

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

**16 MARCH 2022, 9:30 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	X		
Suzanna Barucco	X		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.	X		
Bruce Laverty		X	Arrived at 10:24 a.m.
Debbie Miller	X		
Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.	X		

* Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Committee members, staff, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
Nika Faulkner, Historic and Cultural Resources Intern
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Law Department
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
David Traub
Kevin Block
Jessica Vitali
Mary McGettigan
Nancy Pontone
Domenick Klein
Joe Burda
Audrey Hampton
Erin Abraham
Celeste Morello

Charles Long
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
Meredith Trego
Sally Nista
Amy Lambert
George Poulin
Gideon Fink Shapiro
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Jennifer Loustau
Yevgeny Desyatnik
Steven Peitzman
Dan Henderson
Michael Mattioni
Jay Farrell
Adrienne Carpenter
Samantha Monroe
Hal Schirmer
Janice Woodcock
Cal Leslie
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Dennis Carlisle

ADDRESS: 625-33 CHRISTIAN ST

Name of Resource: St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi Catholic School
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Various owners of condominium units
Nominator: Celeste Morello
Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 625-33 Christian Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi Catholic School satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, H and J.

Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the building reflects the social, cultural, and economic development of the neighborhood when it was associated with Italian immigrants. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the property is significant owing to its association with architect Paul Henon, Jr., of Henon-Hoffman Co., a prolific firm known for its designs of Catholic churches, theaters, and movie houses. Under Criterion H, the nomination asserts that the city grid was altered for the construction of the building, which now serves as a landmark of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 625-33 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. The staff contends that the property does not satisfy Criterion H.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:09:48

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

- Celeste Morello participated as the nominator.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman asked the staff if they had any contact with a representative of the condominium association. Ms. Schmitt responded that the staff had mailed the required notice letters to the property and the property owners but they had not been contacted by anyone representing the condominium association.
- Ms. Milroy asked whether they should consider extending the Period of Significance into the 1960s based on the acquisition of the adjacent parcels or if it should remain limited to the date of construction.
- Ms. Miller agreed with Ms. Milroy that the nomination argued for the building's social, cultural and educational significance to the neighborhood and therefore extending the Period of Significance made sense.
- Mr. Cohen asked if any Committee members agreed with the staff's recommendation that the nomination does not satisfy Criterion for Designation H. He said that he believed the strongest argument was made for Criteria E and J. Mr. Cohen said that he did not agree with the nominator's description of this building as exemplifying the Italianate architectural style but he was happy to see the building nominated.
- Ms. Milroy asked Mr. Cohen his opinion about extending the Period of Significance and he responded that he agreed that the social and cultural importance of the building supported extending it into the 1960s.
- Ms. Barucco said that she also supported the idea of extending the Period of Significance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building was designed by architect Paul Henon, Jr. of Henon-Hoffman Co. and was constructed in 1927.
- The building is an important reminder of the social, cultural, and educational contributions of Italian immigrants to this neighborhood.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- Owing to its association with Paul Henon, Jr., and its role in the social, cultural, and educational development of the neighborhood, the building satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J.
- The nomination's Period of Significance should be extended from 1927 to 1982 to better reflect the building's social, cultural, and educational importance.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 625-33 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, but not A and H, and that the Period of Significance run from 1927 to 1982.

ITEM: 625-33 Christian St MOTION: Satisfies Criteria E and J MOVED BY: Cohen SECONDED BY: Millroy					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	5				1

ADDRESS: 2301-41 S 3RD ST

Name of Resource: Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church and rectory, two buildings on a larger parcel at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church and rectory satisfy Criteria for Designation D and F. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Gothic style of architecture. Under Criterion F, the nomination argues that the church building's architectural sculpture by the Economy Concrete Company represents an anomaly for English Gothic churches.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, with the clarification that the style is Late Gothic Revival with some Tudor Revival elements and is not "Tudor Gothic." The staff also recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies Criterion F, because no argument is offered to demonstrate that the church or rectory represents a significant innovation. Finally, because the nomination fails to include the rectory in the Statement of Significance and no arguments for its significance are made, the staff recommends that the boundary be redrawn to exclude it from this nomination.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:21:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello participated as the nominator.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Morello stated that she understood the staff's recommendation that the property does not satisfy Criterion F and asked if she could correct any other issues raised in the staff's recommendation.
 - o Ms. Cooperman clarified that the nomination cannot be amended or modified at this point in the process, though additional material could be submitted for the Historical Commission to review.
- Ms. Morello questioned whether the staff found that the nomination was sufficient based on Criterion D.
 - o Ms. Cooperman explained that a property can be designated for satisfying a single Criterion and that the staff recommended that the nomination satisfies Criterion D.
- Ms. Morello stated that the buildings were dependent upon innovations used for the Sesquicentennial, because the area was swamp land and the new construction was heavy. The architect, she continued, noted at the time that the church was erected on 140 concrete piles and each pile was driven into the ground to a depth of 23 feet. She contended that this technology was new at the time and the church proves that the land can be improved through drainage and concrete. She added that the style, Gothic Revival with Tudor Revival elements, makes for a very interesting church. She noted that she intended for the rectory to be contributing.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the nomination does not include an argument for the rectory's significance, which was the reason for the staff's opinion that the rectory be excluded from the designation. She clarified that the rectory could potentially be designated in the future if a nomination supported its significance.
- Mr. Farnham stated that he spoke with the attorney representing the Archdiocese, Tony Forte, who consulted with the parish. The parish, he continued, is opposed to the designation but will not participate in the meetings.
- Mr. Cohen stated that he was struck by the style of the building, which he noted was one of the most horizontal Gothic Revival buildings he has seen. He contended that it has a kind of modernity to it and suggested that a discussion of that aspect would have been more appropriate than the medieval antecedents. He noted that there are elements that speak to the 1920s, adding that he wished that theme had been more central to the discussion on style than the discussion of Tudor. He concluded that the style has some relation to Art Deco, as was common for architecture in the 1920s.
 - o Ms. Milroy agreed, adding that there was a chapel on the site constructed in 1897 in the Italianate style. She noted that the existing rectory responds to that earlier chapel. She opined that the church speaks to Modernism in an interesting way.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that the broad proportions give the building a fortress-like appearance. She then asked the Committee whether the rectory should be included as a contributing resource and if the nomination satisfies Criterion F. She remarked that she did not believe that the nomination satisfied Criterion F, because she does not find the building to be particularly innovative in its design. She questioned whether the use of cast stone ornament on a building was common at the time of the church's construction.
 - o Ms. Barucco stated that she was not aware of other churches that used cast stone ornament at the time and found it interesting. She agreed with Mr. Cohen, adding that she had hoped the church's modernity would have been tied into the discussion.

