impression from advertisements, he added, it almost certainly served members of the working-class community as well.

Ms. Cooperman opined that the building is very handsome and stated that the question of Criterion H is difficult. Mr. Lavery disagreed, adding that thousands of people get a close-up view of the building's pediment in a way that they would not otherwise. He referred to The Loop architectural tour in Chicago, stating that there is no better way to see buildings above the first floor than from the elevated train. He also noted that people see it while standing on the platform waiting rather than speeding by the building.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 1801 E. Huntingdon Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and H.

ADDRESS: 5112-14 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: King-Green House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Gibby Bruce Ward

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5112-14 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, but that the property does not satisfy Criterion G.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5112-14 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, and J. The nomination contends that the building, constructed in phases beginning as early as the 1740s, is representative of the eighteenth-century development of Germantown and is associated with Daniel King, Sr., a well-known Philadelphia brass founder, satisfying Criterion A. The nomination argues that the site was used by three generations of hat makers, satisfying Criterion J. The nomination argues that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of a vernacular architectural style, type, and local tradition, satisfying Criteria C and D. Lastly, the nomination argues that the building contributes to the Colonial Germantown National Register Historic District, which is also a National Historic Landmark, and as such, satisfies Criterion G as a component of a distinctive area.

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

Mr. Beisert commented that the property satisfies Criterion G because Germantown Avenue is a distinctive area, which is why it was deemed a National Register historic district and a National Historic Landmark.

Ms. Cooperman asked for public comment. James Duffin, who assisted with the nomination, commented that the house was not featured in *Historic Germantown*, by Harry M. and Margaret B. Tinkcom and Grant Miles Simon. He noted that almost all of the buildings in that book were listed on the Philadelphia Register by Margaret Tinkcom in the 1960s. He suggested that this particular building was omitted because of limited access to sources at the time of the research in the 1960s. He explained that at that time, the title search was only able to be taken back to about 1795, but that he was able to trace it back to the 1740s. He commented that another important piece that was missing in Tinkcom's research was access to the Direct Tax, which is critical to tell us what was standing on this site in 1798. He opined that Tinkcom would have put this property on the Philadelphia Register in the 1960s had she had access to these sources of information. David S. Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented that this building is situated in a distinctive area of Germantown Avenue, and its preservation would lend to the historic atmosphere of that part of the city.

Mr. Schaaf noted that a map provided in the nomination shows a placed called German Square. He asked if anything remains of that development parcel. Mr. Duffin responded that German Square appears to have disappeared around 1805, and never became what it was intended to be.

Mr. Mooney suggested adding Criterion I, owing to the open backyard that has potential to yield information related to the King family or anyone else that lived here, or to events associated with historic Germantown.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5112-14 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, I, and J.

After the motion passed, Mr. Lavery suggested that Criterion H be added. Ms. Cooperman explained that the motion had already passed.

ADDRESS: 5356 CHEW AVE

Name of Resource: Jonathan Graham House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Sisters of the Good Shepherd

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the main building at 5356 Chew Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, but that the outbuildings should be considered non-contributing for the purposes of the designation, as they do not satisfy the Criteria cited in the nomination.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5356 Chew Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the building is significant under Criteria for Designation C and D, as an example of the Second Empire style of architecture at a time when the style was commonly employed on residential, commercial, and civic buildings. The nomination discusses three outbuildings for which it assigns neither a contributing nor non-contributing status. These outbuildings should either clearly be included as contributing to the designation, or deemed to be non-contributing. Outbuilding 1 appears to have been constructed between 1910 and 1926. Outbuilding 2's main block appears to also have been constructed between 1910 and 1926, although a small portion may remain from an earlier outbuilding. The smaller addition to this outbuilding was constructed in 1995. Outbuilding 3 was constructed in 1947. None of the outbuildings exemplify the Second Empire style, the sole basis for the claim of satisfaction of the Criteria.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Oscar Beisert represented the nomination. Attorney Christopher Strom and Good Shepherd Mediation Program's Executive Director Cheryl Cutrona represented the property owner.

Mr. Beisert agreed with the staff recommendation that the outbuildings should be considered non-contributing for the purposes of the designation.

