

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

**21 JULY 2021, 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:

| <b>Committee Member</b>       | <b>Present</b> | <b>Absent</b> | <b>Comment</b>         |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair | X              |               |                        |
| Suzanna Barucco               | X              |               |                        |
| Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.             | X              |               |                        |
| Bruce Laverty                 | X*             |               | (joined at 10:22 a.m.) |
| Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.       | X              |               |                        |

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

The following staff members were present:

Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department  
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Addison Geary  
George Poulin  
Rich Leimbach  
Eileen Lowery  
Kevin McMahon  
Alex Balloon  
Jerald Slipakoff  
Teri Anger  
George Thomas  
Eugene Desyatnik  
Carolyn Campbell  
Stanley Baum  
Richard DeMarco., Esq.

Maeve Pollack  
Mandy Doty  
Lois Price  
John Dever  
Yun Xia  
Jesse Carpino  
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society  
Eric Peterson  
Marissa Miller  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
Carla Puppin  
Jay Farrell  
Scott Welden  
Michael Phillips, Esq.  
Deborah Gary  
Barbara Richman  
Nancy Pontone  
James Lyons  
Harrison Haas  
Gabriel Gottlieb  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Marlene Schleifer  
Susan Wetherill  
Timothy Kerner  
Jessica Radomski  
Amy Lambert  
Jim Duffin  
Jennifer Tintenfass  
Massoud Mohadjeri  
Nathan Doty  
Susan Comninel  
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Leah Silverstein, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Tina Krovetz  
Russell W. Fulton, Jr.  
Cheryl Feldman  
Jeffrey Richman  
Kelly O'Day  
Paula O'Day  
Joshua Upin, Esq.  
Dennis Carlisle  
Lynette Killen  
Celeste Morello

**ADDRESS: 3816 THE OAK RD**

Name of Resource: Memorial Church of the Good Shepherd

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Protestant Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd

Nominator: Nancy Pontone

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 3816 The Oak Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Memorial Church of the Good Shepherd church and parish hall, opened in 1927, satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the church and parish hall embody distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival and Classical Revival styles of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the church and parish hall are the work of Carl Augustus Ziegler, a prolific Philadelphia-based architect who was known for his accuracy with producing Colonial and Georgian Revival residences and special-purpose buildings in the 1920s.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3816 The Oak Road satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:07:33

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Nancy Pontone represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Cohen said this is a well-formed nomination. Mr. Cohen commented that he had minor quibbles with some parts of the nomination, including resting it on the Neoclassical. He said that he sees the design of the church as largely Colonial Revival with 1920s proportions and a certain sparseness that became something more modern.
- Ms. Milroy and Ms. Barucco complimented the quality of the nomination. They agreed with Mr. Cohen's comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination is well done and effectively makes an argument for designation.
- The architecture is Colonial Revival style rather than Neoclassical.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The church and parish hall embody distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival and Classical Revival styles of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- The Church and parish hall are the work of Carl Augustus Ziegler, a prolific Philadelphia-based architect who was known for his accuracy with producing

Colonial and Georgian Revival residences and special-purpose buildings in the 1920s, satisfying Criterion E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3816 The Oak Road satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

|                                           |            |           |                |               |               |
|-------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>ITEM: 3816 The Oak Rd.</b>             |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D and E</b> |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b>                  |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Cohen</b>                 |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>VOTE</b>                               |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>Committee Member</b>                   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Abstain</b> | <b>Recuse</b> | <b>Absent</b> |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                    | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Suzanna Barucco                           | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Jeff Cohen                                | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Bruce Laverty                             |            |           |                |               | X             |
| Elizabeth Milroy                          | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Total                                     | 4          |           |                |               | 1             |

**ADDRESS: 1523 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Love Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1523 Chestnut Associates

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the Love Building at 1523 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the property is significant for its association with the Red Rose Girls, an enclave of notable female artists important in LGBTQ history that included Jessie Willcox Smith, Elizabeth Shippen Green, Violet Oakley, and others. The nomination contends that the women maintained studios in the building during their formative years as artists and became significant contributors to the golden age of American illustration at a time when Philadelphia served as a national center for that industry.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1523 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:15:35

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Tim Kerner of the Center City Residents' Association and Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society represented the nomination.

- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Kerner stated that the building's history is extraordinary and thanked Mr. Beisert for uncovering it. He noted that the building has a spectacular cornice and that he hoped one day that the current covering could be removed and the cornice could be restored to its 1880s splendor.
- Mr. Beisert stated that it was an interesting building to research. He further commented that he finds it challenging to piece together the fragmented histories of the LGBTQ community, adding that it can be hard to articulate the LGBTQ side of an individual's past from a period of time when those aspects of the individual's life were not public.
- Ms. Cooperman remarked that she was familiar with the artists noted in the nomination but was unaware that they maintained a studio in the building and that it was such a concentrated nexus of this artistic community.
- Ms. Milroy added that several buildings along the 1300 to 1500 blocks of Chestnut Street housed artists' studios. She elaborated that it was interesting to learn just how much the illustration profession relied on women artists at this time. She noted that a significant number of significant illustrators were women. She suggested that the nomination should discuss the larger community of women artists in Philadelphia, which would underscore the importance of this building's history.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination was well-researched and well-written. He questioned whether the building is Queen Anne in style, though he acknowledged that the nomination does not rely on the building's style, adding that the property is much more significant for its social history than for its architectural style. He commended the Center City Residents' Association for investigating the building.
- Ms. Barucco agreed with the Committee's comments, adding that she appreciated this nomination coming forward and recognizing these women.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building was constructed in the 1880s, and its significance is identified as c. 1880 to 1923 to span the period when women artists maintained studios at the property.
- The nomination notes that the residents, including Jessie Willcox Smith, Elizabeth Shippen Green, and Violet Oakley, became known as the "Red Rose Girls," owing to their shared studio space in the Love Building.
- The building, significant for its social history as it relates to important women in illustration, is one of several significant properties along the 1300 to 1500 blocks of Chestnut Street that housed prominent Philadelphia artists.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building is significant for its association with several preeminent female illustrators, including Jessie Willcox Smith, Elizabeth Shippen Green, Violet Oakley, and others, satisfying Criterion A.

- Together, the women artists who maintained studios in the building formed the Red Rose Girls and were important figures in both art and LGBTQ history, further satisfying Criterion A.
- The women were significant contributors to the illustration profession at a time when Philadelphia served as a national center for the industry, satisfying Criterion J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1523 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

| <b>ITEM: 1523 Chestnut St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Cohen</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                 |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                     | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                               | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                      | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                         |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                     | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                                | 4   |    |         |        | 1      |

**ADDRESS: 8224 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: Harriett Detweiler and Caroline Detweiler Hammond House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Jeanne & Stanley Baum

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the Harriett Detweiler and Caroline Detweiler Hammond House at 8224 Germantown Avenue and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, H, and J.

Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property has significant character and value as part of the development of the Chestnut Hill neighborhood. Under Criterion H, the nomination contends that the property is significant for its prominent location along Germantown Avenue, the main thoroughfare running through Northwest Philadelphia. The nomination further argues that the property satisfies Criterion J for its association with the Detweilers, an early settler family, and that it serves as a reflection of the early mid-nineteenth-century character of the emerging Chestnut Hill suburb.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 8224 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. However, the staff contends that, while the building contributes to the streetscape, it does not stand out from

the adjacent buildings as an established and familiar visual feature and does not satisfy Criterion H.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:25:10**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Lori Salganicoff and Leah Silverstein of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy and Amy Lambert represented the nomination.
- Attorney Joshua Upin, owners Stanley and Jeanne Baum, and Jesse Carpino represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Lambert argued that the building provides information on Chestnut Hill's development patterns before it became an exclusive, wealthy enclave. She elaborated that the building speaks to early settler families and is nestled between other buildings associated with the Detweiler family. She expressed appreciation for the staff's recommendation that the property satisfies Criterion A and J and contended that the building is prominently sited on Germantown Avenue, close to the street, and satisfies Criterion H.
- Ms. Salganicoff argued that the building is part of the vernacular history that is so often lost and asked that the Committee help the neighborhood protect its historic architecture and streetscape.
- Mr. Upin apologized for emailing a letter of opposition so late and asked the Committee to include the letter in the record. If accepted, he continued, he would conclude his comments.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that the letter was accepted by the staff and is part of the record. It will be forwarded to the Historical Commission, she added.
- Mr. Carpino stated that he and his wife reside in the property and that he understands the historical nature of the community. He asked that the Committee consider the letter of opposition that was submitted by Mr. Upin.
- Mr. Baum stated that he and his wife have owned the property since the early 1980s and have lived in Chestnut Hill for over 50 years. He asked that the Committee consider the letter of opposition, adding that he is not proposing anything that will detract from the historic nature of this part of Germantown Avenue. He claimed that, if historically designated, the building would essentially become a museum, because his granddaughter and her husband cannot raise a family in the building. He argued that it would need to be changed for them to reside in the building, noting that it is old and needs major interior work. He concluded that he is vehemently opposed to designation.
- Ms. Milroy stated that the nomination was interesting and suggested that Ms. Cooperman clarify the Historical Commission's jurisdiction for the owner. Ms. Milroy then recommended expanding on the relationship of the property to 8226 Germantown Avenue, which seemed to be the family's main house. This smaller house, she continued, was built for two female relatives and has an interesting connection to the other building. She added that the nomination seems to conflate Chestnut Hill and Germantown, noting that the history of the two neighborhoods is complex and could have been clarified in the course of the nomination. However, she agreed that this stretch of Germantown Avenue has a very distinct character.