- o Mr. Cohen commented that cast stone ornament was not unusual and was coming into its own as a cheaper material at the time the church was constructed. Other Committee members agreed.
- Mr. Cohen contended that, if the rectory does satisfy any Criteria for Designation, it would need to be presented under a separate nomination.
- Ms. Barucco questioned why the stone connector between the church and rectory was considered non-contributing in the nomination. She noted that, if the boundary is redrawn to exclude the rectory, that the connector should be included within the designated area.
 - o Several Committee members agreed and noted that it stylistically relates to the church.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination identifies the church and rectory as contributing, though no argument for the rectory's significance is included.
- The masonry connector between the church and rectory is identified as non-contributing in the nomination.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The boundary should be modified to exclude the rectory and only include the church and masonry connector. The rectory could be considered for designation in the future if a separate nomination is submitted.
- The masonry connector between the church and rectory contains stylistic elements related to the church building and should be considered contributing.
- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Late Gothic Revival style and satisfies Criterion D.
- The nomination fails to demonstrate that the property contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant element. The nomination does not satisfy Criterion F.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 2301-41 S. 3rd Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, with the suggestion of modifying the property boundary to include only the church and masonry connector.

ITEM: 2301-41 S 3rd St

MOTION: Satisfies Criterion D; modify boundary

MOVED BY: Barucco

SECONDED BY: Milroy

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	5				1

ADDRESS: 32 MANHEIM ST

Name of Resource: 32 Manheim Street

Proposed Action: Reclassification in Manheim Square Historic District

Property Owner: Jennifer Fritzinger

Applicant: Historical Commission staff

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

OVERVIEW: At its December 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission designated the Manheim Square Historic District, which includes 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42 Manheim Street. The nomination included the property at 32 Manheim Street, a vacant lot, in the proposed district and classified it as non-contributing, as the nomination argued only for designation under Criterion J. The Committee on Historic Designation found that the open land in the historic district, including the property at 32 Manheim Street and the rear yards of all properties, may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, satisfying Criterion I. For this reason, the Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrated that all properties in the historic district satisfied Criteria for Designation I and J. At its December 2021 meeting, the Historical Commission found that notice provided to the property owner of the vacant lot at 32 Manheim Street listed the property as non-contributing to the historic district. The Law Department advised that new notice would need to be sent to the property owner if a classification is to be upgraded from non-contributing to contributing, which would change the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over review of building permit applications for the property. The Historical Commission concluded that the vacant lot at 32 Manheim Street shall be classified as non-contributing until such time as the classification is reconsidered. The Historical Commission directed the staff to send new notice informing the property owner of 32 Manheim Street that it will consider amending the historic district to change the classification of the property to contributing, owing to Criterion I for archaeological potential.

The historic house that stood at 32 Manheim Street was demolished by the City in 2017 owing to the poor condition of the structure. The earliest documentation provided in the nomination shows the structures at 32 and 34 Manheim Street having been constructed by 1834. Privies are clearly labeled in the rear yards, which are considered by archaeologists to have high potential for archaeological resources.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends upgrading the classification of the property at 32 Manheim Street to contributing under Criterion I, because the site may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:47:25

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members agreed that this review is a reaffirmation of what it had recommended when it reviewed the Manheim Square Historic District nomination.
- Ms. Miller agreed that there are likely archaeological resources present at this site and therefore the property should be included in the historic district with a classification of contributing, owing to Criterion I.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society and the author of the original historic district nomination, thanked the staff for taking care of this technical matter and supported the reclassification. He asked that the Department of Licenses and Inspections finish the demolition of this site by parging the now-exposed side wall of 34 Manheim Street.
- Allison Weiss, representing SoLo Germantown Civic Association, supported the reclassification and also asked that the Department of Licenses and Inspections finish the exposed wall at 34 Manheim Street.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, supported the reclassification.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- During its prior review of the historic district, the Committee on Historic Designation found that the open land, including the property at 32 Manheim Street and the rear yards of all properties, may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, satisfying Criterion I. For this reason, the Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrated that all properties in the historic district satisfied Criteria for Designation I and J.
- The Historical Commission concluded during the initial review of the historic district nomination that the vacant lot at 32 Manheim Street should be classified as non-contributing until such time as the classification is reconsidered and directed the staff to send new notice informing the property owner of 32 Manheim Street that it will consider amending the historic district to change the classification of the property to contributing, owing to Criterion I for archaeological potential.
- New notice was sent to the property owner informing them of this proposed reclassification from non-contributing to contributing for archaeological potential.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property at 32 Manheim Street is likely to yield information important in pre-history or history.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend reclassifying the property at 32 Manheim Street as contributing under Criterion I in the Manheim Square Historic District, because the site is likely to yield information important in pre-history or history.

