

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

**19 OCTOBER 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 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 III
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:

Susan Wetherill
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown
Hal Schirmer, Esq.
Helma Weeks
Monica Gonzalez
Terrance Arter
Alina Macneal
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Virginia Maksymowicz
Mark Brack
Steven Peitzman
Pax Tandon
Andrew Goodman
Meredith Trego, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy

Alex Charnov
Phil Berryman
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
George Poulin
Pearl Bailey-Anderson
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Kathy Dowdell
Jean Wrice
David M. Raine
Barry Dubrow
Mordecai Terebelo
Ken Kramer
Gregory Fisher
Jay Farrell
Nancy Pontone
Yossi Avraham
Dennis Manno
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
George Thomas, CivicVisions
Amy Lambert
Christos Tzimoulis
Genne Murphy
Debra McCarty
Joseph McCarthy
Angel Thomas Boynes
David Traub, Save Our Sites

ADDRESS: 221 W UPSAL ST

Name of Resource: Jesse A. Tilge House
Proposed Action: Designate
Property Owner: Estate of Joseph Dorfman
Nominator: Historical Commission staff
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 221 W. Upsal Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A large dwelling known as the Jesse A. Tilge House, designed in the Queen Anne style by architect George T. Pearson in 1887, stands on the property.

The nomination contends that the Jesse A. Tilge House satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. The nomination argues that the house embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Queen Anne style, satisfying Criterion D. The nomination also argues that George T. Pearson, the architect of the house, is a designer who has significantly influenced the development of the City of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 221 W. Upsal Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:10:11

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation and represented the nominator.
- Attorney Barry Dubrow and executor Mordecai Terebelo represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Dubrow asked if the Historical Commission would have any jurisdiction over the interior of the building if it were designated.
 - o Ms. Cooperman stated that the jurisdiction would be limited to the exterior of the building.
- Mr. Dubrow asked how the physical condition of the property and alterations to the property are addressed.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Historical Commission does not require owners to restore properties when they are designated, but only reviews subsequent proposals to alter buildings. Changes may be retained until the owner proposes to alter them.
 - o Mr. Farnham agreed and added that non-historic alterations are grandfathered and may be retained as long as the owner wants. At the time that the property owner proposes work to a designated property, the Historical Commission may review the proposed work to ensure that it satisfies historic preservation standards.
- Mr. Dubrow asked about the driveway and the age of the pavers.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over permanent site features like walls, fences, and driveways. He noted that the driveway pavement looks like it is comprised of pavers from the time period of the house.
- Mr. Dubrow asked about a tree on a neighboring property.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission cannot arbitrate disputes between abutting neighbors. Such a dispute would be a private matter. The property owner has various options for settling such a dispute. He also noted that the Historical Commission does not review landscaping, lawn care, and other maintenance to grounds.
- Ms. Cooperman informed Mr. Dubrow that about 95% of all building permit applications submitted to the Historical Commission are reviewed and approved by the staff. She also noted that the staff can provide free technical advice.
- Mr. Terebelo asked if the Historical Commission regulated the land, or just the building.
 - o Mr. Farnham replied that the Historical Commission reviews all building permit applications for the property. Any new construction on the property would require the review and approval of the Historical Commission.
 - o Mr. Terebelo stated that the property is comprised of two lots. He asked if the nomination covered both lots.
 - o Mr. Farnham replied that the area proposed for designation is defined by metes and bounds in the nomination. He noted that Mr. Terebelo could ask the Historical Commission to adjust the boundary before designating. Mr. Farnham offered to speak to the representatives of the property owner offline about the boundary. He observed that the Historical Commission could amend the

boundary. He also observed that the Historical Commission often approves new construction at the rear of historically designated properties.

- Ms. Cooperman thanked the staff for the nomination and especially the context it provided for the design and construction of the house.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the building is “remarkable” and merits designation.
- Ms. Barucco and Ms. Milroy agreed with Ms. Cooperman and Mr. Cohen.
- Mr. Lavery stated that the house was clearly designed by architect George T. Pearson, even if no document directly links Pearson to the house. He stated that Pearson’s style is immediately recognizable, and the attribution is a safe one, even if we do not have the “smoking pencil.”