Mr. Strom stated that he would like to provide information related to the history of the property and the purpose of the Good Shepherd Mediation Program. Ms. Cooperman asked that he focus his remarks on the merits of the nomination. Ms. Cutrona stated that Good Shepherd Mediation Program is the current property owner. The organization has been in existence since 1984, and it operated as a convent in the subject building for the first eleven years. It grew too large for the building and the Sisters moved into an outbuilding on the property in 1995. The property was previously a funeral home. The Sisters deeded the property to the Good Shepherd Mediation Program in 2000, and rented the convent from the Mediation Program for the Sisters to be housed. In 2012, the last Sister moved out of the house, the lease was canceled, and the Mediation Program became responsible for the property. In 2013, unbeknownst to the Mediation Program, a Sister terminated the fuel oil contract to save money, resulting in extensive water damage on the first, second, and third floors. The house had to be gutted to avoid a mold issue. One year later, the heater stopped working and a dozen pipes burst in the basement. The Mediation Program remediated the issue as best as it could with limited funds. The house was put on the market, but a purchaser reneged. The Mediation Program is still in charge of the property but does not have the funds to do anything to it other than let it sit vacant. The main building has been vacant since 2012. The Mediation Program is Philadelphia's only neighborhood justice center, and it moved to Center City because it thought the property had sold. The property is currently on the market.

Mr. Strom addressed several aspects of the nomination which he stated were incorrect. He stated that the condition of the property, while marked “good,” should actually be “fair” or “poor,” owing to the extensive damage to the building. He stated that the property is incorrectly marked as “occupied” when it should be marked “vacant.” He directed the Committee’s attention to the packet of photographs he distributed showing the extent of damage on the interior of the main building. He continued that the nomination incorrectly identifies the property as a villa. A villa is a large building with smaller outbuildings. There is an image of a historic map in the nomination that shows one outbuilding at the property. That outbuilding has not been on the property for quite some time. The three existing outbuildings were constructed after the main house was constructed. The largest outbuilding was completed in 1995. The nomination references a landscaped property, but the property is actually primarily covered with buildings or a parking area and driveway. The property has suffered extensive damage. Ms. Cooperman responded that condition is unfortunately not part of the Committee’s consideration. Mr. Strom stated that this is a heavy commercial district, with a large strip mall across the street. This property sits by itself, surrounded by this changed context. He summarized that for the above reasons, this property should not be designated as historic.

Martin Rosenblum of Martin J. Rosenblum & Associates stated that the nomination is a great treatise on Second Empire and is very comprehensive, but that most of what is cited is so much more significant than the subject building. The nomination is titled “The Jonathan Graham House, a Villa in the Second Empire Style.” He stated that the problem with that title is that there are a number of villas shown in the nomination, but this site is largely built up, and most of the outbuildings are from the time it was a funeral home. He stated that the detail of Satterlee Heights in the nomination shows what a villa landscape would be, which is primarily green and with open space. He stated that the streetscape in the case of this property is gone and the yard is gone. He suggested that there are much better examples of this type of property elsewhere in the city that would be better suited for historic designation, noting that even the nomination describes Second Empire as being ubiquitous. As a villa, it is the body without the arms and legs. He opined that when one says villa, one is assuming landscape. However, the landscape in this case has been largely obliterated. He commented that he reviewed National Register nominations as part of the State Historic Preservation Office Board, and considers this to be simply another Germantown Victorian house. He suggested that the site has been denatured, and without that, it does not stand as a significant property.

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

Ms. Klein stated that the main building stands on its own architecturally, noting that the mansard roof and architectural style are significant. She questioned whether the Committee should be discussing the surroundings. Ms. Cooperman noted that surroundings could be important as they relate to Criterion I. Mr. Mooney responded that he is not concerned about including Criterion I in this case. Ms. Cooperman stated that in contrast to the National Register, there is nothing that asks the Committee to consider context. She asked about the age of the embalming building. Mr. Beisert responded that it appears in a 1926 photograph. Ms. Chantry commented that the staff dated the building to between 1910 and 1926, owing to it not appearing on a 1910 map, but appearing in a 1926 photograph. Mr. Beisert commented that it is not his intent for the outbuildings to be considered contributing to the designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the main building at 5356 Chew Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and that the outbuildings should be considered non-contributing for the purposes of the designation.