ITEM: 32 Manheim St MOTION: Reclassify as contributing to historic district MOVED BY: Barucco SECONDED BY: Miller					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2204 WALNUT ST

Proposed Action: Classification in Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District

Property Owner: Flamingo Bay Investments

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal requests that the Historical Commission reclassify the property at 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The property is classified as contributing in the inventory for the district, which was designated on 8 February 1995. The inventory entry reads as follows:

2204 Two, refaced townhouses for Henry Ashhurst family, c.
 1870, Furness and Hewitt, architects; refaced c.
 1960. --- Contributing

The inventory describes the building at 2204 Walnut Street as two townhouses designed by Furness and Hewitt for the Henry Ashhurst family, about 1870, which were refaced about 1960. Two aspects of the inventory entry are incorrect. The building was constructed as one 36-foot-wide townhouse, not two narrower townhouses. And the front façade of the building was replaced in 1938, not 1960.

Henry Ashhurst purchased the property at 2204 Walnut Street and several nearby properties in 1869 and commissioned a group of grand townhouses for the site from architects Furness and Hewitt. Henry Ashhurst occupied the townhouse at 2210 Walnut Street; it was demolished many years before the district was created. John Ashhurst, a wealthy banker and businessman, occupied the townhouse at 2204 Walnut Street, the property in question. John Ashhurst died in 1892, leaving his property at 2204 Walnut Street to his sons. According to architectural historian George Thomas, the building was altered by architect Wilson Eyre Jr. in 1892, when Chestnut Street was widened for the new bridge over the Schuylkill River. In 1900, the building was

redeveloped as the Holman School for Girls. At the time, it was reported that “the building ... has been remodeled and newly equipped with the latest and most improved furniture and apparatus to be found in this country or abroad” for the school. A garret top floor with dormers was added to the building and the front stoop was removed and the first floor was lowered to street level at some point during its use as a school, probably in 1900. In 1925, the Holman School moved to Ardmore. The property was then used as a social club called Season House. In 1938, architect George W. Neff converted the building for showroom and office space for Anthracite Industries, a promotional and lobbying arm of the coal industry. For the conversion, the front façade was removed, a new façade with storefront was installed, and the interior was converted for exhibition space on the first floor. In 1945, the coal industry group left the building, and it was converted for use by Ward & Ward, a men’s mail-order undergarment company. Ward & Ward constructed a large, rear, one-story addition for the storage of undergarments. The building was later used as the offices of 3I, a computer company specializing in information storage and retrieval; the Institute of Computer Management, a computer school, in 1965; Computer Conversions, Inc. in 1970; Temple Insurance Co. in 1976; a West Coast Video Store in 1987; a childcare facility called The King’s Kids with offices for Mark Ulrick Engineers, Inc. on the upper floors; and several other relatively short-term tenants.

In recent years, the property has been considered several times for redevelopment. The Historical Commission approved two versions of a project to redevelop the property with large rooftop and rear additions in February and July 2019. A demolition permit was issued in November 2019 to remove the rear addition and otherwise prepare the site for redevelopment, but the redevelopment project was eventually abandoned. In October 2021, the Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the building as Unsafe after an engineer reported that the front façade had separated from the remainder of the building.

The only surviving exterior portion of the Furness and Hewitt townhouse is the part of the rear wall facing Chancellor Street, a service alley, above the one-story projection added for the undergarment company and below the garret story added for the school.

The property owner is requesting that the Historical Commission reclassify the property at 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance, which is mirrored by Section 2.5 of the Historical Commission’s Rules and Regulations, defines a “Contributing Building” in a historic district as a building “within a district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Commission’s designation.” The task of the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission is to determine whether this building reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District nomination adopted by the Historical Commission on 8 February 1995. If it does reflect the historical or architectural character of the district, it should be classified as contributing; if it does not, it should be classified as non-contributing. The nomination for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District describes the district as follows.

“The Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential district consists of a series of residential communities representing the historical development of the region surrounding the southwest square of Penn’s original planned city.”

“The unifying factors [of the district] are the early and continuously residential character of the neighborhood, and the high quality of architectural design that pervades the entire area.”

“The buildings of the proposed Rittenhouse Fidler residential district possess significance, however, not just as a grouping of individual landmarks, but rather as a series of streetscapes that give the area a unique sense of time and place. These streetscapes vary from the two story rowhouses of backstreets such as Addison and Smedley, through the four story rowhouses of Pine and Spruce Streets to the mixed scale rowhouses and apartment towers on Rittenhouse Square and Walnut Street.”

It is important to note that the adjective “residential” is included in the name of the district, which was designed to preserve the residential sections of Center City west of Broad Street and south of Market Street. The inventory classifies some non-residential buildings as contributing; they are primarily churches, schools, and small-scale retail buildings that directly supported the residents of the area. Also, buildings that were originally residential but converted to commercial while retaining their residential features and character are also generally classified as contributing. Larger-scale retail and other commercial and office buildings are generally classified as non-contributing. The nomination does not cite, and the Historical Commission did not explicitly identify any Criteria for Designation when it designated the district in 1995. Moreover, the nomination does not propose a Period of Significance. The nomination includes 16 photographs illustrating the district. All depict residential buildings. No commercial buildings are depicted in photographs in the nomination.