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Casey Bechtel supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The house at 221 W. Upsal Street was designed by architect George T. Pearson in the Queen Anne style for Jesse A. Tilge in 1887.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The house embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Queen Anne style, satisfying Criterion D.
- George T. Pearson, the architect of the house, is a designer who has significantly influenced the development of the City of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 221 W. Upsal Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: 221 W Upsal St.					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria D and E					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 4841 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Joseph P. Bolton Store and Residence

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Venture Philly LLC

Nominator: SoLo/Germantown Civic Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4841 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Joseph P. Bolton Store and Residence, a Second-Empire style, mixed-use, commercial and residential building that was erected about 1871, stands on the property.

The nomination contends that the Joseph P. Bolton Store and Residence reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, the Second Empire style, satisfying Criteria C and D.

While the staff supports the nomination, it has one reservation about it. The nomination proposes the designation of one building based solely on architectural style, when that building is one of three nearly identical buildings in a row. The nomination of one building for its architectural characteristics, when all three in the row share the exact same characteristics, is the preservation equivalent of spot zoning. The nominator should have proposed the designation of all three buildings in the row. The staff understands that time and other limitations may have precluded the nomination of all three and suggests that the nominator or the Historical Commission itself nominate the other two.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the property at 4841 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:32:05

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, preservation consultant George Thomas, and architect Logan Dry represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Sklaroff stated that he, along with Mr. Thomas and Mr. Dry, were present at the meeting to oppose the proposed nomination. He explained that plans for redevelopment of the property were well underway before the nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission for consideration. Mr. Sklaroff said the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a zoning permit for the project which was the result of months of hard work for the project team and the expenditure of resources. He noted redevelopment efforts on this project date back to April 2021. Mr. Sklaroff cited Historical Commission regulation Section 6.9.a.10 to point out that the redevelopment of a property already underway can be taken into consideration in deciding whether to designate.

- Mr. Dry walked through the new construction plans and elevations proposed for the property. He pointed to completed zoning permit activity and other engagement with City agencies. He noted the proximity of the date that the zoning permit was issued to the date the nomination was submitted to the Historical Commission. The nomination was submitted immediately after the zoning permit was issued.
- Mr. Thomas stated that the nomination is factually and intellectually incorrect. He pointed out that Joseph Bolton did not own the building until 12 years after its construction, and therefore 12 years after its stated period of significance. It should not be called the Bolton Store and Residence if Bolton did not occupy the property until 12 years after the end of the period of significance. Mr. Thomas said the condition of the building is "Poor" rather than "Fair," as checked on the nomination form. He continued that the Criteria for Designation selected, Criteria C and D, are minimally met by this property. Mr. Thomas remarked on the Historical Commission's staff suggestion that all three connected buildings should have been nominated and he agreed that the row of buildings should have been treated as a whole rather than selecting one of the three for the nomination. He commented that Joseph Bolton's involvement with the building is insignificant and stated that Bolton purchased the building as an investment and never resided there, yet it is called the Bolton Residence. Mr. Thomas pointed out errors in the nomination related to his ownership. He pointed one section of the nomination that states that Bolton owned the property in the 1920s but he in fact died in 1906. Mr. Thomas pointed out additional errors in the nomination. He also noted that the nominator does not appropriately discuss condition and integrity issues. He also noted the extreme deterioration of the extant garage. Mr. Thomas also questioned the architectural style examples cited as related to and influences on the nominated building. He asked if every building with a mansard should be designated in Philadelphia and concluded that that would be ridiculous. Mr. Thomas questioned whether the nominated building is a significant example of the Second Empire style. He stated that, based on his experience looking at Philadelphia architecture for the last half century, the nominated property is an insignificant and unimportant example. Mr. Thomas concluded that the building does not rise to the level that warrants designation, especially when a new building has been designed for the site and approved by the City's Department of Licenses and Inspections.
- Mr. Beisert stated that, despite the report given by Mr. Thomas, he stands by the nomination in the sense that this is a wonderful example of the Second Empire style. He acknowledged that the building may be earlier than some of the examples provided in the nomination. He stated that the building satisfies Criterion C and that that fact has been clearly demonstrated in the nomination. He added that the building stands at an important historic corner.
- Ms. Milroy asked Mr. Beisert why only the one building was nominated, and not the group of three in the row.
 - o Mr. Beisert replied that it was a decision based on time and resources. He agreed they are a cohesive group. He said the garage should be non-contributing because it is not part of the argument for significance.
- Mr. Cohen said he agreed that it is important to for the history in the nomination to be factually correct. He observed that Mr. Sklaroff stated that this has little historic value, but he would contend that the building represents a remarkable moment along Germantown Avenue when the people of Germantown were trying to present a more urbane and cosmopolitan front. Mr. Cohen said that William Rotch Wister, who developed this property, hired very sophisticated architects who produced a