ADDRESS: 319 GREEN LA

Name of Resource: Charles C.A. Baldi House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: William C. and Victoria E. McGahey

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 319 Green Lane satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 319 Green Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property is significant under Criterion for Designation A, for its association with Charles C.A. Baldi, a Philadelphia civic leader, businessman, and patriarch of the Baldi family. Baldi was an Italian immigrant who eventually organized a bank, operated a funeral home, owned a daily Italian language newspaper, and founded a coal yard and a real estate and insurance business. He was the first Italian appointed to the Philadelphia Board of Education in 1924. The house at 319 Green Lane was the primary residence of the Baldi family from about 1891 to 1927.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. She explained that Celeste Morello, the nominator, was in attendance earlier in the meeting but had to leave. No one represented the property owner.

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

Mr. Schaaf stated that the nomination is extremely well-researched and well-written.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 319 Green Lane satisfies Criterion for Designation A.

ADDRESS: 5805 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Heilig's

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mark and Earlene Lightfoot

Nominator: H.R. Haas

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5805 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, I, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5805 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the property is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, I, and J. The nomination contends that the commercial building, constructed in 1876-77, displays character-defining features of the High Victorian Gothic style, satisfying Criteria C and D. The nomination further argues that the building is one of a larger historic commercial corridor along Germantown Avenue, satisfying Criterion J. Lastly, the nomination argues that the property satisfies Criterion I, as the site of an earlier inn, which may have had privies and other subterranean features that may yield information related to the site in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. H.R. Haas represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

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

Ms. Klein commented that it was interesting to see the Price family and Woodlands Cemetery in the chain of title. Mr. Haas agreed, noting that multiple generations of Prices were involved. Mr. Schaaf commented that it is a fascinating building to look at, and called attention to the Founders Day parade photograph that also shows the Reading Railroad head house on Germantown Avenue. Mr. Lavery commended Mr. Haas on an excellent nomination. Mr. Mooney thanked Mr. Haas for including Criterion I.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5805 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, I, and J.

ADDRESS: 924 ARCH ST

Name of Resource: Philadelphia Gazette

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Eugene and Sophia Young

Nominator: H.R. (Harrison) Haas

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 924 Arch Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 924 Arch Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former *Philadelphia Gazette* building, constructed circa 1880, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the building is significant for its cultural and historical importance to the German-American community in Philadelphia for its association with the largest German-language newspaper in the United States, the *Gazette* and its successor the *Gazette-Democrat*, which were published in this building. The nomination also asserts that the building is significant for its association with the newspaper's editor, Gustav Mayer, a prominent Philadelphian who used his influence to "Americanize" German-speakers during World War I and to help hasten the end of Prohibition. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the building is a fine example of the High Victorian Gothic and Neo-Grec styles. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the building was designed by the prominent Wilson Brothers & Co., a Philadelphia firm best known for the design and engineering work on some of the most important nineteenth century buildings in Philadelphia.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator H.R. Haas represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia expressed his organization's support for the nomination and appreciation of the nominator's attention on properties in Chinatown. He noted that it is probably one of the more overlooked collections of late-nineteenth century commercial buildings, and one that is increasingly susceptible to alterations. He opined that now is the opportune time to spend more effort identifying the remaining buildings like this one.

David Traub of Save Our Sites agreed with Mr. Grossi that it is important to save the collection of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century commercial buildings in that vicinity. He noted that this group of buildings is in close proximity to the Convention Center, and the aggregation of the buildings creates a wonderful atmosphere to welcome visitors.

Maria Sturm of the German Society of Pennsylvania noted that the German Society is the only place to house a complete print run of the *Gazette/Gazette-Democrat*, which was printed in this building. She noted that the German Society was not aware before Mr. Haas began doing research at their organization that the building in which the newspaper had been printed is extant and in Chinatown. She noted that she very much hopes that the physical embodiment of the newspaper can be preserved, just like the newspaper itself, which is being digitized at the University of Pennsylvania and will be a tremendous asset to the scholarly community. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Committee members had also received a copy of a letter that Ms. Sturm had submitted for the record.

Ms. Cooperman commented that it is another good nomination, for a building that she personally had overlooked. She opined that it is important to recognize the significance of the Wilson Brother's work, which is under-recognized and under-appreciated, but very significant. She noted that this building is a lovely example of their work, in addition to its significance to the German community.

Mr. Schaaf noted that the building is remarkably intact. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that it is incredible that the railing on the roof has survived.

Ms. Klein asked if Mr. Haas had taken the photographs of the building. Mr. Haas confirmed that he did. Ms. Klein opined that the photographs are fabulous. Mr. Haas responded that he spent more money than he should have on an expensive zoom lens. Mr. Lavery noted that some of the photographs of the rear must have been difficult to take. Mr. Haas responded that he was able to take photographs from a neighboring parking garage.