The entry for 2204 Walnut Street in the inventory of National Register Rittenhouse Historic District, which was the basis for the local inventory, is not surprisingly nearly identical to the local district entry, errors and all, but it classifies the property as an intrusion, the National Register language for non-contributing.

2204 Two refaced townhouses for Henry Ashhurst family c. 1870, Furness and Hewitt, architects; refaced c. 1960. --- Intrusion.

In conclusion, the building has not served as residence since 1892. It was significantly altered about 1900 and again in 1938 for institutional and then commercial uses. Almost all traces of the original Furness and Hewitt townhouse have been removed. The building does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District. The building is labeled an Intrusion in the National Register district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission reclassify 2204 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District, pursuant to Section 14-203(78) of the preservation ordinance, which defines a contributing building as a building “within a district that reflects the historical or architectural character of the district, as defined in the Commission’s designation.”

The staff also suggests that the Historical Commission consider reclassifying 2202 Walnut Street as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District after additional research and proper notice to the owner.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:57:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the reclassification request and staff recommendation to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Architect Janice Woodcock and developer Cal Lesley represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cohen asked if reclassifying this property as non-contributing would mean that all properties without residential uses in the historic district would be considered non-contributing.
 - o Mr. Farnham replied that reclassifying this property as non-contributing would not mean that all properties without residential uses in the historic district would be considered non-contributing. He stated that the Historical Commission's decisions do not create precedent. The Historical Commission makes its decisions on a case-by-case basis after reviewing the specific facts of each case. Mr. Farnham stated that there are many non-residential buildings in the district that are rightly classified as contributing; they are primarily buildings that support the residential character like churches and schools. He also noted that many buildings that were constructed as residences but then converted to other uses like commercial uses are classified as contributing, provided they maintain some sense of their original residential appearance and character. He concluded that the question for the Historical Commission is whether this building sufficiently retains its residential appearance or character.
 - o Ms. Milroy stated that the Sophy Curson building is strictly commercial and contributes to the district.
 - o Ms. Barucco responded that the Sophy Curson building is non-contributing to historic district because it is a commercial building but is individually designated for its commercial and architectural significance.
 - o Ms. Cooperman agreed with Ms. Barucco and stated that the Sophy Curson building is non-contributing to the district and individually designated. She cautioned the Committee members to remember that they are not determining whether this property has any significance. The Committee is not reviewing an individual nomination. It is reviewing a request to reclassify in the historic district and must base its decision on the definition of the historic district.
- Ms. Woodcock stated that 9.5% of the entries in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District are listed as non-contributing in the inventory. She noted that some inventory entries include multiple buildings, so it is not a precise number of the non-contributing buildings in the district. She displayed several photographs of the building at 2204 Walnut Street. She stated that the building's residential use ended in 1892 and it was converted for use as a school in 1900. She showed images of documents including one proving that the new front façade was installed in 1938. She showed images related to the redeveloped building in 1938 including the Art Deco storefront, which has been lost. Ms. Woodcock displayed a series of images of non-contributing properties in the historic district. Some of the properties were residences that either lost their historic character or were constructed in the mid and late twentieth centuries. She displayed several photographs of non-contributing commercial buildings in the historic district. She showed a photograph of a contributing property that was originally residential but had been converted to commercial yet retained its residential appearance. She also showed photographs of architecturally significant commercial buildings that were classified as non-contributing, the Sophy Curson building and the Stein Bellet building. She concluded that residential buildings that were out of character with the district as well as buildings that were commercial in appearance were classified as non-contributing while residential building that were converted to commercial use but retained their residential appearances were classified as contributing. She stated that the building at 2204 Walnut Street should have been classified as non-contributing.

- Mr. Lesley, the developer, thanked the Committee for considering his case and Ms. Woodcock's analysis.
- Ms. Cooperman again reminded the Committee members that their task is determine whether this building contributes to the district, not whether it might satisfy one or my Criteria for Designation. She stated that she reviewed the classification of a nearby building about five years ago and looked very carefully at the nomination and inventory for the historic district at that time. She stated that the contributing buildings in the district are primarily those built before World War II for residential purposes. She stated that she agrees with the analyses presented, even if this building might be able to be individually nominated for reasons unrelated to the historic district.
- Ms. Barucco stated that there are non-residential contributing buildings in the historic district. She stated that residential areas include supporting buildings and this building can be considered supporting because it was used to display coal-powered appliances including coal furnaces, which would have been used to heat houses. She stated that it should continue to be classified as contributing.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the 1938 building at 2204 Walnut Street "creates a lively dialogue on that streetfront" and concluded that the building contributes to the district.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that it is important to differentiate between non-residential buildings that directly support the residential neighborhood and those that do not. She also noted again that the district does not have a Period of Significance. She observed that "pre-war" buildings are generally classified as contributing while "post-war" buildings are generally classified as non-contributing. She asked whether this building played a role in the pre-war residential period of the district. She noted that its current appearance was created just before World War II.
- Mr. Laverty stated that this building would contribute to a commercial district but does not contribute to the residential district as that district is defined in the nomination.
- Ms. Barucco noted that the local register inventory for this district was copied directly, mistakes and all, from the National Register inventory. She noted that this building was classified as an Intrusion, or non-contributing, to the National Register district. She wondered whether the classification change from one register to the other was intentional.
- Ms. Miller asked about the extent of work in 1938.
 - o Mr. Farnham stated that the front façade was replaced in its entirety in 1938. Other work was likely done in the interior. In 1945, the work for the undergarment distributor appears to have been limited to the rear.
 - o Ms. Miller stated that the new building in 1938 was designed to fit into the row and therefore contributes to the district.
- Ms. Milroy stated that the request appears to be driven by condition of the building, which is not the Committee's concern. She stated that the 1938 building fits with the design, style, and scale of the street and should be classified as contributing. She stated that she is concerned that something inappropriate might replace this building if it is classified as noncontributing.
 - o Ms. Cooperman cautioned that a hypothetical replacement for this building should not be factored into the Committee's decision. New construction is not in the Committee's purview or expertise.
- Ms. Woodcock stated that fine commercial architecture was not a basis for classifying a building as contributing. For example, the Stein Bellet building is a well-designed, mid-century commercial building but is classified as non-contributing. She