sophisticated design. He agrees that not every building with a mansard is a full embodiment of the Second Empire style. Mr. Cohen said that the building reflects a moment in Germantown Avenue's history related to a significant shift from country stores and colonial mansions to the more urbane buildings of the post-Civil War era. He said that, based on Criteria for Designation C and D, which are cited, the nomination should be approved.

- Ms. Milroy noted that Germantown became part of the city in 1854. She said that this transformation of Germantown relates to the shift from independent of the city to being part of the city.
- Ms. Cooperman said she thinks it is more nuanced than that. She explained that in the period after the Civil War Germantown was developing and the leafy suburb was becoming increasingly urbanizing. Ms. Cooperman said she agreed with Mr. Cohen's comments about Criterion C.
- Ms. Miller recommended adding Criterion I to the proposed Criteria for Designation. She said this is a very historic corner in Germantown and the rear yards of the three connected buildings potentially have resources from earlier development. Ms. Miller noted she is not concerned with the garage, one-story addition, and lean to. She mentioned that earlier occupation of the site dates to the 1730s and that the significance of the property likely extends beyond the property boundary. Ms. Miller said there is a high probability that there are artifacts on the property.
 - o Mr. Lavery said Ms. Miller makes good points and he has no objection to adding Criterion I to the proposed Criteria for Designation.
 - o Mr. Cohen said perhaps the staff can supplement the nomination with a few paragraphs to support Criterion I.
 - o Ms. Cooperman supported Ms. Miller's recommendation to add Criterion I.
- Mr. Lavery pointed out the corner entry of the building with the cast iron post and noted that such entrances are emblematic of corner stores.
 - o Ms. Milroy said she wished the nomination had included more focus on this corner entrance and less on the mansard roof.
- Ms. Barucco said the integrity of the corner, building, and the adjoining two buildings is impressive.
- Mr. Cohen said the suggestion of the nomination of the two adjoining buildings by the staff is a good one.
- Ms. Cooperman said they cannot automatically add the two buildings because of legal requirements such as documentation and notice, but they can opine on whether the other buildings are worthy of designation.
- Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Farnham to provide guidance to the Committee on the zoning permit.
 - o Mr. Farnham said that the Historical Commission has faced this question many times in the past and has come to different decisions. He continued that the decision to designate in the face of potential development are primarily predicated on architectural and historical significance. Mr. Farnham noted that in the past the Historical Commission has declined to designate when development plans are in process and when the resource proposed for designation is not found to be highly significant. He also noted that the Historical Commission has faced appeals in cases where the Commission designated despite an ongoing development project and has prevailed in some of those appeals. Mr. Farnham concluded that in this case, the Historical Commission will be confronted with having to determine if property merits historic designation in light of the investments the property owner has made in redevelopment.

- Mr. Farnham stated that he wished to comment on Mr. Sklaroff's references to Section 6.9.a.10. He noted that the section of the Rules and Regulations that was cited relates to the review of building permit applications and not nominations. Mr. Farnham added that, in the past, the Historical Commission has extrapolated and utilized this section during designation reviews.
- Mr. Sklaroff said he disagreed with Mr. Farnham that the regulation relates to building permit application reviews only.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The design in the Second Empire style represents a remarkable moment along Germantown Avenue, when the owner and architect were trying to create a more urbane and cosmopolitan look.
- The building maintains a high level of architectural integrity and original details.
- Owing to the property's location in Germantown, the property has a likelihood for archaeological artifacts.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, the Second Empire style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- Owing to its location and the development of the property dating to the 1730s, it is likely that it could yield important pre-history or history of the community, satisfying Criterion I.
- The row of three buildings at 4837, 4839, and 4841 Germantown Avenue is worthy of designation and listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The properties at 4837 and 4839 Germantown Avenue should be nominated.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4841 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and I and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the garage considered non-contributing.

