

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

**21 SEPTEMBER 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 9:32 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

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

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

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Kerrian France, Historical Commission Intern
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Leonard Reuter, Law Department

The following persons attended the online meeting:

- George Poulin
- S. Rottenberg
- Mandy Doty
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
- David Traub, Save Our Sites
- George Thomas, CivicVisions
- Sister Rosemary Herron, Mercy Career and Technical High School
- Allan Nadav
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
- Nancy Pontone
- Marlene Schleifer
- John Dever
- Susan Wetherill
- Mesha A. Hester
- Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society

Richard DeMarco, Esq.
Cheryl Feldman
Eileen Lowery
Celeste Morello
Coley Gestetner
Brian Nadav
Aaron Holly
Jay Farrell
Lori Arnold
Steven Peitzman
Tina Krovetz
Neil Sklaroff, Esq.

ADDRESS: 2901 W ALLEGHENY AVE

Name of Resource: Catholic Home for Destitute Children/Mercy High School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mercy Career and Technical High School

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Catholic Home for Destitute Children, constructed in 1912 on a design by Edwin F. Durang, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and H. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the Home's history is significant as part of the City and Commonwealth's response to the aftermath of catastrophic events that left children without parents or care. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Gothic, and specifically that of King Henry VIII's sixteenth-century Hampton Hall. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the design is the work of Edwin F. Durang, a significant ecclesiastical architect. Under Criterion H, the nomination explains that the large T-shaped building is an established visual feature, situated on elevated ground and occupying an unusual triangular parcel at the confluence of several major thoroughfares.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and H.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:09:11

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Lavery recused from all reviews of nominations authored by Celeste Morello.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, Sister Rosemary Herron, Vince Dolan, and consultant George Thomas represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Sklaroff opposed the nomination, explaining the mission of the owners and claiming that the nomination does not demonstrate that the property satisfies the Criteria for Designation cited in the nomination. He noted that the history presented in the nomination predates the construction of the building. He opined that the Historical Commission should use its discretion and decline to designate the property. He argued that the Committee should weigh the nomination fairly and conclude that the nomination does not warrant a favorable recommendation.
- Mr. Thomas, the property owner's preservation consultant, presented a series of slides to make the case that the nomination does not adequately satisfy the Criteria for Designation cited. He argued that the claim is made that this building is emblematic of the whole cultural history of such institutions across the city. He contended that the nomination fails to provide a context for the building typology in the city. Such a context should include Girard College, Williamson Free School of Mechanical Trades by Furness and Evans, and the Carson Valley School by Albert Kelsey. He opined that the nomination does not address these other sites or contextualize the property.
- Mr. Thomas continued that the second failure of the nomination is that its history of the architecture is irrelevant and incorrect. He explained that he studied medieval architecture under prominent medieval historian David Robb and noted that the design of Canterbury Cathedral broke with the French form to move in the direction of the English Gothic. He opined that whether this design came from Hampton Court or another source is a red herring. The nomination fails to explain how the building is exemplary of a specific architectural style and therefore fails to demonstrate that the property satisfies Criterion D. He opined that the building is late for its style and is less architecturally significant and less interesting than comparable buildings. He displayed several examples of more significant buildings.
- Mr. Thomas opined that, while the building's architect Edwin F. Durang was originally an interesting architect who brought the Italian Roman Baroque and the Counter-Reformation designs to Philadelphia, the design of the Catholic Home for Destitute Children was late in his career, unimaginative, and a low point in his portfolio. Mr. Thomas opined that most of the numerous buildings by Durang are not of consequence, as his firm became a production office for the Archdiocese.
- Mr. Thomas continued that the nomination fails to demonstrate that this location is so unique that it merits designation on the grounds of Criterion H, opining that there are triangular parcels throughout the city.
- Mr. Thomas concluded by opining that this is not a building that by its architecture, architect, or site merits designation. He stated that the nomination fails to demonstrate that it satisfies any of the Criteria for Designation.
- Ms. Herron provided an overview of Mercy Career and Technical School, which she opined is in a great location to serve its constituents, who are a diverse population from throughout the city. She opined that safety is critical for the school and stated that they need to make updates to various elements of the school to make it safer than it is today. The school cannot privilege historic preservation above the needs of its students.
- Mr. Sklaroff explained that the board of directors for Mercy looked to acquire a different site a few years ago but ultimately decided to remain at this site and renovate the building. He noted that, after a condition assessment in 2018, they concluded that they would need to rebuild portions of the building and construct an addition. He opined that, based on the public interest in permitting the school to

adapt the building for contemporary needs and the many failures in the nomination related to the history and significance, the nomination does not warrant a positive recommendation from the Committee on Historic Designation and should be rejected.