also noted that the inventory entry for 2204 Walnut Street includes major errors, which may indicate that the Historical Commission was mistaken when it classified the property as contributing; it may be nothing more than a clerical error.

- Ms. Cooperman agreed with Ms. Woodcock and remarked that she found numerous inconsistencies and “clear errors” in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory. She stated that the entry for the property she was researching, 2216 Walnut Street, included numerous “egregious” errors.
- Mr. Farnham agreed with Ms. Cooperman and recounted that he has struggled for 20 years to regulate this district, owing to its flawed inventory. He noted, for example, that he encountered difficulties with a property classified as an “Intrusion,” an invalid classification in the local inventory carried over directly from the National Register inventory.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Amy Lambert stated that she is aware of two commercial buildings in the district that are classified as contributing, one at 20th and Walnut Streets and the other at 21st and Chestnut Streets.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the building has a “modestly interesting refacing” but the argument for a classification of non-contributing has merit. Mr. Steinke advocated for reclassifying the building as non-contributing. He also explained to the Committee and audience that, even with the reclassification, the Historical Commission would retain plenary jurisdiction over the site and would have full jurisdiction over any new development proposed for the site. He stated that historic districts should “breathe,” and preservationists should “be open to new fabric.”
 - o Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Farnham to confirm or rebut Mr. Steinke’s statements.
 - o Ms. Barucco interjected that the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction over a non-contributing site is irrelevant.
 - o Ms. Cooperman disagreed, stating that some may have incorrect information that should be corrected.
 - o Mr. Farnham confirmed that Mr. Steinke’s statements about classification and jurisdiction were correct.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society asked if the Furness and Hewitt rear wall survives, and whether it is visible from the street and regulated.
 - o Mr. Farnham stated that the second and third-floor brick rear wall above the one-story addition and below the mansard is original to the 1870 building. It faces a service alley.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that this request raises questions about inserting modern buildings in historic districts. He asked the Committee to think about these questions.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building was constructed about 1870 as a residence.
- It ceased being used for residential purposes in 1892.
- It was altered for a school in 1900. The first floor was lowered, the front stoop was removed, and a mansard story was added.
- It was altered for a showroom and offices for a coal industry group in 1938. The front façade and mansard were replaced at that time.

- It was altered for an undergarment distributor in 1945. A one-story, rear addition was constructed at that time.
- The only surviving exterior portion of the 1870 townhouse is the second and third-floor rear brick wall facing Chancellor Street, a service alley.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections cited building as Unsafe in October 2021 because the front façade has disconnected from the remainder of the building.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- Although the building lost its residential appearance in 1938, it still contributes to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 4 to 2, the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Historical Commission retain the classification of the property at 2204 Walnut Street as contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Laverty dissented.

ITEM: 2204 Walnut St					
MOTION: Retain classification of contributing					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair		X			
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty		X			
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4	2			

THE CONWELL HOUSE BLOCK HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Number of properties: 7

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a historic district comprised of 7 properties on the west side of the 2000 block of Broad Street. Six of the properties are classified as contributing and one is identified as significant. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C and D.

Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district is significant for its association with the life and legacy of Reverend Russell Conwell, the founder of the college that would eventually become Temple University. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the buildings, “likely constructed at some point in the late 1880s, reflect the popularization of the Second Empire style in Gilded Age Philadelphia and the speculative development of North

Broad Street...” Finally, the nomination asserts that the structures retain distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire style, thereby satisfying Criterion D.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and D, provided the property at 2014 N. Broad Street is classified as non-contributing, owing to its extensive alterations.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:58:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Patrick Grossi from the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia represented the nominator.
- No one represented the property owners.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman asked the staff whether they had been contacted by any owners or their representatives. Ms. Schmitt replied that Temple University owns multiple properties in the proposed district and that the staff had been in touch with its representatives.
- Ms. Milroy thanked the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia for preparing the nomination. She commented that she was amused by the nomination’s reference to corruption since former Philadelphia Mayor William Stokely, known for his own corruption, lived at 2010 N. Broad Street.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the buildings are remarkable and a rare example of the Second Empire Gothic Revival style. He said the nomination was well written and addressed the social history of the area very effectively. Mr. Cohen remarked that there is a fire insurance survey available for the structures that dates to 1876, when the buildings were constructed.
- Mr. Lavery said that he supported the nomination and that Russell Conwell’s contribution not just to Temple University but also to North Philadelphia is important.
- Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Cohen that it would be interesting to try and identify the architect of the buildings. She asked the Committee members their thoughts on whether 2014 N. Broad Street should be categorized as contributing or non-contributing. She asked if anyone had a sense of how much historic fabric might be left underneath the existing screen.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that, based on his site visit, the building’s façade appears extant behind the screen. He noted that some window openings had been infilled and others remain. Mr. Farnham explained that the historic fabric at the ground floor appeared to have been removed. However, it appears intact at the second and third stories.
 - o Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had discussed whether to classify the building at 2014 N. Broad Street as contributing or non-contributing and had changed their initial recommendation of contributing to non-contributing. He added that he did not disagree with Mr. Grossi’s comments about the structure.
- Ms. Barucco commented that it would be helpful to include photographs documenting the conditions of the façade of 2014 N. Broad Street in the nomination.
- Ms. Miller noted that the historic fabric can be seen beneath the screen from Google Streetview, which made her feel more convinced of the intact nature of the façade beneath the screen.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The intact row of structures was built about 1876 in the Second Empire Gothic Revival style.
- Reverend Russell Conwell, the founder of the college that would eventually become Temple University, resided at 2020 N. Broad Street.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The proposed district is significant for its association with the life and legacy of Reverend Russell Conwell, the founder of the college that would eventually become Temple University, satisfying Criterion A.
- The buildings represent Gilded Age Philadelphia and the speculative development of North Broad Street, satisfying Criterion C.
- The structures retain distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire Gothic Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, and D and that the property at 2014 N. Broad Street should be classified as contributing.