- Ms. Lambert clarified that this building at 8224 Germantown Avenue is situated between two buildings with Detweiler connections. The relationship between the buildings, she continued, speaks to the development patterns of the family and that two strong, single women built this house on their own and ended up raising some of the Detweiler children.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that strength often corresponded to financial independence more than character.
- Mr. Cohen remarked that the Criteria have been questioned by the staff and asked to address them. He stated that the nomination shows a good depiction of development patterns in Chestnut Hill. He commented that he appreciates the picture of the family and social meaning of the two women in this building who are affiliated with the adjacent building, but he argued that he does not see the building as a prime visual landmark that satisfies Criterion H, noting that the staff also recommended against the Criterion. He then questioned whether the nomination satisfies Criterion A by holding significance to the city, state or nation. Mr. Cohen agreed that the nomination satisfies Criterion J, adding that the building serves as a strong example of the ways in which Germantown Avenue evolved socially and architecturally. He then argued that the building is not Gothic in style, nor does it rely on Downing's pattern books. He stated that the property is a worthy addition to the Philadelphia Register, even if significant for its typicality more than for its distinct uniqueness.
  - Ms. Milroy asked Mr. Cohen for clarification on his reason for supporting Criterion J, questioning whether the reason is because the property preserves the spatial characteristics of Germantown Avenue rather than specifically for the Detweiler family.
  - Mr. Cohen affirmed that his support is due to the developmental history and spatial relationships of the property.
- Ms. Milroy stated that the nomination lacked an argument for why the Detweilers were different from their neighbors. She stated that the significance of the property is due to the preservation of the spatial relationships along Germantown Avenue.
- Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Detweilers, while neither denigrating nor lionizing them, could be used to show a pattern of development in Chestnut Hill that is distinct from the summer resort that transitioned into wealthy suburb. She contended that the Detweilers have a place in that history that satisfies Criterion J, without assigning any specific importance to them.
- Mr. Baum requested clarification on the difference between Criteria A and J.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that for a property to satisfy Criterion A, it must have significance to the city as a whole and not just a section of the city. A building qualifies for Criterion J, she continued, when its history is more locally significant. She explained that there is no hierarchy and that one criterion is not better than another. She then explained that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over private interiors and that designation would apply only to the exterior of the building. She added that there is a large latitude in what changes can be approved at the exterior and that the Commission is guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
  - Ms. Barucco added that the Historical Commission may also approve exterior modifications and that buildings do not need to retain their appearance at the time of designation.
- Mr. Cohen questioned the basis for the c. 1885 date attributed to the building. He added that the date is late for that form.

- Ms. Lambert answered that the date is in the inventory from the Chestnut Hill Historic District National Register nomination.
- Mr. Cohen responded that the same design could be found in buildings from the 1840s and 1850s.
- Ms. Salganicoff added that the property is not shown in the 1885 Hopkins atlas but is shown in the 1889 Bromley atlas. She further noted that it was located between two Detweiler houses, which are both eighteenth-century buildings, and that all three are listed as significant on the National Register. She added that both eighteenth-century buildings are already individually listed on the Philadelphia Register.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that it is possible that the building was missed on the 1885 map.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination dates the building's construction to 1885 to 1889.
- The building was constructed by two female members of the Detweiler family, the same family that owned the two adjacent eighteenth-century buildings.
- The property is located along Germantown Avenue, a historic and important thoroughfare in Northwest Philadelphia that evolved into a wealthy suburb within the city.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Detweiler family owned 8224 Germantown Avenue and the two adjacent properties; however, the history of the family does not contribute significance to the city as a whole. The nomination fails to satisfy Criterion A.
- The property contributes to the streetscape but does not stand out as an established and familiar visual feature and does not satisfy Criterion H.
- The building serves as a strong example of the ways in which Germantown Avenue evolved socially and architecturally and preserves the spatial characteristics of the historic street, satisfying Criterion J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 8224 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

| <b>ITEM: 8224 Germantown Ave.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criterion J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cohen</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Barucco</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                               |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                   | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                       |     |    |         |        | X      |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                              | 4   |    |         |        | 1      |

Mr. Lavery joined the meeting at 10:22 a.m.

**ADDRESS: 318 E DURHAM ST**

Name of Resource: 318 E Durham Street

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Sedgwick House, LP

Nominator: East Durham Street Neighbors

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, [meredith.keller@phila.gov](mailto:meredith.keller@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 318 E. Durham Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the subject property is closely associated with Aston S. Tourison, an important developer of the Sedgwick Farms neighborhood in East Mt. Airy. It also suggests that the land's prior association with Henry Lehnert, a well-respected maker of musical instruments, and Louis Grossman, "renowned in the field of medical science," also support the subject property's significance under Criterion A. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that the subject property "records the beginning of the development in East Mt. Airy...built along the Reading Railroad commuter train line at the turn of the 19th century." Under Criterion E, G and J, the nomination suggests that Tourison's business, Ye Old Sedgwick Farms Company, was responsible for constructing most of the houses that still remain on the 300 and 500 blocks of E. Durham Street. The nomination argues that Tourison was a pioneer in residential development in East Mt. Airy who designed in a wide range of architectural styles across a wide range of home prices. Under Criterion H, the nomination describes the subject property as an established and familiar feature to the current residents of both the block and the surrounding streets, many of whom "consider [it] an asset to the legacy, social fabric, design, and character of this community-oriented walking neighborhood."

Tourison is unquestionably an important figure in the history and development of Mt. Airy, but this building's connection to Tourison does not bestow architectural or historical significance on the building. The fact that Tourison renovated this building does not qualify it for historic designation. Tourison constructed and renovated hundreds of buildings in northwest Philadelphia. This particular building does not illuminate Tourison's body of work. The

connections to former owners likewise lack the significance required for designation. Moreover, this building fails to evidence the development of East Mt. Airy; the planned developments like Sedgwick Farms are certainly worthy of designation, but this building is not. Finally, this small building cannot be considered an established and familiar visual feature; it is not large, tall, or located in a prominent place. The staff questions the identification of this building on the 1901 Bromley map and contends that the yellow spot on the map that is interpreted as this building is nothing more than a smudge. The spot is the wrong size and shape, is in the wrong location, is not outlined in black like other wood-frame buildings on the map, and does not appear on the 1910 Bromley map. The building does not merit historic designation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 318 E. Durham Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, E, G, H or J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:53:00

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Kelly and Paula O'Day represented the nomination.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco, owner Jerald Slipakoff, and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. O'Day stated that the owner's response provided a more accurate date of construction of 1896, adding that it was a stableman's residence and attached stable. He contended that the property aligns with the philosophy of retaining and rehabilitating existing structures, which was practiced in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Tourison, he continued, worked on at least eight stable projects in which he rebuilt the structures. He argued that the block of Durham Street falls within what the Planning Commission's 2035 Comprehensive Plan deemed "Sedgwick Farms B." The nomination, he continued, used the term "anchor house" to make clear that the property at 318 E. Durham Street was the first documented Tourison project east of the Reading Railroad, which was constructed in 1854. He noted that the Sedgwick Farms development occurred later. He contended that four notable individuals were involved with the property, adding that he does not want to claim that they resided in the building. One of those individuals, he continued, was Major Gravell, who did reside at the property, according to the 1930 and 1940 censuses.
- Ms. O'Day claimed that there were several erroneous statements in the staff overview and contended that the property owner's report offers factual support to the nomination's assertions.
- Mr. DeMarco directed the Committee to the first page of the nomination, which is a "statement of urgency." He added that the staff's language is unusually strong against the nomination. He stated that the nominator admitted that this is a response to ongoing development plans, which have been pending for a number of years, adding that there is intense opposition to the development in the neighborhood. He asked the Committee to be cautious, stating that the Commission's power is not unfettered and further arguing that the property owner had significant rights under the Pennsylvania and U.S. Constitutions. While it is legal for the Historical

Commission to designate properties, he stated that he believed it would be an abuse by the Commission to designate this property. He noted that the nomination was submitted while an appeal for the demolition of the property was pending before the Court of Common Pleas. He then argued that the property is in poor condition and has been altered over the years.