ITEM: 4841 Germantown Ave

MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and I

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	6				

ADDRESS: 6376-80 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: J.F. Rausenberger's Bee Hive Meat Market

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Neighborly Living LLC

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 6376-80 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. A mixed-use commercial and residential building, erected in 1889 and known as J.F. Rausenberger's Bee Hive Meat Market, stands on the property.

The nomination contends that the Bee Hive Market is an important commercial building representative of the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Germantown community, satisfying Criterion J. The nomination further contends that the Bee Hive Market is a store building that strongly reflects an era of commercial architecture that is characterized by eclectic designs influenced by the High Victorian Gothic and Queen Anne Revival styles in late nineteenth century Germantown, satisfying Criterion C. The nomination also asserts that the Bee Hive Market embodies distinctive characteristics of a Victorian vernacular applied to commercial buildings in the late nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion D.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6376-80 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:26:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Beisert stated that he prepared the nomination on behalf of the property owner.
- The Committee members expressed support for the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the building is not Queen Anne nor Victorian vernacular in style. He stated that the building is trying to be a modern inventive design.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, 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:

- A mixed-use commercial and residential building, erected in 1889 and known as J.F. Rausenberger's Bee Hive Meat Market, stands on the property.
- The building's architectural style cannot be easily labeled as one particular style.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building strongly reflects an era of commercial architecture that is characterized by eclectic designs influenced by the High Victorian Gothic and Queen Anne Revival styles in late nineteenth century Germantown, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building embodies distinctive characteristics of a Victorian vernacular applied to commercial buildings in the late nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion D.
- The Bee Hive Market is an important commercial building representative of the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Germantown community, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6376-80 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

ITEM: 6376-80 Germantown Ave.					
MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and J					
MOVED BY: Cohen					
SECONDED BY: Milroy					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

POWELTON VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Various

Nominator: Powelton Village Civic Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a historic district consisting of 935 properties in the Powelton Village neighborhood of West Philadelphia. The nomination argues that the Powelton Village Historic District is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The period of significance for the district begins in 1851, the year assigned to John Hare Powel's original plan for "Powelton" and the division of the Powel and Baring estates, and ends in 1931 with the construction of the Sarah Van Rensselaer Hall, a women's dormitory for Drexel University. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the Powelton Village Historic District represents the arc of West Philadelphia's development from large early nineteenth-century estates owned by a select few, to a suburban enclave for Philadelphia's growing middle class, which included industrialists and other entrepreneurs, many of whom owned businesses located along the edges, making these boundaries integral to the district's significance. Under Criteria C and D, the district reflects popular mid-nineteenth century suburban development patterns and is characterized by mid-to-late nineteenth century architectural styles, including an inventory of Italianate, Second Empire, Queen Anne, and other Revival styles. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the district includes works of many important Philadelphia architects, including Wilson Eyre, T.P. Chandler, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, Willis G. Hale, and Addison Hutton, among others.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Powelton Village Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and should be designated as historic with the following inventory amendments:

- the properties at 3829 Lancaster Avenue and 424 N. 33rd Street are reclassified from Contributing to Non-contributing;
- the properties at 3613 through 3631 Spring Garden Street are reclassified from Contributing to Significant.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:52:50

RECUSAL:

- Ms. Barucco recused, owing to her involvement in the preparation of the nomination.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Consultant Kathy Dowdell, George Poulin, Amy Lambert, and Mark Brack of the Powelton Village Civic Association (PVCA) represented the nomination.
- Numerous property owners participated in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Dowdell explained that most members of the team who worked on the nomination are residents of Powelton Village. She noted that she is also a resident of West Philadelphia and is familiar with the neighborhood, but in working on the nomination was reminded of the range and styles of properties within the district. She explained that the boundaries of the district form a triangle running along the railroad, Spring Garden Street, and Lancaster Avenue.