ITEM: Conwell House Block Historic District					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, C and D					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Miller					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

DREXEL-GOVETT HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Number of Properties: 95

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, Meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Drexel-Govett Historic District, a large district comprised of 95 properties on the 3900 blocks of Delancey Street, Pine Street, and

Baltimore Avenue, as well as properties on the 300 and 400 blocks of S. 40th Street in the Spruce Hill neighborhood of West Philadelphia. All 95 properties are classified as contributing to the district. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the district's developers, Anthony J. Drexel and Annesley R. Govett, were significant individuals in the city and helped galvanize development in the Spruce Hill neighborhood. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the buildings embody distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate, Second Empire, Neo-Grec, and Queen Anne styles of architecture. Finally, under Criterion E, the nomination contends that many of the district's buildings were designed by prominent architects such as Samuel Sloan and G.W. and W.D. Hewitt.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, and that the arguments made for the satisfaction of Criterion A better apply to Criterion J.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:14:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Amy Lambert and George Poulin of the University City Historical Society represented the nominator.
- No one represented the property owners.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lambert noted that the nomination was written by Jennifer Loustau of the University City Historical Society and commended her on the nomination. She stated that the Drexel-Govett Historic District merits listing on the Philadelphia Register because of its significance in the early development of West Philadelphia.
- Responding to comments posted in the Zoom Q&A, which the Historical Commission uses for reporting and correcting technical problems, not for public comment, Mr. Farnham clarified that the Historical Commission is obligated to send two letters for each property. He explained that one is sent to the property owner and one to the property at least 60 days in advance of a public meeting to consider the district. The Historical Commission, he continued, is also obligated to place notice in a newspaper and to place posters within the proposed district. For all three districts on the agenda, he added, the Historical Commission has met its obligations. He further clarified that the City's Law Department had responded to Ms. Monroe's Right to Know Request.
- Ms. Barucco stated that it was a great nomination and an impressive district. She thanked the University City Historical Society for submitting it. She questioned why Criterion A would not apply, adding that she thought the nomination potentially satisfies Criteria A and J.
 - o Ms. Milroy contended that the nomination would satisfy Criterion A as it applies to A.J. Drexel.
 - o Ms. Cooperman agreed that Drexel has citywide significance and questioned whether that broader significance is reflected in this development. She commented that she finds Criterion J to be more appropriate. She elaborated that the district did not change the course of the city.
 - o Ms. Barucco contended that, if the district lacked Drexel's involvement, it would have less significance.

- Mr. Cohen stated his appreciation for the nomination, adding that he would have liked to have seen certain arguments developed further. Specifically, he continued, if Hewitt is only attributed with the designs. Arguments for the attribution should have been included. He then suggested that nominations should better integrate primary evidence, observing that much of the information is combed from secondary sources.
 - o Ms. Cooperman questioned whether Mr. Cohen's issue with the reliance on secondary sources changes his opinion on the worthiness of the district.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that it does not, but that the inclusion of primary sources would have made a more compelling nomination.
- Ms. Milroy agreed with Ms. Cooperman's argument that Drexel's signature is not on this district as it is on other buildings, but she contended that it would be important to acknowledge Drexel's involvement.
 - o Ms. Cooperman countered that Drexel is not significant for developing the buildings on these blocks and pointed to other buildings that are important for his involvement.
 - o Ms. Milroy argued that he was one of the most significant post-Civil War developers in West Philadelphia.
 - o Ms. Cooperman suggested that Drexel's development satisfies Criterion J.
 - o Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination satisfies Criterion J, adding that he would support the inclusion of Criterion A or accept if the Criterion is not included. He added that Drexel is important in shaping Philadelphia.
 - o Ms. Miller argued that both Criteria A and J apply.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Samantka Monroe opposed the nomination.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The district includes 95 properties, all classified as contributing.
- The district is located in West Philadelphia between 39th and 40th Streets and includes properties on Delancey, Pine, and 40th Streets, as well as Baltimore Avenue.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The district is significant, owing to Anthony J. Drexel's association as a developer and his citywide significance. The nomination satisfies Criterion A.
- The district was developed in the mid- to late-nineteenth-century in the Italianate, Second Empire, Neo-Grec, and Queen Anne styles of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- Several prominent Philadelphia architects, including Samuel Sloan and G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, are attributed with designing many of the buildings in the district, satisfying Criterion E.
- The district exemplifies the development of West Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination for the proposed Drexel-Govett Historic

District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, and to include Criterion J, owing to the significance of the district in the development of West Philadelphia.