- Mr. Slipakoff affirmed Mr. DeMarco's comments.
- Ms. Cooperman clarified that the Committee does not consider pending development plans and that the Committee provides a recommendation to the Historical Commission based on its experience and expertise.
- Mr. Thomas noted that the staff recommended that the nomination does not satisfy any Criteria for Designation. He added that he agrees with their reasons and conclusions. He commented that the property is not significant to the development of the region. The original building, he continued, was a wood frame structure and the building is currently stucco over brick. He explained that the individuals identified as significant in the nomination either did not reside at the property or were not significant enough to satisfy Criterion A. He elaborated that Mt. Airy developed with the Gowen properties and Frank Mauran prior to 1900 and that the property at 318 E. Durham Street did not contribute to those developments. He further noted that Tourison was listed as a builder or carpenter, but not a developer, in 1900. He argued that the Durham Street property is not an early work of Tourison's, adding that he had worked as a builder for nearly 30 years. He clarified that the property is not an early or unsophisticated building and called it a minor work of Tourison's, adding that it is not characteristic of Tourison's better known work. He argued that the property does not meet Criteria C, D, or G and is sandwiched between a group of eight 1960s garden apartments.
- Ms. Milroy requested more information about the scrapbook photographs, observing that the inscription is truncated. She asked whether the scrapbook resides at the Germantown Historical Society.
  - Mr. O'Day replied that he was provided with a copy of the scrapbook, noting that it came from Tourison's grandson's files furnished to the Historical Society.
  - Mr. Duffin clarified that his pencil marks are on the photograph and that it appeared that the document was a photocopy of a photograph lent by the Eddleman family. He elaborated that he is unsure whether the Historical Society's document has further inscriptions.
  - Mr. DeMarco confirmed that no further information exists on the document.
- Mr. DeMarco stated that the fact that the building is an example of adaptive reuse does not qualify it for historic designation. Properties, he continued, are adaptively reused throughout Philadelphia and are more representative of historic fabric than this one.
- Mr. Thomas stated that, in looking at the scrapbook page, the image shows a board and batten building, explaining that it had a vertical skin over a wood frame. At the site, he continued, he discovered that the building is brick with stucco and a basement. He contended that the stable is gone and what is described as a remodeling is not a remodeling. He asserted that the current building was constructed around 1916 and is not part of Sedgwick Farms. He argued it is a minor placeholder while Tourison decided what to do with the block.
- Mr. Cohen asked to consider each Criterion to see which, if any, the property satisfies. He stated that he did not feel that any argument was made for Criterion A.

- In terms of Criterion C, Mr. Cohen contended that he did not believe the building was a significant reflection of a style. He questioned whether the property satisfied Criterion E based on its association with Tourison and asked that the Committee discuss that criterion separately. He then stated that the property stands surrounded by an apartment complex but that it is not part of a square, park, or other distinctive area that would qualify it for designation under Criterion G. He questioned whether the property could satisfy Criterion H as a distinguished and familiar visual feature. Under Criterion J, he stated that it could be responsive to the argument that it is a renovation of a historic property. He added that this is a minor scale building, though this criterion could be the strongest for designation.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that Criterion E relates to the significance of a designer rather than a builder.
    - Mr. Cohen questioned whether a designer and builder are intended to be the same.
    - Ms. Cooperman contended that the designer would be recognized for his or her general work rather than one particular building.
  - Mr. Cohen commented that the building stands out against the apartment buildings and seems to be a unique reminder of the history of that block, though he added that it may not be significant enough to function as an established and familiar visual feature under Criterion H.
  - Ms. Cooperman asserted that adaptive reuse in this part of the city is distinctive from general adaptive reuse that happens elsewhere. She contended that there is a pattern of adaptive reuse by George Woodward, arguing that the practice was prevalent in Chestnut Hill and Mt. Airy and was an important component of Woodward's work. She stated that, for the property to satisfy Criterion J for its significance as a reuse project, the Committee would need to make clear how this pattern is distinctive. She argued that the adaptive reuse of historic early eighteenth-century buildings by incorporating them into the fabric of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century buildings is distinctive in Northwest Philadelphia. She contended that it seemed to be a significant choice to reuse rather than demolish those early buildings.
  - Ms. Milroy observed that there is no documentation in the nomination that the reuse was done by Tourison. She stated that it seems based on the attribution that the Germantown Historical Society librarian wrote on the photocopied document.
    - Ms. Cooperman responded that if the significance is based on the pattern of reuse rather than Tourison's association, then it would not matter.
  - On page 15 of the nomination, Ms. Milroy noted that the nomination states that Tourison built 318 E. Durham Street on the site of a former barn as a single-family detached home. She commented that she infers from that statement that the property was not a reuse project but was new construction. In the chronology, she continued, the nomination states that the building was constructed for Amelia Lehnert who died in 1893. She asked that some facts be clarified.
  - Ms. Cooperman remarked that the Committee can formulate an opinion that the nomination does not provide enough information to forward a recommendation for designation under any of the criteria.
    - Mr. Cohen stated that the recommendation needs to be made on the merits of the nomination, having nothing to do with whether it was born out of a zoning issue.

- Ms. Barucco lauded the nominators for their efforts, adding that she is challenged by this nomination. The Committee is having difficulty talking through it, she continued, because the nomination is not offering full opportunity for the Committee to support it. She stated that she is disappointed by that fact, adding that she is not suggesting that the building does not merit designation. Additional arguments, she continued, could be further developed and presented to Historical Commission. She added that the neighbors clearly view this building as contributing to the character of the neighborhood.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned whether the Committee must provide a recommendation.
  - Mr. Reuter stated that there have been several instances in the past when the Committee has not made a recommendation. Under the rules, he continued, the Committee does typically make one, adding that theoretically there should be a motion by the Historical Commission to adopt the Committee's recommendation. He concluded that it is not problematic for the Committee to choose not to make a recommendation.
- Mr. Cohen stated that uncertainty remains over whether this is a reuse of an existing building or an entirely new building and whether Tourison was involved in the design of the building. He asked that those issues be clarified, though he acknowledged that the property is not the best representation of Tourison's work. He opined that Criterion H is the next most compelling possibility for the property's designation. He added that Criterion J tells the story of this place and is a key to understanding the changes to the neighborhood in the twentieth century.
- Ms. Milroy questioned who paid for the building to be produced and who lived in the building, adding that it is a very modest building that remains standing in a neighborhood that would develop very different kinds of buildings. She suggested that the nominator find more information to answer those questions.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that there is a distinction between the fact that there is not enough information before the Committee to recommend the property be designated under any criteria and not recommending the property for designation because it is not worthy. She argued that the Committee does not have the facts to articulate what criteria are relevant.
  - Mr. Cohen contended that the facts would only inform them of Criterion E, which is not a strong argument regardless. He suggested that the question is whether the property satisfies Criteria H and J, adding that those are not subject to additional information.
- Ms. Chantry read Section 5.10.b regarding the review of nominations by the Committee, noting that the Committee may return a deficient nomination to the nominator for revision and resubmission if it determines the resource to be eligible for designation and the nomination does not satisfy any Criteria for Designation.
- Mr. Laverty suggested that they follow the Rules and Regulations and return the nomination to the nominator for revision in hopes that more information can be uncovered to link the property to Tourison or another designer. He contended that the other criteria are nebulous. He clarified that, if returned, the Committee would not be suggesting that the property has no historic value but that the arguments in the nomination are not made strongly enough.
- Mr. Reuter explained that the regulation is more informative than regulatory and that returning the nomination to the nominator is a de facto denial of the nomination. Any

nomination that fails can be resubmitted, he added, though a failed nomination cannot be held onto indefinitely to allow nominators to keep returning and trying again. He elaborated that if the information presented fails to demonstrate that a property should be designated, then the regulation is simply adding that the nominator should attempt to find additional information for the future. Under this scenario, he continued, the nomination would be denied.