- Mr. Poulin thanked Ms. Dowdell and her team. He noted that he is a resident of Powelton Village, and it is a special place. He opined that the nomination's Statement of Significance explains why the district is so special. He remarked that the district has maintained an amazing degree of integrity despite all that the neighborhood has endured over the last 170 years. He noted that, while the nomination does not touch on the more recent history of the community, it is also significant that the neighborhood has evolved over time, and yet through that evolution, transformation, and development, the neighborhood remains incredibly intact. He explained that while it is still largely intact, it is threatened, with more than a dozen properties listed as contributing to the National Register historic district having been demolished in recent years. He highlighted that in addition to the buildings themselves, the streetscape, sidewalks, iron fences, and yards all contribute to the character of the district.
- Mr. Brack, chair of the PVCA's historic preservation committee, noted that nominating a historic district is an issue they have been discussing for many years, but that the process accelerated because of threats to properties in the neighborhood. He explained that the PVCA held several public meetings about nominating the district and raised tens of thousands of dollars for the preparation of the nomination. He explained that PVCA members voted 114 to 4 to move forward with preparing the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman explained that properties in a historic district are classified as Non-contributing, Contributing, or Significant. She noted that, while there is no benchmark for integrity in the local preservation ordinance, it is important that there be some historic material. She also noted that most designated buildings have had changes over time.
- Mr. Cohen commented that an incredible amount of work went into the nomination, and that it has an excellent narrative and is well documented. He remarked that what strikes him most from the testimony is that the nomination is a tool that is enabling the will of many people in the neighborhood to protect the character of the place they live. They are making use of a tool that government has put into place.
- Mr. Cohen addressed Mr. Arter's written letter, which touched on the fact that the nomination does not address the last 80 years of Powelton Village's history. Mr. Cohen noted that there are in fact different cultures and populations on the boundaries of the district that are underserved by this narrative, particularly when talking about representing cultures and people as opposed to preserving buildings. He noted that historic preservation is used to the notion of protecting buildings, but the way to protect and recognize culture is not as easy.
- Ms. Cooperman explained that the current nomination is mostly based on architectural quality and age but noted that a cultural narrative could be accommodated by Criteria A or J. Doing so at this point, however, would raise questions about the period of significance, which could result in a major change to the way many properties are classified as contributing or non-contributing and would involve a serious overhaul to the nomination and inventory.
- Ms. Milroy noted that the question of culture in historic preservation is an ongoing conversation in Philadelphia and nationally. In this case, she noted, the nominators have worked within the guidelines of the nomination process, established narratives for the statement of significance and determined a period of significance. She opined that nominations whose period of significance comes right up to the present are rare.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that there are many nominations that have extended the period of significance to recent history.

- o Ms. Dowdell responded that the nominating team had numerous discussions about the boundaries and period of significance. She explained that the PVCA originally wanted to include more recent cultural and social history in the nomination, but as they began to look at the physical properties in the district, they found that the later cultural history had not significantly impacted the original, earlier form of the buildings and properties. For example, she noted, a house that was turned into a commune still looked much the same as it did when it was originally constructed. From a practical perspective, she continued, the PVCA had limited resources for producing the nomination. She explained that they could have spent twice as long or twice as much money detailing every aspect of the district's history and potential significance, but opted to focus on researching, writing, and submitting the nomination quickly in order to start protecting the neighborhood. She acknowledged that she found Mr. Arter's letter very compelling and opined that it made a case that the 3800 block of Spring Garden Street could be its own historic district, as could the 3600 block of Warren Street, which is one of the remnants of the Black Bottom. She explained that they would have loved to conduct oral histories in the neighborhood but did not have the resources to do so at present. She concluded that this nomination is but a chapter in the history of Powelton Village, and that they would love to see that story continue and learn more about the neighborhoods that people are talking about today.
- o Ms. Cooperman agreed that the later stories might or might not be reflected in the physical fabric of the neighborhood and suggested that Criteria A and J might include an acknowledgement of the important narratives associated with the later history of the Powelton Village district, but that doing so would not change the Criteria cited in the nomination.
- Ms. Milroy explained that designation does not mean a place will be preserved in amber, noting that buildings change over time, and that designation does not force buildings to be turned back to the day after they were built. Designation, she explained, is a mechanism to support the neighborhood.
- Mr. Laverty explained that the task at hand is to evaluate the argument that has been made and the Criteria cited, and to look at the individual properties and district as a whole. He opined that one of the great things about the community is the diversity of architecture, created for all classes of society. He argued that, if the integrity of the buildings, of the bricks and mortar, is lost, then we lose the opportunity to tell all of the different stories of the diverse people who lived in and used the properties. If we lose the buildings, we lose the tangible talisman of those stories. Stories will continue to change, but if we can preserve the buildings, we can add to those chapters. He noted that he would hate to see the nomination scuttled because it does not do everything. He explained that the nomination is a great basis for creating something larger. He suggested that it would be great if the local universities would sponsor oral histories to tell more of the stories of the neighborhood.
- Mr. Cohen noted that there are an enormous number of properties in the district, but that it would be helpful to have more of the information from the Doug Eubank's links on the inventory forms themselves, and to have the sources for the dates of the buildings called out. He acknowledged that there is notion of compliance with a City database, but suggested that for transparency sake in terms of documentation, a key field would be the source of the date identified for a given property, which might be an atlas or a building permit.
 - o Ms. Dowdell responded that the City is talking about moving to the Arches platform for nominations and a citywide survey. She noted that the process has