ITEM: Drexel-Govett Historic District					
MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, D, E, and J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Barucco					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

4200-30 CHESTER AVENUE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Number of Properties: 16

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a small historic district comprised of 16 properties on the south side of the 4200 block of Chester Avenue in the Spruce Hill neighborhood of West Philadelphia. The district's inventory classifies all sixteen properties as contributing to the historic district; however, several of the properties have substantial non-historic additions which the inventory calls out as non-contributing. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination states that the eight sets of twins have significant character, interest, and value as part of the development of the neighborhood, being among the earliest block development projects of its kind for middle class residents in the emerging suburb of West Philadelphia during the post-Civil War period. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the block, constructed between 1870 and 1872, reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Second Empire style, and that the twins embody distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire style, including mansard roofs with dormers, moulded cornices, and decorative brackets beneath the eaves.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, provided the properties at 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue, which have been substantially altered, are excluded from the historic district.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:38:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

- George Poulin and Amy Lambert represented the nominator.
- Attorney Michael Mattioni and historic consultant Gideon Fink Shapiro represented the property owner of 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue. Samantka Monroe represented the properties at 4208 and 4210 Chester Avenue.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry stated that, at its 11 March 2022 meeting, the Historical Commission granted a continuance of the review of this nomination at the request of the attorney representing the owner of 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue. The Historical Commission will review the nomination at its 13 May 2022 meeting rather than its 8 April 2022 meeting, owing to this continuance.
- Mr. Poulin summarized the historic significance of the block. He stated that the block tells the early story of Spruce Hill's development, and there are relatively few examples of intact Second Empire blocks in Spruce Hill. He stated that 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue have non-contributing additions extending into the front yards, but their character-defining features such as mansard roofs, bay windows, and cornices remain and identify these properties as clearly being constructed at the same time as the remainder of the block. He stated that there was public comment received by the Historical Commission from a Ms. Monroe, and that the nominators could not identify her as a property owner on the block, although they do appreciate her opinions as a resident and member of the public.
- Mr. Mattioni introduced himself as representing the owner of 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue. He introduced Mr. Shapiro as his expert consultant. He stated that they support the nomination as recommended by the staff, which calls for excluding the properties at 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue. Mr. Mattioni referenced Mr. Shapiro's report. The Committee members confirmed that the report was received in advance of the meeting. Mr. Mattioni noted that he does not represent the owners of 4204 and 4206 Chester Avenue although he supports the conclusion of the Historical Commission's staff that all four eastern properties should be excluded from the district, owing to the extent of alterations.
- Mr. Shapiro provided testimony in support of excluding 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue from the historic district. He confirmed that he read the nomination and agreed with most but not all the findings. He stated that the nominators did a good job researching the history of the neighborhood and the history of the Second Empire style in West Philadelphia. He suggested adding the historic district to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, provided the boundary is first adjusted so that the district can best represent the period of significance. He stated that the nomination does not support including all the properties, and that the nomination states that "these dwellings were built to be precisely alike." He noted that the basis for the nomination then focuses heavily on the similarity of the buildings, and so only the buildings which meet this criterion should be included. He acknowledged that 150-year-old buildings do not need to be perfectly preserved in order to have historic value and be added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but that 12 of the 16 buildings have relatively minor cosmetic changes that allow their historic integrity to shine, whereas the four easternmost buildings have been altered in fundamental ways and have sustained a variety of unsympathetic, intrusive, and some irreversible modifications. He noted that the nomination refers to the brownstone facades of the block, but that most of the brownstone façade is destroyed at 4200 and 4202 Chester Avenue. He noted that the original bracketed cornice called out in the nomination is now concealed or modified. He stated that the mansard roofs are

- refinished in non-historic roofing material. He discussed the non-historic storefront additions, and noted that there was an addition at 4200 Chester Avenue by 1927 and by 1949 it was joined with the addition at 4202 Chester Avenue. He observed that these additions have destroyed the primary elevations and block visibility of what little remains that is historic material, rendering these properties unlikely candidates for restoration. Regarding 4204 Chester Avenue, Mr. Shapiro stated that no symmetry and no sense of a twin remains, and the brownstone façade has been obliterated. Regarding 4206 Chester Avenue, Mr. Shapiro stated that this building is the most obviously compromised by a full three-story brick addition covering the front façade. He stated that the nomination downplays the extent of alterations to these properties. He stated that the brownstone façade is gone and the building no longer reads as a twin. He acknowledged that the side and rear are more intact but argued that these are far less important than the primary elevations in this historic district. He stated that the front addition at 4206 Chester Avenue dates to 1938. Mr. Shapiro argued that the photographs in the nomination emphasize the intact buildings and gloss over the heavily modified buildings at 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue. He stated that the nomination does not provide photographs of these four properties in the statement of significance, only in the inventory. He stated that this is not surprising, because these four properties do not match the quality of the rest of the row and do not deserve to be included in the historic district. He stated that visibility and legibility are very important for listing on a historic register, and it is not enough to only have an idea of what a building once was. He concluded that including the four properties at 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue would dilute and distract from the intent of this otherwise well-qualified historic district. He stated that these four properties do not satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.
- Ms. Monroe spoke regarding the properties at 4208 and 4210 Chester Avenue. She explained that she will be inheriting these properties from Raymond H. Cairnes and as such, she has a vested interest in the matter. She stated that Mr. Cairnes also authorized her to speak on his behalf. She stated that her interest in these properties is on record in City Hall, with the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Ms. Monroe stated that she is not happy with this proposed historic district. She claimed that she has two petitions, one from all owners on the 4200 block of Chester Avenue which states they are opposed to the historic district, and a second that stipulates that these property owners understand what the Commission is doing, do not agree with it and believe it to be unconstitutional, but will not fight it if the Commission removes the properties at 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue from the historic district boundaries. She clarified that she has no business with Mr. Mattioni or Mr. Shapiro, but that in the interest of the community, the easternmost properties should be allowed to be redeveloped. She stated that the corner bar is a nuisance and should have been demolished decades ago. She claimed that there are multiple violations against the property. She stated that the community does not want the Commission in its business and regulating work to the buildings. She stated that it is burdensome. She stated that half of the community is still waiting on rental grants from the city. She claimed that every building on the block has been divided into apartments. She asked the Committee to work with the block and allow 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 to be excluded from the historic district boundaries so that development can occur that will improve the neighborhood.
 - Ms. Cooperman reminded everyone of the purpose of the Committee on Historic Designation, which is to make a recommendation to the Historical Commission regarding whether a property satisfies Criteria for Designation. She stated that anyone may submit a nomination to the Historical Commission to designate a