- Ms. Barucco asked whether following this procedure would remove the property from the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.
- Mr. Reuter affirmed that if the Historical Commission adopts that recommendation, then the property would be removed from the Commission's jurisdiction unless and until another nomination is submitted and notice is sent to the property owner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property was historically associated with the larger property of 7131 Sprague Street and functioned as either a stable or barn.
- The nomination argues that the property is significant for its association with Ashton Tourison, Henry Lehnert, Louis Grossman, and Major Gravel.
- The nomination suggests that the building serves as the "anchor house" that galvanized development in East Mt. Airy.
- The nomination contends that the building serves as an early example of an adaptive reuse project by prolific developer Ashton Tourison in 1901.
- The nomination asserts that the building serves as a familiar and established visual feature to the neighborhood.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination's contention that the property is associated with significant individuals in the past is unfounded. Most of those individuals owned the property but did not reside at it. The nomination does not satisfy Criterion A.
- The building is not a strong representation of any particular architectural style. The nomination fails to satisfy Criterion C.
- The nomination's assertion that Ashton Tourison adaptively reused an existing structure and converted it into the current residence lacks complete documentation. The nomination does not satisfy Criterion E.
- The nomination fails to make any assertion that the property is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area and does not satisfy Criterion G.
- The nomination's argument that the building serves as a familiar and established visual feature is weak. The property is small relative to its surroundings and is not a prominent visual feature along the streetscape. The nomination does not satisfy Criterion H.
- The nomination contends that the property holds historic importance for its reuse of an earlier building. Documentation provided by the owner suggests that the building was not adaptively reused and was instead replaced. The nomination does not provide sufficient information to support Criterion J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 318 E. Durham Street satisfies any Criteria for Designation.

| <b>ITEM: 318 E. Durham St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Nomination fails to demonstrate satisfaction of any Criteria for Designation</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Lavery</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Milroy</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                                                                   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                                                                       | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                                                                                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                                                                             |     |    | X       |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                                                                           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                                                                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                                                                                  | 4   |    | 1       |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 1010 S 10TH ST**

Name of Resource: First Italian Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Trustees of the Presbytery of Philadelphia

Nominator: Bella Vista Neighbors Association

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1010 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former First Italian Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the church has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation, as a physical example of the social outreach efforts of the Presbytery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the influx of Italian immigrants arriving in America. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the church was designed in 1908 by Charles W. Bolton & Son, a prolific family enterprise in Philadelphia in the early twentieth century that specialized in ecclesiastical design and whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as a purpose-built church to serve the Italian immigrant population that had settled in the Little Italy neighborhood of South Philadelphia.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1010 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:00:15

**PRESENTERS:**

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

- Scott Welden, chair of the Bella Vista Neighbors Association (BVNA) Preservation Committee, represented the nomination on behalf of BVNA member Ralph Marano.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Welden read a letter of support for the designation of the property.
- Ms. Barucco commented that she is familiar with the building through an architecture studio on adaptive reuse that she taught. She supported the nomination and observed that the church has an interesting history.
- Mr. Cohen commented that it is a remarkable building designed by a significant architectural firm. He applauded the nominator. He opined that Criterion A is not applicable because the significance is better tied to the community rather than the nation.
- The Committee discussed the potential addition of Criterion D and the common use of the auditorium plan in Presbyterian churches. The Committee agreed that Criterion D is not part of the narrative and does not need to be added as part of the significance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Celeste Morello commented that the building is altered.
- David Traub supported the nomination and suggested the inclusion of additional Criteria for Designation.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The former First Italian Presbyterian Church, now Christ Presbyterian Church, was designed by Charles W. Bolton & Son in 1908 to serve the Italian immigrant population of South Philadelphia.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The church was designed by Charles W. Bolton & Son, a prolific family enterprise in Philadelphia in the early twentieth century that specialized in ecclesiastical design and whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, satisfying Criterion E.
- The property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the community, as a purpose-built church to serve the Italian immigrant population that had settled in the Little Italy neighborhood of South Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.
- The property does not satisfy Criterion A, as having significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation, as a physical example of the social outreach efforts of the Presbytery in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the influx of Italian immigrants arriving in America.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1010 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E and J, but not Criterion A.

| <b>ITEM: 1010 S. 10th St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria E and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cohen</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Barucco</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                    | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                     | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                               | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 5706 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: The John S. Trower Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Sung Choel Kim

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia and Germantown United CDC

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5706 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the building is associated with the life of a person significant in the past, successful caterer, businessman, philanthropist, real estate investor, and restaurateur John S. Trower, a Black man who achieved local, statewide, and national significance in American history. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the building stands as an important monument to the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of Trower's significant catering and restaurant business that predominated in the Black community in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Germantown and Philadelphia. The period of significance begins when the property was acquired by John S. Trower in 1887 and ends with his passing in 1911.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5706 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:13:25**

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Cooperman voiced support for the history provided about Black caterers in Philadelphia.
- Ms. Milroy commented that the nomination provided a fascinating history.

- Mr. Cohen supported the nomination but commented that the nomination needed to be better proofread by the nominator.
- Ms. Barucco supported the nomination and commented that she was involved in the restoration of the mansard roof.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- James Lyons, great-grandson of John S. Trower, supported the nomination. Mr. Lyons provided additional information about Trower's significance. He commented that Mr. Trower lived on the top floor of the subject building.
- Susan Comninel, great-granddaughter of John S. Trower, supported the nomination. Ms. Comninel provided additional information about Trower's significance and how he contributed to his community.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property at 5706 Germantown Avenue was purchased by John S. Trower in 1887, and he used the property for his catering business and residence.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building is associated with the life of a person significant in the past, successful caterer, businessman, philanthropist, real estate investor, and restaurateur John S. Trower, a Black man who achieved local, statewide, and national significance in American history, satisfying Criterion A.
- The building stands as an important monument to the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of Trower's significant catering and restaurant business that predominated in the Black community in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Germantown and Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5706 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

| <b>ITEM: 5706 Germantown Ave.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Milroy</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                    |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                                  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                            | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                                   | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 340 GATES ST**

Name of Resource: The Lamon House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Denise Lehmann

Nominator: Ridge Park Civic Association

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, [kim.chantry@phila.gov](mailto:kim.chantry@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 340 Gates Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the residence, constructed between 1906 and 1910, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the residence reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Second Empire style, specifically in northwest Philadelphia. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of a late vernacular Second Empire style.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff acknowledges that the building at 340 Gates Street is a Second Empire-style building but questions whether it is a sufficiently noteworthy example of the style to qualify for individual designation based on stylistic reasons alone.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 02:26:05

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Marlene Schleifer, of the Ridge Park Civic Association, represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Schleifer spoke on behalf of Oscar Beisert, who authored the nomination. She stated that Mr. Beisert maintains that the property is a highly intact vernacular example of the Second Empire style as it influenced the architecture of the city in the early twentieth century. She stated that Ridge Park Civic Association is sponsoring a small historic district which will include all of the 300 block of Gates Street. She stated that this property was nominated individually because it is threatened. She suggested that the property could satisfy Criterion H because it is highly visible.
- Mr. Cohen noted the amount of community support for the designation.
- Mr. Cohen observed that this building is very late for the Second Empire style, but it is characteristic of the Roxborough area.
  - Mr. Lavery noted that in a suburban area, the mansard roof was a relatively inexpensive way to give extra space and style for a middle-class clientele.
- Ms. Cooperman noted the stone wall which contributes to the street presence.
- Mr. Cohen opined that the Criteria for Designation do not really make a place for a type as opposed to a style. He suggested that Criterion J is applicable because it relates to a neighborhood or community.
- Ms. Milroy commented that the nomination uses the term “Second Empire” frequently but never actually defines it.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that this is about a certain building type with certain features, one of which is the mansard roof. It is a suburban house type that has a specific relationship to its lot in the way the lot is landscaped and includes important features such as the stone wall.

- Ms. Milroy commented that the term “style” is being used writ large in this case, and that the Committee is not sticking to the narrow Second Empire definition.
  - Ms. Cooperman commented that the building represents a style that is recognizable in the vernacular sense.
  - Ms. Barucco agreed, and commented that this property was meant to stand out from the rest.
  - Mr. Cohen suggested the omission of the term vernacular, and opined that this building was meant to impress.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Cheryl Feldman, chair of the Preservation Committee of the Ridge Park Civic Association, supported the nomination.
- Celeste Morello commented that she does not know where Gates Street is located, but that she authored a nomination for a property on a different street and hopes to have the support of the Civic Association.
- Neighbor Tina Krovetz supported the nomination.
- Neighbor Mandy Doty supported the nomination.
- Neighbor Teri Anger supported the nomination.
- Neighbor Nathan Doty supported the nomination.
- Neighbor John Dever supported the nomination.
- Neighbor Lois Price supported the nomination.
- Neighbor Addison Geary supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building was constructed between 1906 and 1910 on a highly visible corner lot in Roxborough.
- The nomination addresses Criteria C and D, but Criterion J is also applicable.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The residence reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Second Empire style, specifically in northwest Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of a late Second Empire style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the 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 340 Gates Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

| <b>ITEM: 340 Gates St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C, D, and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cohen</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Milroy</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                    | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                     | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Laverty                                                                                                                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                               | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 1946 N 23RD ST**

Name of Resource: Pearl Bailey House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: William Sharrock