- Mr. Cohen explained that the nomination process in Philadelphia is a public one in which members of the public are encouraged to write what are usually complex documents that might not reach scholarly levels, but which reflect an earnestness and appreciation for Philadelphia's history. He noted that this nomination is flawed, but that he asserted that the property satisfies Criteria D and H, noting that the building stands out in the factory landscape and is a place that declares a certain identity. He opined that it is intriguing that the design moved away from typical Catholic iconography and towards English Gothic. He suggested that the elder Durang may have handed off the design to his son, who shifted from his father's vocabulary that was stridently Catholic to a vocabulary that leaned towards the English ideal, Hampton Court, and thereby represented the next generation. He opined that Mr. Thomas's comments actually place the building in its context. He commented that, if the Commission only designated the most significant buildings, the city would be robbed of many worthy buildings.
- Ms. Miller agreed with Mr. Cohen, opining that the building is a landmark, juxtaposed against the industrial landscape.
- Ms. Barucco observed that the nomination is being challenged because the school is concerned that a designation will prevent it from updating the building. She explained that designation does not mean that the plans provided in the school's submission materials could not go forward, noting that many designated buildings have been added to and changed, such as Rodeph Shalom, to which a new entrance was added alongside the front elevation. She noted that stewardship goes along with designation and hoped that the organization would be proud to have its building designated. She argued that the idea that designation would prevent changes to the building is far from the truth.
- Ms. Barucco agreed with Mr. Cohen regarding the Criteria.
- Mr. Sklaroff rebutted. He pointed out that they are not demolishing the building and have no intention of doing so, but if they plan to expand to the rear and the building is designated, they expose themselves to litigation. He noted that, while the Commission may approve the modifications, people can appeal building permits presented to the Commission, such as they did with the Dilworth House.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that, as a member of the Historical Commission, she has seen many projects such as those for ADA and other code related issues move forward, as they are essential to the continued function of a historic building. She noted that she understands that Mr. Sklaroff would see things from a specific angle because of his line of work, but, in her experience, she has seen many successful projects to update buildings for current needs.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that the information in Mr. Thomas's presentation helps give a positive context to the building. She noted that the Historical Commission is not in the business of only designating the highest and most artistic buildings, but a broad range of buildings that can be representative of a period and of design trends. She noted that the Carson Valley school, which Mr. Thomas referenced, and which is not in the city, is exemplary, but not every building that is worthy of designation is going to be as noteworthy as that one.
- Ms. Barucco questioned the period of significance of 1910 to the present, asking whether the end date is appropriate. She suggested that 1912 might be an

appropriate end date, because the siting occurred at that time and continued to be an important character-defining feature.

- o Ms. Cooperman replied that, if the Committee is not endorsing Criterion A, then the period of significance would not have to extend the full life of the institution.
- o Mr. Cohen suggested that an end date of 1920 would cover the full period of construction.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination, noting that it is an important historic landmark especially in the highly industrialized landscape around Hunting Park Avenue. He commented that the Commission may or may not designate in public interest and may also choose how to regulate. He disagreed with the owners' representatives, noting that the mission of Mercy Career and Technical High School is incredibly important, but that part of educating students is showing them the importance of where they go to school. He opined that a designation would not prevent the school from modernizing in a cost-effective way.
- Steven Peitzman of the East Falls Historical Society supported the nomination, opining that this is a landmark building on a key intersection that is fairly near East Falls, and that it is unfortunate that so little in this area is designated.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination. He remarked on the architectural quality of the building and how Durang fused medieval elements with functional accommodations for its former residential use.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building was constructed between 1910 and 1912, when its siting was completed. Some additional early alterations by the same architect may have occurred prior to 1920.
- A property does not have to be the most important or highly detailed of its type to warrant designation.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Tudor Gothic style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building was designed by the firm of Edwin F. Durang & Son. Durang was a significant and prolific ecclesiastical architect, satisfying Criterion E.
- The large T-shaped building is an established visual feature of the neighborhood, situated on elevated ground and occupying a triangular parcel at the confluence of several major thoroughfares and standing out among the largely industrial and residential context, satisfying Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2901 W. Allegheny Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and H and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with a period of significance from 1910 to 1920.

ITEM: 2901 W Allegheny Ave

MOTION: Designate; Criteria D, E, and H, period of significance 1910-1920

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	4			1	1

ADDRESS: 234 AND 240 HERMITAGE ST

Name of Resource: Holy Family Church, formerly Church of the Holy Family

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street, today known as Holy Family Church, formerly known as the Church of the Holy Family, and associated rectory, convent and school buildings, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church building is designed in the “seldom-seen ‘German Romanesque’” style of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the buildings are significant for their associations to “award-winning, pioneering and nationally-known” architects Patrick C. Keely, Thomas P. Lonsdale, and George I. Lovatt. Under Criterion H, the nomination argues that the complex is majestically positioned on a “summit overlooking the rooftops of the residences nearby,” making it a familiar site within the neighborhood. The nomination claims that the site is also significant under Criterion F, that it “contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation”; however, no specific argument is presented.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street satisfy Criteria D, E and H, but not Criterion F.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:48:00

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Lavery recused, owing to the involvement of Ms. Morello.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.