slowed down, but that they worked closely with the Historical Commission staff to use the same fields that Arches uses so that other fields are not lost when the inventory is added to Arches. She noted that Doug Eubank's inventory includes deep deed research on properties in Powelton and is available through an interactive map on the PVCA website. She explained that they plan to give local copy to the Historical Commission staff and to understand how electronic records are maintained long-term is important.

- o Mr. Lavery agreed, noting that long-term electronic record preservation is a challenge. He suggested that a working group be set up among the Historical Commission staff and interested community members so that the data collected can be added to and synthesized.
- Ms. Milroy and Mr. Cohen noted a few minor typographical errors, including on page 10 Jessie Sabin should be Sabin-Coulter, and on page 9 Wilks should be Dilkes.
- Numerous property owners participated in the discussion.
 - o Debra McCarty supported the nomination, opining that the district has significant historic character and distinguishing characteristics worthy of preservation.
 - o Ken Kramer opposed the nomination. He opined that many of the buildings in the district represent freedom, evolution and change, and that designation would create stagnation. He opined that since the original owners were allowed to build what they wanted, and subsequent owners allowed to change to fit their character, current and future owners should be allowed to alter their properties as well. He argued that the district boundaries have been gerrymandered so that Drexel University properties have been excluded and opined that there was not enough notice of the meetings.
 - o Virginia Maksymowicz, an owner and resident of the 3700 block of Lancaster Avenue, supported the nomination. She noted that journalist Inga Saffron recently highlighted the block as “a syncopated ensemble of 19th-century brick houses with small shop fronts on the ground floor and identical roof cornices,” which was under threat of demolition and incompatible new construction. She explained that her block alone has lost three buildings in the last few years and a fourth demolition is pending.
 - o Terrance Arter opposed the nomination and opined that the border is arbitrary, and that Spring Garden Street is not a natural border to the Powelton Village neighborhood. He referred to the letter that he sent to the Historical Commission and which is on the record detailing his concerns.
 - o Genne Murphy supported the nomination, noting that she and her wife are newer homeowners in Powelton Village and love the historic character and nature of the neighborhood and have concerns about development pressure in the neighborhood.
 - o David Raine, the owner of 3822 Spring Garden Street, commented that he has never been invited to a Powelton Village Civic Association meeting and did not receive notice letters. He noted that he supports preservation in the neighborhood because development is severe but noted that most houses have been altered in some way and he does not feel good about how the nomination came about without the input of every property owner.
 - o Pearl Bailey-Anderson, the owner of 3857 Lancaster Avenue, supported the nomination. She commented that she is honored and excited to be recognized as part of the proposed district. She noted that, when properties in the area are torn down, people do not always know they are tearing down a historic property, and that work that is done is not necessarily sympathetic to the historic character of many buildings. She explained that her property is individually designated, and

she has gone to the Historical Commission for review to work in the past and has been approved and has done the work correctly and would like for future generations to know that the work she did was beneficial to them. She asked about other benefits of designation.