Nominator: Historical Commission staff

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1946 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the building, constructed in 1882 as part of a larger speculative development project by architect Willis G. Hale, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property is socially and culturally significant as the family home of actress and singer Pearl Bailey, who described it in her autobiography as the house “where [her] career started.” Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the property is significant as the work of Willis G. Hale, one of Philadelphia’s most important late nineteenth-century architects, whose work influenced the development of the city, and in particular North Philadelphia, in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. With its intricate brickwork, flamboyant window hoods, and projecting balconettes, the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of Hale’s unusual Victorian eclectic style as applied to speculative rowhouse design, satisfying Criterion D.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1946 N 23<sup>rd</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:51:15**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff had not heard from the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Laverty opined that it is surprising how many original details of the building exist, particularly the brackets and flower boxes.
- Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination is a “double win.” It is significant for its association with Pearl Bailey, and also as the work of Willis Hale. He noted that Hale came up with different eye-catching distinctions from block to block within the context of the nineteenth-century expansion of North Philadelphia. He noted that the design of this building is one of Hale’s most distinguished forms.
- Mr. Cohen noted he was pleased to see the *Record of Growth* publication that identified Hale as the architect of this development, along with numerous other projects in North Philadelphia.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the nomination. He noted that they had fairly recently featured the property in their publication *Extant* as worthy of preservation.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society of Philadelphia supported the nomination. He noted that he was recently at a small community meeting in North Philadelphia near the property with some local historians led by Judith Robinson, and they discussed the Pearl Bailey House. He explained that one of the attendees told a story of how, when she was a young girl, she and friends used to stand across from the house and wait all day to see Pearl Bailey come out. He opined that this anecdote shows what the house meant to the community.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the designation of the property for its significant architecture and as the work of an important architect.
- Deborah Gary supported the nomination. She noted that she is one of the co-founders of the Society to Preserve Philadelphia African American History, so she is trying to keep up with what is left representing the significant contributions of Philadelphia’s African American community.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building at 1946 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street was constructed in 1882 as part of a larger speculative development project by architect Willis G. Hale for developer William Singerly.
- Singer and actress Pearl Bailey lived in the house with her family during the 1930s and 1940s, when her career started, and continued to visit her mother there until her death in 1969.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property is socially and culturally significant as the family home of actress and singer Pearl Bailey, a person significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A.
- The property is the work of Willis G. Hale, one of Philadelphia’s most important late nineteenth-century architects, whose work influenced the development of the city, and in particular North Philadelphia, in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, satisfying Criterion E.
- The property embodies distinguishing characteristics of Hale’s unusual Victorian eclectic style as applied to speculative rowhouse design, satisfying Criterion D.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1946 N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E.

| <b>ITEM: 1946 N. 23rd St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, D, and E</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cohen</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Lavery</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                   |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                       | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                                  | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 7600 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: St. Martin's Coal Company Office

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: John Mascaro

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 7600 Germantown Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former St. Martin's Coal Company office, designed by John T. Windrim in 1916, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the one-story office building is reflective of an era characterized by the Colonial Revival style as applied to commercial and office buildings in the larger Mt. Airy neighborhood and throughout Philadelphia. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the building possesses distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style, including its Classical entryway, fanlight transom, six-over-six wood windows. Under Criterion J, the nomination asserts that the one-story office building is of a form and type that represents the cultural, economic, and social history of individual neighborhoods and the larger City of Philadelphia.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7600 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, but that the argument for the satisfaction of Criterion J is incomplete. The discussion of Criterion J provides examples of other office buildings without explaining how this or the other offices exemplify the heritage of the community.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:59:23**

**PRESENTERS:**

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

- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff had not heard from the property owner.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Cooperman noted that St. Martin's was a creation of developer George Woodward, who made it the name of his estate. If he was associated with it, it was called St. Martin's. She explained that it makes sense for the coal company to capitalize on the George Woodward aura.
- Mr. Cohen opined that the building was not a folly or small operation; in fact it had a big back of the house operation along the tracks separated from the clean, genteel office, that did not need to be large. He commented that the entrance to the building is actually quite grand and distinguishes it from a residential building. He opined that the building is of a type. It is an office building where the automobile meets the railroad.
- Ms. Milroy opined that the nomination clearly satisfies Criteria C and D. She noted that the nomination makes the point that this is something. As soon as one sees this building, it is clear where in the city they are. It fits the Germantown/Chestnut Hill aesthetic.
- Mr. Cohen noted that the images should be keyed better. He opined that the image grids are annoying.
- Ms. Cooperman opined that it is a great big little building. With the pergola, she noted, it might be a gas station or a garden building.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned whether Criterion E should have been included as the work of J.T. Windrim.
  - Mr. Cohen questioned whether the case for Windrim is made in the nomination.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded that the significance of Windrim is well known.
  - Ms. Milroy asked whether Windrim designed any other similar buildings.
  - Mr. Cohen responded affirmatively, noting that Windrim designed other small offices closer to the city.
  - Mr. Lavery agreed, noting that Windrim designed numerous offices for the pedestrian customer.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Jim Duffin commented that the building is reflective of the Colonial Revival style and the clientele that the coal company was wishing to serve, and the fact that it was capitalizing on the St. Martin's name in Chestnut Hill. The coal company was trying to fit into that period of development by using the name but also by designing a high style building for a simple office.

#### **COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property at 7600 Germantown Avenue was constructed in 1916 on a design by John T. Windrim for the St. Martin's Coal Company.
- The name St. Martin's was used many times by developer George Woodward in the Chestnut Hill area during this period.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building at 7600 Germantown Avenue is reflective of an era characterized by the Colonial Revival style, as applied to commercial and office buildings in the larger Mt. Airy and Chestnut Hill neighborhoods of northwest Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion C.
- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building is the work of renowned local architect John T. Windrim, satisfying Criterion E.
- The one-story office building is of a form and type that represents the cultural, economic, and social history of individual neighborhoods throughout the city, and was designed in such a way as to reflect and capitalize on the St. Martin's name popularized by George Woodward in northwest Philadelphia during the early twentieth century, satisfying Criterion J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7600 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

| <b>ITEM: 7600 Germantown Ave.</b>            |     |    |         |        |        |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| <b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C, D, E, J</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>MOVED BY: Milroy</b>                      |     |    |         |        |        |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Cohen</b>                    |     |    |         |        |        |
| VOTE                                         |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                             | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Laverty                                | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                        | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 3615-35 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Ralston House

Proposed Action: Amend boundary

Property Owner: Ralston House

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, [jon.farnham@phila.gov](mailto:jon.farnham@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to amend the boundary of the designation of Ralston House at 3615-35 Chestnut Street, removing the area that includes the surface parking lot at the western edge of the site. The property includes a U-shaped historic building with frontages on Chestnut and Ludlow Streets, a lawn between the building and Chestnut Street, and a parking lot at the west accessed from Ludlow. The site plan submitted by the applicant proposes the removal of an 84 foot wide piece of land running from Chestnut Street to Ludlow Street. Most of the land proposed for removal was not historically associated with the designated property and some it is not currently designated.

The Historical Commission designated the Ralston Center on 23 February 1971. The meeting minutes list the property as “3615 Chestnut Street, Indigent Widows and Singlewomen’s Home.”

In 1884, the Indigent Widows and Single Women’s Society purchased parcels 017S07-0014, 0016, 0017, 0018, 0019, and 0062, all 50 feet wide on Chestnut Street and 0015 on Ludlow Street at the rear of 0014. The historic parcel was 300 feet wide on Chestnut and Ludlow.

In 1955, Ralston House purchased the property with the twin house at 3635 Chestnut Street, parcel 017S07-0020, and incorporated it into the larger lot. On 18 April 1990, the Historical Commission reviewed a demolition permit application for the house and determined that the house at 3635 Chestnut Street was not designated and it therefore had no jurisdiction over it. The house was subsequently demolished. It is clear from the 1990 decision that the Historical Commission determined that it did not have jurisdiction over what was 3635 Chestnut Street, parcel 017S07-0020, which corresponds to the southern three-fourths of the surface parking lot. Moreover, the northern section of the surface parking lot was historically unrelated to the Ralston House property. The northern section of the parking lot was the rears of three separate properties, where a fire station and other buildings stood facing 37th Street. It is unclear when Ralston House acquired the rears of the lots facing 37th Street, but it is clear that that northern section of the parking lot is not currently considered part of the 3615-35 Chestnut Street tax parcel and therefore is not considered designated at this time.