- No one represented the property owner. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff has been in touch with the Archdiocese and attorney Tony Forte about the nomination of the property. He indicated that the ownership does not plan to participate in today's discussion.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cohen commented that the Holy Family complex is a remarkable place and designation would provide more protection in the future. He noted that the argument in the nomination was more based on antecedents and medieval and renaissance times than on the period in which it was constructed, and that he wished it told more of the story of it when it was built in the late nineteenth century. He noted that Ms. Morello is great at finding documentation in the archives of Catholic publications and would have liked to see her bring the narrative into the period of construction. Nevertheless, he noted, the property is clearly worthy under Criteria D, E, and H, but the nomination does not provide an argument for Criterion F.
- Ms. Cooperman agreed with Mr. Cohen, noting that it would be nice to understand how the German and other architectural precedents described in the nomination were being received and interpreted in the United States in the nineteenth century. Nonetheless, she opined, the nomination presents enough information, and it is abundantly clear that the complex is worthy of designation for its architecture.
- Ms. Barucco agreed, noting that it is an interesting story of multiple ecclesiastical architects contributing to a specific site.
- Ms. Barucco proposed an end to the period of significance of 1922 with the construction of the rectory.
 - o Ms. Morello noted that the complex was altered in the 1920s.
 - o Ms. Morello commented that periods of significance are elusive to her.
 - o Ms. Cooperman explained that periods of significance depend on the significance itself. If the significance is based on design, then the period of significance is the period of the design and construction. If the significance is social significance related to an institution that exists for a period of time, then the period of significance would span the life of that institution.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Nathan Doty, a resident of the neighborhood, supported the nomination.
- Marlene Schleifer, the president of the Ridge Park Civic Association, supported the nomination. She noted that the buildings and property are beautiful and deserve designation.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination, noting that it could be designated solely under Criterion H for its prominent position and views.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street form a complex of several buildings including a church formerly known as the Church of the Holy Family, and the associated rectory, convent, and school.
- The buildings were constructed between 1897 and 1922.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the German Romanesque style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The buildings were designed by several significant architects, including Patrick C. Keely, Thomas P. Lonsdale, and George I. Lovatt, satisfying Criterion E.
- The complex is prominently positioned and is an established visual feature in the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 234 and 240 Hermitage Street satisfy Criteria for Designation D, E, and H, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with a period of significance from 1897 to 1922.

ITEM: 234 and 240 Hermitage St					
MOTION: Designate; Criteria D, E, H; period of sig 1897- 1922					
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			1	1

ADDRESS: 4501 POPLAR ST

Name of Resource: Stephen Smith Home

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Miron Poplar Realty LP

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4501 Poplar Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The property, which has been subdivided from the main parcel, includes two subsidiary buildings of the Stephen Smith Home, formerly the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons. Both buildings are abandoned, in very poor condition, and slated for demolition. One was constructed in 1901, the other in 1961, both well after Stephen Smith's death. The institution's main historic buildings, which were directly connected to Smith, were previously demolished.

The nomination contends that the Stephen Smith Home satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the property housed an important Philadelphia institution that was among the earliest in the United States to provide residential care to elderly African Americans. Additionally, under Criterion A, the nomination contends that

the property is significant for its association with Hobart Calvin Jackson, the longtime administrator of the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons and a national leader in the administration of elderly care. The nomination makes no claims about architecture or style.

In 2015, the staff of the Historical Commission reviewed and rejected as incorrect and incomplete a nomination for the same two buildings. The staff concluded at that time that, although the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons was undoubtedly historically significant, the two subsidiary buildings proposed for designation, which were constructed later than the institution's primary buildings and which were abandoned, in very poor condition, and slated for demolition, could not adequately represent the history of the site and did not merit designation as historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The current nomination is more robust than the nomination rejected in 2015, but it still depends solely on two subsidiary buildings in poor condition to represent the significance of an important institution. The staff offers no recommendation.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:03:25

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert and George Poulin represented the nomination.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco, preservation consultant George Thomas, and property owner Colev Gestetner represented the property.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Poulin, representing the University City Historical Society as the nominator, explained that the nomination was a community-led initiative. He agreed that the extant buildings represent only a portion of the Stephen Smith Home, but the other buildings associated with it have been demolished. He stated that the University City Historical Society believes there may be creative solutions to preservation of portions of the property. He noted that this is the second nomination to be submitted for this site. He stated that there is strong support from the community for the designation of these buildings.
- Mr. Beisert summarized the historic significance of the infirmary. He stated that it would be irresponsible not to designate what remains of this site.
- Mr. DeMarco questioned what community Mr. Poulin was referencing when he stated that the community supports the nomination. He stated that the community was involved in of the previous demolition, which allowed for the construction of a nursing home that supports the community. He stated that his client has planned to demolish these buildings in order to serve the mission of the nursing home and the community has supported that plan.
- Mr. Thomas presented a series of slides documenting the history and condition of the property. He argued that there is no public interest in designating and forcing the preservation of the Cunningham Building. He stated that since Mr. Farnham's original rejection of a nomination in 2015, the surviving buildings have significantly deteriorated because of a lack of heat and maintenance. He stated that the nomination left out the City's role in making the Cunningham Building derelict. He stated that the nomination ignored readily available Philadelphia Atlas data that shows that the building is a fragment without HVAC or utilities suited for reuse. He stated that the nomination provides no context on the physical condition or recent

history of the buildings, and provides no context on the architects, building typology or importance to the institution or city. He stated that the nomination ignores the financial situation of the nursing home and the costs of keeping a building with no utilities and in deteriorated condition. He concluded that there is no value to designating this deteriorated ruin.