property as historic. She stated that the Committee will not address any sort of status related to a nominator. She stated that the Committee is not considering whether a property could be rehabilitated to its former appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert, representing the Keeping Society and the author of the nomination, commented in support of the nomination. He commented in response to written public comment, that the Keeping Society operates under the auspices of CultureWorks, he works as a volunteer of the Keeping Society, and there are no issues with its tax-exempt status.
- Paul Steinke, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented in support of the nomination. He stated that he reviewed Mr. Shapiro's report but reached a different conclusion which was provided as written public comment. He commented that there is no question that the properties beginning with 4208 Chester Avenue are more intact than those at 4200-06 Chester Avenue; however, the character-defining features of the latter buildings are still partially visible. He commented that the non-contributing additions could be removed in the future and the first floors could be restored or replaced with sympathetic new facades. He commented that all properties on the block should remain classified as contributing, with the unsympathetic non-historic additions classified as non-contributing.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination. He stated that he is currently researching a block of Second Empire twins in East Falls.
- Mary McGettigan, representing West Philly Plan and Preserve, commented in support of the nomination. She commented that blocks of twins are experienced differently than block of rowhouses. She commented that 4200-06 Chester Avenue should be included in the historic district.
- A Zoom user logged in as "Dissent" was unable to unmute. Mr. Farnham suggested conveying comments via the Q&A. In the Q&A, they identified themselves as Linda and Charlie, representing 4206 Chester Avenue. They commented that they oppose the designation. They later clarified in the Q&A that they are representing 4204 Chester Avenue, not 4206 Chester Avenue as originally stated.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED:

- Ms. Barucco stated that she appreciates what has been expressed thus far regarding the buildings in the district, and that the easternmost buildings at 4200-06 Chester Avenue can still be understood as part of the row despite the additions and should be included in the district. She referred to a photograph in the nomination showing 4200 Chester Avenue from S. 42nd Street, where much of the historic side elevation is visible.
- Ms. Cooperman reiterated that a property owner is not compelled to restore a building when it is designated as historic. She stated that most building permit applications are processed by the Historical Commission's staff, and do not require a review by the full Historical Commission at a public meeting. She stated that applications for window replacement, for example, are typically processed expeditiously by the Commission's staff.
- Ms. Cooperman agreed that there is a fundamental difference between a rowhouse block and sets of double houses, as was suggested during the public comment period. She stated that one perceives the three-dimensional nature of the double houses in a way that is not the case with most rowhouse blocks. She agreed that all

properties on the block should be included in the district and classified as contributing.

- Mr. Cohen agreed that the altered buildings at 4200-06 Chester Avenue should be classified as contributing. He stated that the sense of the early suburb is still evident.
 - o Ms. Miller and Mr. Lavery agreed.
- Ms. Miller suggested the inclusion of Criterion I for archaeological potential. She explained that the block is between two major transportation hubs in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, being Baltimore Pike and Darby Road, with the Woodlands also being in the immediate vicinity. She stated that there is a high probability for impermanent architecture that may not have been evident on historic maps. She stated that historically within Clark Park there was Mill Creek Pond and potential for Native American resources. She stated that the block itself is pristine in terms of its development, with fairly intact yards and nominal development in the area. She concluded that, owing to other archaeological work in this area that she is aware of, there is a potential for significant historical resources to be found, both prehistoric and historic.
 - o Ms. Milroy agreed, and suggested the nominators consider Criterion I when preparing nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The block was constructed between 1870 and 1872 in the Second Empire style.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The block has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development of the neighborhood, being among the earliest block development projects of its kind for middle class residents in the emerging suburb of West Philadelphia during the post-Civil War period, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The block reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Second Empire style, and the twins embody distinguishing characteristics of the Second Empire style, including mansard roofs with dormers, moulded cornices, and decorative brackets beneath the eaves, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The district may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, satisfying Criterion I.
- The easternmost properties at 4200, 4202, 4204, and 4206 Chester Avenue have later additions that are non-contributing, but the overall properties should remain classified as contributing.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed 4200-30 Chester Avenue Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, and to include Criterion I owing to archaeological potential.

ITEM: 4200-30 Chester Avenue Historic District**MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, C, D, I, and J****MOVED BY: Milroy****SECONDED BY: Miller**

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:58 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Committee on Historic Designation are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

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

- 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;
- Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- 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;
- Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- 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;
- Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.