In addition to the lot line changes at the west, the lot lines at the east, at the opposite end of the property, were redrawn in 1986, removing most of 017S07-0014 and 0015 from the eastern edge of the Ralston House property. The new building that was constructed to the east was not reviewed by the Historical Commission.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the proposed amendment to the boundary of the designation of 3615-35 Chestnut Street, provided that an adequate buffer is maintained between the historic building and new property line at the west, because almost all of the land to be excluded from the designation was not historically associated with Ralston House, is currently used as a surface parking lot, and has no known historical significance.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:13:36**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Attorney Michael Phillips and Lynette Killen, the executive director of Ralston Center, represented the application.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Milroy and Ms. Barucco stated that the proposed buffer between the historic building and the new boundary line is not sufficient.
  - Ms. Cooperman suggested that they let the property owner’s attorney speak before getting into the merits of the request.
- Mr. Phillips stated that his client would like to remove the parking lot from the designated area. He stated that there are no immediate plans to develop the area. Ralston House will seek opportunities for redevelopment to help fund the maintenance of the historic site. He noted that the lot lines have been reconfigured at this site several times. He noted that the house at the western edge of the site that was demolished was not designated and the Historical Commission has already

- determined that that section of the site is not under its jurisdiction. He stated that they have no plans to alter Ralston House itself. He noted that they could shift the proposed boundary line slightly to the west, if the Committee made such a request.
- Ms. Cooperman asked why classifying the parking lot as non-contributing would not be a better alternative.
    - Mr. Phillips responded that they plan to subdivide the lots at some point in the future.
  - Ms. Milroy asked about an acceptable buffer. She said that the proposed line is very close to the northwest corner of the building.
    - Mr. Phillips stated that any new building would not connect to the historic building, but would be separated from the historic building.
  - Ms. DiPasquale provided measurements of the historic lot and the section proposed to be removed.
  - Ms. Cooperman stated that the Committee does not need to provide an exact measurement for the buffer, but can provide some general guidance to the Historical Commission.
  - Ms. Barucco stated that the paved area could be removed, but the area to the east should be retained within the designation.
  - Ms. Cooperman stated that some open space should be retained at the west.
  - Ms. Barucco thanked Mr. Phillips for addressing this matter in advance, rather than after the subdivision was undertaken.
  - Mr. Cohen stated that the Historical Commission should retain as much control as possible.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- On 18 April 1990, the Historical Commission determined that it did not have jurisdiction over the lot at 3635 Chestnut Street, parcel 017S07-0020, which corresponds to the southern three-fourths of the surface parking lot.
- The northern section of the surface parking lot was historically unrelated to the Ralston House property; it was the rears of three separate properties, where a fire station and other buildings stood facing 37th Street.
- The surface parking lot has no known historical significance.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The surface parking lot may be removed from the designation, but a buffer should be maintained between the western edge of the historic building and the western boundary line of the designated area.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission amend the boundary of the property at 3615-35 Chestnut Street, shifting the western boundary of the designated area to the eastern edge of the paved area of the parking lot, thereby retaining a buffer between the western façade of the historic building and the western boundary line.

| <b>ITEM: 3615-35 Chestnut St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Amend boundary</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Milroy</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Barucco</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                         |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                             | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                 | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                        | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 714 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: Henry A. Dreer Seed Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Herbert Richman

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 714 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth of Nation, being the headquarters for the Henry A. Dreer Seed Company between 1863 and 1924, a leader in the development of horticulture in Philadelphia, the surrounding region, and nationally during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Under Criterion J, the nomination contends that the property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community, with Philadelphia being recognized as “the oldest and perhaps the foremost seed market in America.”

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 714 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:33:48**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia and Kevin McMahon represented the nomination.
- Jeffrey Richman, Herbert Richman, and Barbara Richman represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Jeffrey Richman, the owner’s son, explained that his father Herbert Richman worked on the 700 block of Chestnut for about 40 years and the property has been in their

family for about 45 years. Mr. Richmond stated they have been good stewards of the property. He said that he does not believe Criteria A and J apply to this property and noted that Henry A. Dreer is not a known historical figure. He strongly opposes the arguments for designation outlined in the nomination. Mr. Richmond also pointed out that this building and other buildings on the block have been altered over time. He is opposed to the historic designation of the property.

- Ms. Richmond stated she is opposed to having the property designated. She does not believe Henry A. Dreer was an important historical figure or the relevance of the seed industry as the city is not known for this. Ms. Richmond said the historical designation is not necessary and urges the Committee to recommend against it. She noted that she is concerned that a designation will not allow any future development or changes to the property.
- Mr. McMahon said that the seed industry was very important in nineteenth century Philadelphia. He noted the city was the national leader in this industry during most of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Mr. McMahon pointed out that Henry A. Dreer was a major national figure in horticulture during that period.
- Mr. Lavery said that he believes the 700 block of Chestnut Street is one of the most unique and special blocks architecturally and historically in Philadelphia. He added that if a nomination was presented to the Committee to designate the full 700 block as historic, he would immediately vote in favor of that. He explained that it is their job as historians and preservationists to identify and remind people of those who had an impact on their lives, even if they are not commonly recognized. Mr. Lavery noted the importance of this block as the front face of national commerce in the nineteenth century. He argued that just because someone not a household name does not mean they did not have an impact on history.
- Mr. Cohen commented that every building on the 700 block looks different because they were different enterprises. He noted that this was the high retail center of Philadelphia during the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. Mr. Cohen pointed out that the 700 block continues to reflect an era of commercial competition through the variety of architectural styles and forms on the block. He noted this history and architecture continues to be threatened and the Historical Commission is one of the mechanisms to keep it from being eradicated.
- Ms. Milroy commented on the historic integrity of the front façade, especially the pediment and the articulated bay windows. She pointed out that the seed industry in Philadelphia began earlier, around the 1820s, than the 1870s era noted in the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman pointed out that agriculture was the heart of the American economy during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and was the largest sector. She agreed that industry was extremely important in Philadelphia's economy but agriculture was enormously important. Ms. Cooperman said that this building reflects the commercial presence of one of the most important figures, Henry A. Greer, in agriculture and ornamental horticulture in the country. She added that the top tier seed houses were in Philadelphia and it was recognized as a national location for this industry.
  - Ms. Milroy interjected that they also had an international presence through attendance at world fairs and similar venues.
- Ms. Milroy inquired about the floral design in the pediment.
  - Mr. McMahon responded that the clover incorporated in it was a motif or logo used throughout Dreer's company but he does not know about the rest of the design.

- Ms. Barucco commended Mr. McMahon on the quality of the nomination and said that reading it made her eager to learn more about the history of horticultural activities in Philadelphia as it is such an important story.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- Marissa Miller opposed the nomination.
- Gabriel Gottlieb supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building represents the commercial presence of Henry A. Greer, one of the most important figures in agriculture and ornamental horticulture in the country during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. At that time, the top tier seed houses in the country were in Philadelphia and it was recognized as a national location for this industry.
- The building at 714 Chestnut Street and all buildings on the 700 block of Chestnut were the front face of national commerce in the nineteenth century. This building reflects this era of commercial competition through their variety of architectural styles and forms on this block.
- The front façade maintains its historic architectural integrity, especially the floral pediment at the top of the building.
- The nomination is well written and researched.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth of Nation, being the headquarters for the Henry A. Dreer Seed Company between 1863 and 1924, a leader in the development of horticulture in Philadelphia, the surrounding region, and nationally during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, satisfying Criterion A.
- The property exemplifies the cultural, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community, with Philadelphia being recognized as “the oldest and perhaps the foremost seed market in America,” satisfying Criterion J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 714 Chestnut St satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

| <b>ITEM: 714 Chestnut St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A and J</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Cohen</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                    | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                     | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                    | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                               | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 1923 CHESTNUT ST**

Name of Resource: The J.E. Limeburner Co. Store

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1923 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, LP

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, [allyson.mehley@phila.gov](mailto:allyson.mehley@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1923 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination contends that the J.E. Limeburner Co. store, constructed in 1925, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Modern Classical Style and reflects the environment in an era influenced by modernism and classicism. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that the building is the work of the prolific architectural firm Heacock & Hokanson, whose designs significantly influenced the built environment of the Greater Philadelphia region.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1923 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:15:40**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Tim Kerner of the Center City Residents' Association represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Ms. Mehley read owner Glenn Krotick's statement into the record.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Cooperman said she was pleased to see the discussion of the context of Neoclassicism versus Modernism in the nomination. She commented that it was well done. Ms. Cooperman said she was also happy to see the history of optics in Philadelphia discussed in this nomination.
- Mr. Lavery said he did not realize this building was the work of the architectural firm of Heacock & Hokanson until he read the nomination. He noted the Philadelphia

Athenaeum has the building drawings in its collection. Mr. Lavery said the “Limeburner” signage over the front door makes it a landmark on its own in terms of the street. He added that he thought this was a good nomination.