- Mr. Gestetner confirmed that he represents Miron Poplar Realty LP, the property owner. He explained that the buildings were abandoned and occupied by squatters when he purchased them. He stated that he was told the main building had been demolished because of concerns by neighbors about crime. He explained that he has tried to maintain the structure and has hired security guards, but that it is a constant battle of reboarding up windows to keep the buildings secure. He stated that there is no real access to or visibility of these buildings from the street, and that the area is crucial to allow for parking for staff and ambulance access. He stated that the Councilperson was supportive of the mission at time of the purchase, and the facility now has a good reputation. He stated that there are consequences with historic designation. He explained that this is a Medicaid facility, and the maintenance of historically designated buildings is not in the budget and could be detrimental to the level of care provided.
 - o Mr. Beisert refuted the claim that the buildings are not visible from the street. He stated that they are visible from Belmont Avenue.
- Ms. Miller noted that Olive Cemetery appears on historic maps near this site. She asked Mr. Beisert about the nineteenth-century boundaries of the cemetery. She suggested that the designation may warrant the inclusion of Criterion I for archaeological potential. She noted that Olive Cemetery was an African American cemetery established by Stephen Smith. She stated that the bodies were reinterred at Eden Cemetery and that there has been much ground disturbance at the site, but that archaeological potential remains.
 - o Mr. Laverty agreed with the inclusion of Criterion I.
 - o Mr. Beisert responded that he is unsure of the exact historic boundaries of the cemetery.
- Ms. Barucco commented that it is compelling that the Committee is hearing different things about the community interest in the property. She suggested that members of the community participate in the Historical Commission meeting when the nomination is reviewed, so that the Commission can hear directly from the community. She stated that arguments related to the poor condition of the buildings were not compelling reasons against designation, and that cutting off utilities and calling a building vacant is not a reason to decide against designation. She agreed that the buildings are visible from the street. She stated that she supports the designation. She stated that the juxtaposition of the two buildings speaks to the history of the institution.
- Mr. Laverty commented that Stephen Smith was highly significant and left a legacy deserving of recognition. He agreed that the conditions of the buildings are poor but stated that condition is not part of the Committee's purview.
- Mr. Cohen agreed that the 1901 infirmary building is indeed visible from Belmont Avenue. He agreed that there are incredible challenges associated with the condition but noted that nominators typically lack access to interiors to assess condition. He questioned how to assess the argument for the 1961 building.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission can take condition into account when reviewing the matter. She noted that Stephen Smith's home was recently designated. She agreed that there is a potential for graves owing to the

historic cemetery near the site, and the knowledge that cemetery boundaries were often fluid and removal of remains were often incomplete. She concluded that the inclusion of Criterion I is justified.

- Mr. Cohen stated that the inclusion of Criterion A is warranted based on the importance of the institution. He stated that the nomination was well-researched. He stated that the Committee's expertise is not in building condition but rather historical significance.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Celeste Morello commented in support of the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The proposed designation includes two subsidiary buildings of the Stephen Smith Home, formerly the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons. One was constructed in 1901, the other in 1961. Both were constructed many years after Stephen Smith's death. The institution's main historic buildings were previously demolished.
- Olive Cemetery appears on historic maps adjacent to this parcel.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property housed an important Philadelphia institution that was among the earliest in the United States to provide residential care to elderly African Americans, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The property is significant for its association with Hobart Calvin Jackson, the longtime administrator of the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons and a national leader in the administration of elderly care, satisfying Criterion A.
- The former Olive Cemetery, located near and perhaps overlapping with the parcel, may be likely to yield information important in history, satisfying Criterion I.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4501 Poplar Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, J, and additionally Criterion I, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: 4501 Poplar St.

MOTION: Designate, Criteria A, I, and J

MOVED BY: Cohen

SECONDED BY: Laverty

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: 148-54 E MT AIRY AVE

Name of Resource: Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church, one building on a larger parcel at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the church building satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and F. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the English Gothic style of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the building is significant for its design by prolific Philadelphia architect Henry D. Dagit. Under Criterion F, the nomination contends that the church building's use of sculpture is unique for its integration into the building's structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, with the clarification that the style is Late Gothic Revival and is not "English Gothic." The staff also recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the building satisfies Criterion F; sculptural elements have been incorporated into religious buildings for millennia, and the use of such elements at Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church does not represent a significant innovation.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:55:00

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Laverty recused from the review of the nomination.