- o Angel Thomas Boynes, a second-generation Powelton Village owner, supported the nomination. She noted that her mother, who owns the property at 421 N. 33rd Street, has tried to keep the property as historic as possible, but it is difficult to find good contractors who will do the work properly and keep the historic integrity of the property.
- o Alina Macneal, an owner on the 3700 block of Hamilton Street, supported the nomination, remarking on the beautiful neighborhood and lamenting the development pressure has led to demolition in the neighborhood.
- o Casey Bechtel, a resident of 39th and Spring Garden Streets, supported the nomination, opining that the district is a “no-brainer.” She remarked on the charm of the district and arguing that it must be preserved, and that the community as a whole will benefit from it. She noted that development is incentivized to tear buildings down as opposed to preserve them. She commented that she has known about the nomination for months because she saw a poster for it on a telephone pole and argued that no one was keeping it a secret.
- o Jean Wrice commented that she has been talking with neighbors, and some people received the notice letters and shared them with others. She noted that she was not part of the PVCA nomination process, and even though many owners have known about the Historical Commission part of the process for months, they were unaware of the previous efforts leading up to the nomination. She noted that she knew St. Agatha’s church across the street and St. Andrews/St. Monica were historic but did not know exactly what was going on until contacted by the Historical Commission notice letters.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination, opining that it is a well-researched nomination that presents a compelling case for the merits of the district. He argued that the boundaries are far from gerrymandered, but in fact closely conform to the PVCA boundaries. He opined that anyone who visits neighborhood will be struck by the gracious tree-lined streets with the variety of architectural styles, arguing that it is a standout neighborhood and overdue for recognition. He noted that the nomination came not a moment too soon, as some properties that would have been Contributing have already been lost. He explained that, although not one of the Criteria cited in the nomination, it is a neighborhood with a longstanding tradition of being welcoming to people of diverse backgrounds and cultural identities.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination, opining that the district will also benefit the surrounding universities.
- Hal Schirmer supported the nomination. He commented that some sections of the district appear to follow the property lines and some do not. He suggested following the Licenses & Inspections notification process, and when a zoning permit is issued, the RCO is notified.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Designation does not preserve a property or district in amber. Most buildings have changed and will continue to change over time.
- Cultural significance can be more challenging to capture than architectural significance but is also important.
- The more recent cultural and social significance of the Powelton Village neighborhood is not addressed in the current nomination, which focuses on the earlier history and architecture of the neighborhood.
- A nomination does not have to address every single aspect of significance for a property or district but is a chapter in a longer story of a neighborhood.
- An amendment or separate nomination could be submitted later that addresses the more recent cultural and social history of the Powelton Village neighborhood.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Powelton Village Historic District represents the arc of West Philadelphia's development from large early nineteenth-century estates to a suburban enclave for Philadelphia's growing middle class, which included industrialists and other entrepreneurs, many of whom owned businesses located along the edges, making these boundaries integral to the district's significance, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The district reflects popular mid-nineteenth century suburban development patterns, satisfying Criterion C.
- The district is characterized by mid-to-late nineteenth century architectural styles, including an inventory of Italianate, Second Empire, Queen Anne, and other Revival styles, satisfying Criterion D.
- The district includes works of many important Philadelphia architects, including Wilson Eyre, T.P. Chandler, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, Willis G. Hale, and Addison Hutton, among others, satisfying Criterion E.
- The façade of the historic building at 3829 Lancaster Avenue was demolished in 2021 and a three-story front addition constructed, changing the spatial relationship and eliminating the historic character of the property, and therefore should be classified as Non-contributing rather than Contributing in the district inventory.
- The property at 424 N. 33rd Street is a vacant lot and should be classified as Non-contributing rather than Contributing in the district inventory.
- The properties at 3613 through 3631 Spring Garden Street are part of the Gardiner-Poth Historic District, which is already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and are classified as Contributing in the Powelton Village National Register Historic District inventory, and should be classified as Significant rather than Contributing.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed Powelton Village Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the following inventory amendments: the properties at 3829 Lancaster Avenue and 424 N. 33rd Street are reclassified from Contributing to Non-contributing; and the properties at 3613 through 3631 Spring Garden Street are reclassified from Contributing to Significant.

ITEM: Powelton Village Historic District**MOTION: Designate, staff rec****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	

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

ITEM: Adjournment**MOTION: Adjourn****MOVED BY: Milroy****SECONDED BY: Cohen**

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

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.