- Mr. Cohen stated he agreed with Mr. Lavery’s comments. He explained that the western part of Walnut and Chestnut Streets in the nineteenth century was high end residential. Mr. Cohen continued that then in the early twentieth century there was a massive adaption to commerce. He notes that architect Heacock & Hokanson did a great job on this building, pointing out that they tried to make it both classic and modern. Mr. Cohen said that this must mean what the nominator meant when he referred to this as the “composite era.” He commented that this is not a term that is widely used or recognized. Mr. Cohen said you see this in the way the architects are reducing the detail to make it more severe, a kind of modernism of stone. He pointed out the cable molding on the first-floor façade that surrounds the ground floor entrance. He noted that the molding expressed strength much more effectively with the original opening shown on Figure 15 in the nomination rather than what is there now. Mr. Cohen stated that the nomination is well researched and well done and puts it into a good context of understanding these dynamics within classicism as western Center City was modified in those years between the turn of the century and the Great Depression.
- Ms. Milroy agreed with both her colleagues’ previous comments. She commented on the way this building looks back to the earlier residential history but also forward, as a point that the nominator makes. Ms Milroy also noted that the owner’s written comment refers to the Historical Commission as the Historical Society. She wanted it on the record that he was referring to the Philadelphia Historical Commission and not another organization.
- Ms. Cooperman responded to the owner’s written comment. She stated that the fact that it has not been designated previously is not an indication in any way of its worthiness for the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- Mr. Lavery said that Heacock & Hokanson got their start in the 1890s designing houses suburban houses much the way that Will Price it was doing it in Overbrook and Wayne but not quite that polished. He continued that the firm moved very quickly in adopting the Colonial Revival for their residential and institutional buildings, where the idea was to make the buildings fit in with their neighbors. Mr. Lavery noted that in the city, where owners had limited street frontage, the designer needed to walk the fine line between making the building different from its neighbors but not offending or garish.
  - Ms. Cooperman agreed that the design needed to stand out but not too much.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building successfully communicates that it is both classical and modern in its design.
- The building reflects an era when this section of Chestnut Street was developing as a commercial area and the intention was for the design to stand out rather than blend in with its neighboring buildings.

- The historic signage above the first floor entrance is an important component of its architectural integrity.
- The nomination is well researched and written.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building, constructed in 1925, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Modern Classical Style and reflects the environment in an era influenced by Modernism and Classicism, satisfying C and D.
- The building is the work of the prolific architectural firm Heacock & Hokanson, whose designs significantly influenced the built environment of the Philadelphia region, satisfying Criterion E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1923 Chestnut St satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

| <b>ITEM: 1923 Chestnut St.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C, D, and E</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Cohen</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Milroy</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                    |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                        | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                                  | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                              | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Laverty                                                                                                                           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                                   | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 6500-90 OLD YORK RD**

Name of Resource: The Carmelite Monastery

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Carmelite Convent of Philadelphia

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the chapel building located on the property at 6500-90 Old York Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Under Criteria D and F, the nominator argues that the chapel of the Carmelite Monastery is a highly unique embodiment of the Lombard Romanesque style that is enhanced by the architectural sculpture adorning the structure. Under Criterion E, the nominator argues that the chapel is significant owing to its association with Charles D. Maginnis of Magginis & Walsh, an important architect whose use of architectural sculpture set his career apart from his peers. Finally, under Criterion H, the nominator argues that the chapel has been “a beloved sight in Olney, a visual of solace and peacefulness” since before the commercial and residential development seen today.

The nomination only proposes the designation of the chapel. The nomination neither documents the other structures on the property including those attached to the chapel and the imposing perimeter wall nor suggests that those structures have historical significance or should be classified as contributing to the significance of the site.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the chapel at the property at 6500-90 Old York Road satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, F and H and suggests that the Historical Commission and Committee on Historic Designation make determinations regarding the potential significance of the other structures and appurtenances at the site.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 04:29:55

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Morello explained that she had spoken the day before with Mother Pia, a Carmelite nun, who expressed support for the nomination. Ms. Morello said that Carmelite nuns are limited in their ability to speak to the public so she was not aware who would speak on behalf of the order regarding the nomination. She said that she had informed two attorneys who represent the Carmelite nuns of the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman asked the staff if they had heard from the property owner.
  - Ms. Schmitt responded that the staff had not received any response from the property owner.
- Mr. Lavery commented that he would refer to this section of Philadelphia as Oak Lane rather than Olney. He shared that he had also had the opportunity to speak with Mother Pia on two occasions, and reiterated Ms. Morello's comment about the Carmelite nuns' limitations interacting with the public since they are a cloistered order.
- Mr. Lavery said that through the help of an intermediary, the Athenaeum scanned the original Maginnis & Walsh blueprints the nuns had for the building and provided Mother Pia with digital copies. Mr. Lavery commented that Mother Pia told him that she had been at the Carmelite Monastery since 1968. He asked whether the Committee on Historic Designation might want to consider including the stone perimeter wall as a contributing feature in the nomination, noting that its purpose was both to keep the sisters cloistered per their order, and that it also created a visual landmark for the public where Old York Road crosses Broad Street.
- Ms. Milroy asked Mr. Lavery if the blueprints depicted the chapel only or the entire building complex.
  - Mr. Lavery responded that he would have to check the details but that the blueprints included more than the chapel.
- Ms. Milroy thanked Ms. Morello for another wonderful nomination. She asked whether the importance of this site related only to the chapel or the entire convent as a facility. Ms. Milroy wondered if the entire complex could possibly qualify for Criterion G.
- Ms. Morello stated that Mother Pia had requested that more than the chapel be included in the nomination. Ms. Morello commented that she thought Mother Pia

- would welcome the Committee on Historic Designation's review of more than just the chapel.
- Ms. Morello explained that the walls surrounding a cloister such as this one were regulated by the Vatican or by Canon law, and she had only researched the details in a general way. Ms. Morello confirmed that she had Mother Pia's support to pursue additional research, and Ms. Morello also stated that she would welcome guidance from the Committee on Historic Designation members.
  - Ms. Cooperman told Ms. Morello that she had some concerns about nominating only a part of a building, like the chapel in this instance. Ms. Cooperman pointed out that the chapel is connected to the rest of the complex and it was her understanding that it was part of the same project. She said she was inclined to agree with Ms. Milroy that it made sense to consider this site as an enclave and that the wall surrounding it was an important feature.
  - Ms. Milroy commented that she was curious to know if there were sculptural relief elsewhere on the site. She added that she would have liked to see more discussion about architectural sculpture in the nomination in support of Criterion D. Ms. Milroy stated that it would likely not be difficult to determine the name of the artist behind the architectural sculpture given the prominence of the architects who designed the complex. Ms. Milroy said that, if the nomination was arguing that the sculptural features contributed to the significance of the chapel, it would be helpful to have more information to support that.
    - Ms. Morello responded that she did try to identify sculptor. However, she was unable to find a name.
  - Ms. Milroy asked if Ms. Morello knew where the archives of the Magginis firm were located.
    - Ms. Morello responded that she had tried to access the archives through the Boston Public Library. However, the staff had been uncooperative.
  - Mr. Cohen agreed with Ms. Milroy and added that, if the nominator was going to argue that the architectural sculpture was innovative, they really needed to explain in what way. Mr. Cohen said that several questions that came up for him during his review of the nomination had to do with the twentieth-century rather than the eleventh-century. He said he wanted to know why the cloister was built, by whom, why at this specific site, saying that in order to situate this complex into the context of Philadelphia's history, the nomination needed to answer these questions.
    - Ms. Morello asked Mr. Cohen what about the chapel he thought was lacking from the nomination.
  - Mr. Cohen restated his previous questions about who decided to erect the monastery in this particular place and why, and reiterated that this information was missing for the entire site, not just the chapel. Mr. Cohen asked for confirmation that the use of the word monastery was correct since this was a complex for nuns.
    - Ms. Morello confirmed that Carmelite Monastery was the correct name of the complex.
  - Mr. Cohen said that it was known that Maginnis wrote and spoke frequently about his work, and it would be interesting if the nomination tapped into that.
    - Ms. Morello responded that she did include that information in her nomination and that she had provided photocopies of every source that she could find during the Covid-19 shutdown.
    - Mr. Cohen stated that he was asking for more information.
  - Ms. Cooperman suggested that the Committee on Historic Designation needed to determine two things: Did they want to recommend designation of the entire property

and did they have enough information to recommend the designation of even just the chapel. Ms. Cooperman said that based on the discussion and what she had seen, she believed they had enough information to recommend that the entire property be designated. She asked for other opinions and asked if there were any committee members who believed that the nomination did not present a strong enough argument and should be returned to the nominator for revisions.