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry noted that the attorney representing the Archdiocese was aware of the nomination and was not going to be attending the Committee meeting.
- Ms. Morello summarized the historic significance of the church building.
- Ms. Miller asked if Criterion H should be included.
 - o Ms. Cooperman disagreed with the inclusion of Criterion H, but agreed with the staff recommendation against the inclusion of Criterion F.
 - o Ms. Barucco suggested that Criterion H should be reserved for a building with more street presence. She agreed with the omission of Criterion F.
- Ms. Barucco suggested that the period of significance should be from 1928 to the church's dedication in 1929.
- Mr. Cohen commented that the nomination needs fixing. He noted that the staff points out that the style described in the nomination is incorrect and a major flaw which needs correction. He stated that Ms. Morello submits idiosyncratic nominations for which the Committee makes exceptions. He stated that there should be a single narrative for the description of the statement of significance, not a collage of snippets and other things thrown in. He stated that the nomination needs to discuss the twentieth century of revivals in their own right more than the historical reference from the thirteenth and fourteenth century. He stated that Ms. Morello's nominations must put a building into the context of the time it was commissioned. He opined that the building is worthy of historic designation. He agreed that Criterion F needed to be removed. He suggested designation based on Criteria D and E.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the nomination.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Ms. Morello's nominations typically lack a single narrative for the statement of significance, and fail to place a building into the context of the time it was commissioned.
- The style classification of "English Gothic" in the nomination is incorrect.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The church building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Late Gothic Revival style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building is significant for its design by prolific Philadelphia architect Henry D. Dagit, satisfying Criterion E.
- The nomination fails to demonstrate that the building satisfies Criterion F; sculptural elements have been incorporated into religious buildings for millennia, and the use of such elements at Holy Cross Roman Catholic Church does not represent a significant innovation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the church building at 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, but not Criterion F, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance from 1928 to 1929.

ITEM: 148-54 E. Mt. Airy Ave.

MOTION: Designate, Criteria D and E; period of significance 1928-29

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	4			1	1

ADDRESS: 1400, 1406-18 AND 1420 S 3RD ST

Name of Resource: Sacred Heart of Jesus Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street, known as the Sacred Heart of Jesus Church and associated rectory and former convent buildings, and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Under Criteria C, D, and H, the nomination contends that the complex exemplifies the evolution of the “Picturesque Eclectic Style” by incorporating variations of architecture associated with the movement across the three buildings. The nomination also argues that the siting of the nominated properties, along the expanse of Moyamensing Avenue, provided a welcome open space close to the congestion of Washington Avenue, further demonstrating how the complex reflects the “Picturesque Eclectic Style.” Under the Criterion E, the nomination argues that the church building is significant for its association with the prolific architect Edwin F. Durang, whose designs shaped ecclesiastical architecture in Philadelphia.

The steeple of the church has been removed, but the complex is otherwise in nearly in original condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street, satisfy Criteria C, D and E, but not Criterion H.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:07:10

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Lavery recused, owing to Ms. Morello's involvement in the nomination.

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Chantry noted that the attorney representing the Archdiocese was aware of the nomination and was not going to be attending the Committee meeting.
- Ms. Morello summarized the historic significance of the property.
- Ms. Cooperman commented on the style called out in the nomination relative to Criterion D. She suggested that there are more specific ways of describing the relationship between the exterior details of these buildings and how it relates to contemporaries.
- Mr. Cohen lamented the recent demolition of a nearby historic church building. He commented that the “Picturesque Eclectic Style” called out in the nomination is a category looking to be inclusive of almost everything. He disagreed with the staff regarding Criterion H. He requested that Ms. Morello rotate the images in her nominations so that they are oriented with the pages.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the nomination.
- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The complex was constructed between 1872 and 1887 as the Sacred Heart of Jesus Church and associated buildings.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The complex exemplifies the evolution of the “Picturesque Eclectic Style” by incorporating variations of architecture associated with the movement across the three buildings, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The church building is significant for its association with the prolific architect Edwin F. Durang, satisfying Criterion E.
- The church, rectory, and former convent buildings represent an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, satisfying Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the properties at 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd Street satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and H, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with an amended period of significance from 1872 to 1887.

ITEM: 1400, 1406-18 and 1420 S. 3rd St.

MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, E, and H; period of significance 1872-87

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	4			1	1

ADDRESS: 1106 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: John Davis Co., Furrier

Proposed Action: Rescission

Property Owner: Joseph Nadav

Applicant: Roger F. Perry, Esq.

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to rescind the designation of the property at 1106 Chestnut Street.

The Historical Commission individually designated the property in 1986 for its unique Art Deco façade that featured glass and metal panels designed by architect Markham Asberry in 1933.

On April 13, 2014, L&I inspected the building and deemed the Art Deco façade unsafe because panels were loose, falling, and hazardous. The property owner's contractor, William Proud Masonry, removed the entire Art Deco façade, which was composed of glass and metal panels hung with mastic and revealed the earlier brick facade. The property owner claims that an on-site L&I inspector ordered the removal of all panels. On April 22, 2014, after the facade had been removed, L&I issued a violation stating that only unsafe and loose façade materials should be removed and that the Historical Commission's approval was required to replace the panels. The violation was later closed without any work being undertaken.