Mr. Lavery noted one tiny clarification for the nomination's statement of significance. In Point Seven, Mr. Haas describes the Wilson Brothers' work, including Reading Terminal. Mr. Lavery clarified that the Wilson Brothers designed the Reading Terminal train shed, to be differentiated from the headhouse.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 924 Arch Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

ADDRESS: 1026 ARCH ST

Name of Resource: Board of Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Nancy and Alfred Capelli Jr.

Nominator: H.R. (Harrison) Haas

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1026 Arch Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and E.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1026 Arch Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Board of Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church building, constructed in 1878, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the Board, which met annually at this building on Arch Street, played a substantial role in the expansion of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. The nomination also contends that the building is significant for its association with Benjamin D. Price, the architect who shaped the appearance of Methodist Episcopal church in the late-nineteenth century, whose office was located in this building. In addition to Price's association under Criterion A, the nomination also argues that the building is significant under Criterion E as a likely design by Price, and under Criteria C and D as an excellent example of the High Victorian Gothic style.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation. Nominator H.R. Haas represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

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

Mr. Schaaf commented that the nomination was incredibly well done. He noted that he had never heard of imitation stained glass, and the discussion of that in the nomination added an extra element of interest. Mr. Lavery replied that the Athenaeum was recently given a trade catalog from the late-nineteenth century for paper imitation stained glass.

Ms. Cooperman noted that she had not known enough about B.D. Price. Mr. Lavery explained that he likes and supports the nomination, and that there is no question that Benjamin Price was an important architect internationally in terms of the scope of his building, but opined that it is a tenuous jump to give him the credit for the building. He asked if the other members of the Committee feel strongly that the case was made for Price's attribution. He noted that he recognizes that the building was completed before the Builder's Guide, and before building permits, but opined that there are not enough non-church buildings of Price's to compare. He noted that he went through Price's project list, and only found one other comparable building, the YWCA, which is not close enough. Mr. Haas responded that the YWCA was constructed several years after 1026 Arch Street, but that he thinks there is strong circumstantial evidence that B.D. Price was behind this building. Mr. Haas explained that Price had a working relationship with the Board of Church Extension before the building was constructed, and that, although they had another architect, Samuel Sloan, who they worked with, by the time this building was constructed, B.D. Price was designing their catalogs. Mr. Haas continued that Price was essentially the Board's "go-to" architect when they had to install a ventilation system in the building within one or two years of its construction, and most significantly, he moved into the building. Mr. Haas argued that Price was an architect for the Methodist Church, not just a contractor. If he had other significant clients, perhaps he would have looked elsewhere for his office, but he chose to be in this building. Mr. Haas noted that that fact made him suspect that

Price would not have moved into a building by another architect if he did not have to. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that she had been convinced by the argument in the nomination. She noted the building's decoration is nice, but nothing that goes too far astray from ecclesiastical or institutional design. She noted that there may never be a smoking gun, but that other factors added up to it being a strong attribution in her mind. Who else would the church have hired? Mr. Laverty responded that he was convinced.

Ms. Cooperman opened the floor to public comment. David Traub of Save Our Sites noted that, in line with his comments about the building at 924 Arch Street, this building is even closer to the Convention Center, which desperately needs a context of small-scale historic buildings to soften and enrich the atmosphere of the neighborhood.

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

ADDRESS: 30 PELHAM RD & 15 WESTVIEW AVE

Name of Resource: Fairelawn

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Hector & Susan Badeau and Joseph A. Sullivan & Sandy Crimmins

Nominator: Philadelphia Historical Commission staff

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the buildings at 30 Pelham Road and 15 Westview Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 30 Pelham Road and 15 Westview Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that former Fairelawn house and carriage house, constructed in 1902, satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the buildings exemplify the establishment of the suburban Pelham neighborhood by developers Wendell & Smith, also known for their developments of Overbrook Farms, Wayne, and St. David's, Pennsylvania. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the buildings are significant as the works of the prominent partnership of brothers G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, and for embodying distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

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

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

Ms. Cooperman noted that this is another building that she had not paid enough attention to, and had not realized that it was by the Hewitt Brothers. She agreed that it is a key building to Wendell & Smith's development.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the buildings at 30 Pelham Road and 15 Westview Avenue satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

§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.