In 2016 and 2017, the staff of the Historical Commission approved two permit applications to repoint and repair of the back-up brick façade and install new and salvaged glass and metal panels to restore the Art Deco appearance. The work was never undertaken. The property owner claims that the approved plans were not feasible.

In July 2021, the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application proposing to legalize the removal of the panels and repair the exposed brick wall.

In 2017, L&I issued a second violation, this time for failing to restore the facade. In January 2020, the City initiated an enforcement case against the property owner based on the newer violation. In July 2022, the Court of Common Pleas held a hearing on the enforcement case and

ordered the property owner resolve the matter with the Historical Commission, through the rescission of the designation, the legalization of the removal of the façade through the hardship process, or the restoration of the façade. To comply with the court order, the property owner is seeking to rescind the designation.

The rescission application argues that the Art Deco façade was removed because it was not structurally sound and posed a safety hazard, that it was removed pursuant to an L&I directive, that any new façade would not be historically significant, and that the extant brick façade is not capable of supporting a restored façade.

Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations authorizes the Commission to "rescind the designation of a building ... and remove its entry or entries from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places if ... the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed." In this case, the qualities that caused the designation, the glass and metal Art Deco façade, have clearly been lost and destroyed. However, the question remains whether the property owner has an obligation to re-create the Art Deco façade. Given that the rescission request does not raise questions about historical or architectural significance, but only about facts associated with the removal of the façade as well as legal questions about the owner's obligation to re-create the facade, the matter exceeds the Committee on Historic Designation's purview. The Historical Commission itself will need to determine whether the owner is obligated to re-create the facade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Committee on Historic Designation decline to offer a recommendation for approval or denial of the request because the questions raised by the request are outside of the Committee's purview.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:19:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the rescission request to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Brian and Allen Nadav represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Brian Nadav stated that he is one of the owners of the property. He stated that he was on site at the time that an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) ordered the ownership to remove the façade. He explained that a panel fell off the façade on a windy day and crashed on the street. He reported that the inspector shut down the street, owing to the public safety hazard. He explained that he hired a contractor, William Proud Masonry, who examined the façade and determined that removing the panels was the only way to make the building safe. He reported that the panels were attached to the brick façade with a mastic. The panels overlapped slightly and when one started to come loose, the others came loose. He stated that the inspector ordered his contractor to remove all of the panels because they posed a public safety hazard. He stated that they attempted to salvage as many of the glass panels as they could, but they were very brittle, and the salvaging was not very successful. He acknowledged that the Art Deco façade was beautiful but asserted that it was installed incorrectly on a brick façade that was never intended to carry the weight of the glass. He noted that he has consulted with many engineers since the Art Deco façade was removed and all have concluded that it is not possible to install a new, replica façade on the existing brick façade. To install a replica Art

- Deco façade, the brick façade would need to be removed and a new steel-reinforced façade would need to be erected. He concluded that reinstalling an Art Deco glass façade is not feasible. He stated that they would like to renovate the building and open a restaurant at the rear on Sansom Street, but the open issue of the façade is preventing them from moving forward with any work. Rescinding the designation would allow them to move forward and improve the property. The Vitrolite façade is gone and cannot be restored. The designation should be rescinded.
- Allen Nadav stated that they have additional information about their attempts to restore the façade as well as about materials salvaged during the removal of the façade.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that that information would be better presented to the Historical Commission itself.
 - Ms. Barucco stated that the reconstruction of a facade is an acceptable historic preservation practice. She pointed to the National and Rittenhouse Coffeeshop examples. She stated that she is opposed to rescission.
 - Mr. Lavery indicated his concern about a precedent that might be set by a rescission.
 - Ms. Cooperman stated that she does not think that the Committee has enough information to recommend in favor of rescission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that this was a distinctive and unusual façade. He stated that his understanding of the situation in 2014 was that only one panel was loose, and the entire façade did not need to be removed. He asked if any of the original panels survive. He asked whether alternative materials for replicating the façade have been explored. He stated that those questions should be answered. He stated that restoring this façade would create a competitive advantage for the building. He noted that the Preservation Alliance offered in writing to assist with researching schemes to replicate the façade, but never received a response to the offer. He offered again to arrange for experts associated with the preservation Alliance to meet with the ownership to explore options for replicating the façade.
 - o Mr. Nadav offered to answer Mr. Steinke's questions.
 - o Ms. Cooperman declined his offer, stating that the Committee was taking public comment at this time.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society suggested that the Historical Commission amend the nomination for the property to call out the significance of the earlier brick building that was behind the Art Deco façade.
- Jay Farrell asked if the owner has saved any of the glass or metal panels.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Historical Commission designated the property at 1106 Chestnut Street for its Art Deco façade in 1986.
- The property owner's contractor removed the Art Deco façade in its entirety in 2014. The property owner claims that the L&I inspector ordered the contractor to remove the entire Art Deco façade because it posed a safety hazard.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Committee on Historic Designation does not have enough information to make a recommendation for or against the rescission request.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to decline to recommend approval or denial of the rescission request.

ITEM: 1106 Chestnut St MOTION: Decline to offer a recommendation MOVED BY: Lavery 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	5				1

ADDRESS: 1001 W LUZERNE ST

Name of Resource: Little Flower High School for Girls

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1001 W. Luzerne Street, known as the Little Flower High School for Girls as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Located in the Hunting Park neighborhood, the school was constructed in 1938 with an addition built in 1958. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the Little Flower High School for Girls was strongly influenced by two significant figures, St. Therese (Martin) of Lisieux and Cardinal Dennis J. Dougherty. Cardinal Dougherty's role in St. Therese's canonization in the 1920s and his relationship with her family were pivotal in the naming of the school. The nomination further contends that the nomination satisfies Criteria D and E, as an example of a modern school building designed in the International Style by prominent Catholic Church architect Henry D. Dagit & Sons and constructed by builder McCloskey & Company. Under Criterion H, the nomination maintains that the property represents an established and familiar visual feature to the neighborhood and community owing to the size of the building and its location directly adjacent to Hunting Park.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1001 W Luzerne St satisfies Criteria A, E, D, and H. The staff does not agree with the description of the school building's design as International Style but more appropriately embodies features of Stripped Classicism.

The nomination does not include an end date for the period of significance. Staff recommends that it focus on the period of construction, 1938-1939.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:54:55

RECUSALS:

- Mr. Lavery recused, owing to Ms. Morello's involvement in the nomination.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nominator.
- No one represented the nomination. Tony Forte, an attorney representing the owner, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, sent a letter to the Historical Commission prior to the meeting stating that the owner is opposed to the designation.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cohen said he thought the nomination was well done and well written. He said he agreed with the staff's recommendation that the identification of the style is not correct. All references within the nomination pointing to the International Style should be removed. Mr. Cohen said it interesting to see how the architect's style is developing in these later years. He agreed that the property does satisfy Criterion H as a neighborhood feature, but he did not agree that it satisfied Criterion A. He said that the argument for Criterion A is not sustained. Mr. Cohen commented that it is really interesting to see how the Beaux Arts architects have developed by 1938. He said it is clear that they sense something new is happening in architecture, but they still really want a symmetrical, monumental building.
- Ms. Cooperman followed up on Mr. Cohen's final comment. She agreed, noting that although the architect senses a change, he is still holding onto the Philadelphia pallet of materials even though things are getting a little more streamlined and abstracted in terms of the surface plane and the specific details such as the horizontal lines of the base, ribbons of windows, and more. Ms. Cooperman said that it is not quite accurate to call it International Style but maybe the best way to describe it is Moderne. She added that this is representative of new ideas that are filtering into the Philadelphia scene, and this building is a very good early example of these new ideas.
- Ms. Barucco said this is a style that the Dagits really embraced. She pointed out that they are exploring new ideas and refining their style.
- Mr. Cohen mentioned that late English Gothic schools have grouped windows of three or four under a flat or slightly pointed arch. The window design is almost the same formulation of classroom windows for lighting that you see on schools from 1910 but transformed in style.
- Ms. Miller commented on Mr. Cohen's recommendation to remove Criterion A. She questioned if there is an argument for Criterion J for this nomination. Ms. Miller said that in the 20 years she has been living in Philadelphia, she consistently has heard references to this school and feels there is a strong argument that it does exemplify the cultural, historical, and social heritage of Philadelphia not only because it is a school that children from all over Philadelphia have attended for decades and has an active alumni community. She added that the building is not only part of the fabric of the Hunting Park community but also part of the fabric of those who attended the school from elsewhere.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The style is not International Style as described in the nomination. All references to this should be updated to Stripped Classicism or Moderne.
- The building's architecture is a good representation of changing ideas within the Philadelphia architectural community in the late 1930s and how this new style was applied to institutional buildings.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination does not demonstrate that the property satisfies Criterion A. The nomination's argument that Little Flower High School for Girls was strongly influenced by two significant figures, St. Therese (Martin) of Lisieux and Cardinal Dennis J. Dougherty, is incorrect.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criteria D and E, as an example of a school building by prominent Catholic Church architect Henry D. Dagit & Sons and constructed by builder McCloskey & Company that shows the influence of new architectural concepts emerging internationally and regionally in the 1930s.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion H because the property represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood and community, owing to the size of the building and its location directly adjacent to Hunting Park.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion J, owing to the school's influence on the cultural, historical, and social heritage within Hunting Park and throughout Philadelphia by way of the school's alumnae.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1001 W. Luzerne Street satisfies Criteria for Designation Criterion D, E, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: 1001 W. Luzerne St

MOTION: Designation under Criteria D, E, H, and J

MOVED BY: Cohen

SECONDED BY: Miller

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty				X	
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy					X
Total	4			1	1

GATES STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: Ridge Park Civic Association

Number of Properties: 24

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate 24 properties along the 300 block of Gates Street in Central Roxborough as a historic district. The nomination states that the Gates Street Historic District is significant under Criteria for Designation D and J with a period of significance of 1887 to 1927. For Criterion D, the nomination contends the buildings on this block exemplify Philadelphia's diverse architectural periods constructed for a working and middle-class population. Styles such as Italianate, Folk Victorian, Second Empire, Gothic Revival, and Colonial Revival are applied to modest homes set back from the street, often on large lots. For Criterion J, the nomination asserts that the 300 block of Gates Street possesses significant character, interest, and value as a representative part of the development of the neighborhood as a dense Philadelphia suburb and represents the economic, social, and historical heritage of the Roxborough communities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that this nomination does not satisfy Criterion D and J. While the nomination offers well-researched, detailed, and factual documentation about the 300 block of Gates Street, it does not offer a compelling argument for significance under Criteria D and J. The type of argument for significance presented in the nomination for Criteria D and J could be made for almost every older, residential block in Roxborough. The staff recognizes that the nomination is indicative of the pride of this residential block and the desire to protect the existing character of the neighborhood and landscape, but questions whether this area merits designation as a historic district under the current system. The Historical Commission is currently exploring options for creating a second type of historic district that focuses on conserving the historic character of a community rather than preserving the architectural details. This area would be better served by that historic district option when it becomes available in the future.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:14:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Marlene Schleifer, president of the Ridge Park Civic Association, and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Multiple owners represented the property owner within the proposed historic district.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Schleifer and Mr. Beisert spoke about the nomination. Ms. Schleifer spoke about the extreme real estate pressure that their neighborhood is experiencing. She said they are working hard to protect and retain the remaining historic properties in Ridge Park. Mr. Beisert also addressed the changes currently occurring in Roxborough and how quickly blocks are changing. He summarized how the Criteria for Designation D and J apply to this proposed historic district and urged the Historical Commission to protect these historic resources.
- Mr. Lavery said he was impressed by the research and the way the nomination was put together. He stated that, after initially reading the nomination, he was concerned whether this area merited consideration as a historic district. He initially questioned what made this area distinct and observed this proposal is very different from other historic districts in theme and scope, such as the Ridge Avenue Thematic Historic District. Mr. Lavery explained that he initially was not inclined to recommend in favor of this district and thought perhaps the best solution would be some other regulatory mechanism focused on protecting the character of the district. He stated he changed his mind after reviewing the public comment and observed how the property owners are largely in favor of preservation. He said that, even if a new type of historic district was established within a year, this block may be inappropriately altered in one year given the development pressures in Roxborough. Mr. Lavery said it is not appropriate to punish the 300 block of Gates Street for wanting to protect the block that they care about. He concluded by saying that he will recommend in favor of this historic district. He added that when a new historic district option is introduced, this specific historic district nomination could be used as an example of where that type of district could have been applied.
- Mr. Cohen said he agreed with Mr. Lavery based on the owner and neighborhood support for this historic district and the development pressures they are currently experiencing. He said that Criteria D and J are appropriate for this nomination.
- Ms. Barucco agreed with Mr. Lavery's and Mr. Cohen's comments. She said that, based on the public comments, it sounds like this street has a high degree of architectural integrity compared to other streets around it and noted that fact speaks in favor of its preservation.
- Ms. Miller stated that she agreed with her fellow Committee members' comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Cheryl Feldman, head of the Historic Preservation Committee of the Ridge Park Civic Association, supported the nomination.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination.
- Mandy Doty, a property owner, supported the nomination.
- Nathan Doty, a property owner, supported the nomination.
- Stephen Peitzman of the East Falls Historical Society supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.
- John Dever, a property owner, supported the nomination.

- Eileen Lowery, a property owner, supported the nomination.
- Cory Wyffles, a property owner, supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- There is strong owner support for this historic district.
- The proposed historic district is described by owners and neighbors as having unique characteristics including a sense of place.
- The 300 block of Gates Street and the surrounding Central Roxborough community is experiencing ongoing real estate development that is altering the architectural and physical landscape of the overall neighborhood.
- This specific block retains a high degree of architectural integrity.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criterion D as the 300 block of Gates Street exemplifies Philadelphia's diverse architectural periods constructed for a working and middle-class population. Styles such as Italianate, Folk Victorian, Second Empire, Gothic Revival, and Colonial Revival are applied to modest homes set back from the street, often on large lots.
- The nomination demonstrates that the proposed historic district satisfies Criterion J as the 300 block of Gates Street possesses significant character, interest, and value as a representative part of the development of the neighborhood as a dense Philadelphia suburb and represents the economic, social, and historical heritage of the Roxborough communities.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Gates Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: Gates Street Historic District					
MOTION: Designated under Criteria for Designation D and J					
MOVED BY: Lavery					
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	5				1

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 1:14 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:

- (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.