- Ms. Morello told Ms. Cooperman that she believed that recommending the entire property be designated would be the answer to Mother Pia's prayers.
- Mr. Laverty said if they were to expand the boundaries to include the perimeter wall and then limit the period of significance to somewhere around 1920 to 1935, then the Committee on Historic Designation could move forward with a recommendation to designate the entire parcel.
- Ms. Barucco commented that she felt the nomination supported the designation of the chapel and the perimeter wall, but there was not enough information in the nomination to include the rest of the complex. She expressed concerns that, in the future, it could be argued that the rest of the complex was nominated without sufficient justification. Ms. Barucco stated that though the whole site was likely worthy of designation, perhaps the nomination needed to be modified in order to support this argument before being reviewed by the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Cooperman reminded Ms. Barucco that in order to modify the nomination, it would need to be returned to the nominator at which point the Historical Commission would lose jurisdiction over exterior alterations.
- Leonard Reuter informed the Committee on Historic Designation that as long as the property description used in the nomination reflected the entire parcel, the members could recommend that the complex be designated if they believed there was enough information to support it. Mr. Reuter requested confirmation about the correct address for the parcel under review just to make sure that the parcels had been officially consolidated in the past and not just combined by the property owner.
- Mr. Reuter confirmed that the layout and dimensions of the perimeter wall did, in fact, follow strict guidelines reflected in Canon law. He pointed out that the designation of these walls was more similar to the designation of the interior of a church rather than the exterior of one because it is the wall that makes this site a monastery.
- Mr. Reuter suggested that one approach the Committee on Historic Designation could take would be to recommend that the full parcel be designated with the chapel as a contributing resource and the rest of the property non-contributing. He said that if more information was produced to support that other structures were also contributing, the Historical Commission could amend the nomination.
- Mr. Laverty and Ms. Cooperman commented that while the public might not be allowed onto the property, the wall, chapel and other buildings could be seen from the street and had a strong public presence.
- Mr. Cohen asked if the committee could table the item for their consideration at a later date. Ms. Cooperman responded that they could recommend this to the Historical Commission. However, the committee could not decide this on their own.
  - Ms. Morello told Mr. Cohen that she had specifically requested an emergency hearing, owing to the sensitivity of this matter, and any delay would create a negative impact for the nuns.
  - Ms. Milroy asked Ms. Morello what the emergency was.
  - Ms. Morello replied that the lawyers had told her there was an emergency but all she knew was that she had the support of the nuns.

- The Committee members responded that they did not understand the emergency.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if others agreed that there was sufficient information to recommend that the perimeter walls be included as contributing and there was agreement among the Committee members.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Carmelite Monastery was designed by renowned architect Charles D. Magginis of Maggins & Walsh and dedicated in 1925.
- The site, including the stone perimeter wall, is an important visual landmark of the neighborhood.
- The site likely possesses significant landscape features in addition to the architectural significance of the chapel.
- Other buildings in the complex, including those connected to the chapel, could likely be considered as contributing should further research be presented to the Historical Commission for its review.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The chapel is a highly unique embodiment of the Lombard Romanesque style, satisfying Criterion D.
- Under Criterion E, the chapel is significant owing to its association with Charles D. Maginnis of Magginis & Walsh, an important architect whose use of architectural sculpture set his career apart from his peers.
- Under Criterion H, the prominent site is an established and familiar visual feature along Old York Road and North Broad Streets.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6500-90 Old York Road satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and H, and that the boundary be defined as extending along 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Old York Road, 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and N. 15<sup>th</sup> Street to include the wall, the entire chapel, and all buildings and landscapes within the walled complex.

| <b>ITEM: 6500-90 Old York Rd.</b><br><b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D, E, and H, with boundary amendment</b><br><b>MOVED BY: Barucco</b><br><b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b> |     |    |         |        |        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| VOTE                                                                                                                                                                     |     |    |         |        |        |
| Committee Member                                                                                                                                                         | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                                                                                                                                   | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco                                                                                                                                                          | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen                                                                                                                                                               | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery                                                                                                                                                             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                                                                                                                                         | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                                                                                                                                                                    | 5   |    |         |        |        |

**ADDRESS: 1517 W GIRARD AVE**

Name of Resource: Pyramid Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: ADIR Holdings LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1517 W. Girard Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the subject property was the home of the Pyramid Club from 1940-1965, and as such possesses “significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of Philadelphia’s black elite, and especially that community’s participation in and contribution to the city’s art world.” Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the renovation done by celebrated architect William Lightfoot Price in 1901 is “historically significant insofar as it helps to further document his career and professional network.”

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1517 W. Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and E.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:11:50**

**PRESENTERS:**

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

**DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Cooperman asked the staff if there had been any contact with the property owner.
  - Ms. Schmitt replied that the staff had not heard from the property owner since sending the required notice.

- Ms. Milroy thanked the Preservation Alliance for submitting a fascinating nomination.
- Ms. Barucco commented that the photographs included in the nomination were extraordinary and it was very lucky to have them.
- Mr. Cohen said that the nomination was extraordinarily well researched, especially the social history of the building.
- Ms. Cooperman asked whether Criterion E could be applied since the work of William Lightfoot Price to the building in 1901 was done at the interior. Mr. Cohen agreed with Ms. Cooperman.
- Mr. Cohen stated that he found an 1875 fire insurance survey of the building that included a plan, and he said that a revised 1901 fire insurance survey was also available. Mr. Cohen remarked that while it could help to detail the work that Price did at the interior, it was likely not sufficient to satisfy Criterion E. Both Mr. Cohen and Ms. Cooperman agreed that the social history of the building remained extraordinarily important and satisfied Criterion A.
- Ms. Milroy asked how to describe the wonderful existing window surrounds. Mr. Cohen replied that they had been more wonderful before being altered. He said he would love to know who designed this building in 1875.
- Mr. Cohen suggested that Criterion E be removed but that Criterion J be added to their recommendation.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Deborah Gary supported the nomination.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building at 1517 W. Girard Avenue was constructed between 1863 and 1875.
- The building at 1517 W. Girard Avenue was home to the Pyramid Club from 1940 to 1965.
- Renowned architect William Lightfoot Price made alterations to the interior of the building in 1901.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Pyramid Club played an extraordinary role in the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of Philadelphia's Black elite, contributing enormously to the social vibrancy of the neighborhood and to the city's art world, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- Though renowned architect William Lightfoot Price renovated the property in 1901, those changes occurred at the interior, and therefore did not support the application of Criterion E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1517 W. Girard Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J.

**ITEM: 1517 W. Girard Ave.**

**MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A and J**

**MOVED BY: Lavery**

**SECONDED BY: Milroy**

| VOTE                   |     |    |         |        |        |
|------------------------|-----|----|---------|--------|--------|
| Committee Member       | Yes | No | Abstain | Recuse | Absent |
| Emily Cooperman, chair | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Suzanna Barucco        | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Jeff Cohen             | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Bruce Lavery           | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Elizabeth Milroy       | X   |    |         |        |        |
| Total                  | 5   |    |         |        |        |

### **3611-31 SPRING GARDEN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Proposed Action: Designation

Nominator: University City Historical Society

Number of properties: 11

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate a historic district comprised of 11 properties on the north side of the 3600 block of Spring Garden Street in the Mantua section of West Philadelphia. Ten of the properties are classified as contributing and one is identified as non-contributing. The nomination argues that the district satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the district exemplifies the Flemish Renaissance Revival style of architecture. Under Criterion E, the nomination argues that Willis Hale-disciple Henry E. Flower designed the row of buildings. The nomination suggests that Flower is most known for his relationship with beer baron Frederick A. Poth and for his designs of several architecturally significant buildings on Viola Street and Parkside Avenue in the Parkside neighborhood.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the proposed district satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. However, the staff recommends removing the property at 3611 Spring Garden Street, which is a vacant lot on the boundary of the proposed district, from the district and changing the district's name to the 3613-31 Spring Garden Street Historic District. Historic preservation best practices advise against including non-contributing properties on district boundaries, especially vacant lots.

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 05:21:21**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- George Poulin of the University City Historical Society represented the nomination.
- Yun Xia represented 3611 Spring Garden Street. No one represented the other property owners.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Poulin stated that there were several alterations that had been made to the buildings within this proposed historic district since the time that notice had been sent to the property owners. He read a list of the changes that he had documented for the record. Mr. Poulin also stated that he was aware that the owner of the property at 3611 Spring Garden Street had submitted an objection to the inclusion of their property in the historic district. Mr. Poulin noted that while the staff recommended leaving that parcel out, the nominators believed that it should remain within the boundaries of the proposed district since it was built as part of the original row. He acknowledged that if the currently vacant lot was designated as part of the district, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over building permit applications would be limited to Review & Comment. However, that oversight was still important to the neighbors he represented.
- Yun Xia, an owner of 3611 Spring Garden Street, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of their vacant lot in the proposed district.
- Ms. Cooperman asked the staff if there had been any contact with additional property owners.
  - Ms. Schmitt responded that they had not heard from any of the other property owners. She informed the Committee members that the staff held an information session on Zoom for the owners of properties within the proposed district. However, no owners attended the meeting.
- Mr. Cohen congratulated the nominators for the excellent research on the row and on architect Henry E. Flower. He added that perhaps the Committee should recommend that the vacant lot at 3611 Spring Garden Street remain within the district so that the Historical Commission can maintain control over what gets built there.
- Ms. Milroy asked if the existence of the party-wall on the otherwise vacant parcel at 3611 Spring Garden Street supported inclusion of the parcel as contributing in the historic district. She asked why the staff recommended that the vacant parcel be excluded from the historic district.
  - Ms. Schmitt responded that best practices recommended minimizing the number of non-contributing structures within a historic district. She explained that, since the vacant parcel at 3611 Spring Garden was at the end of the row, it could be excluded without compromising the integrity of the proposed district.
- Mr. Reuter reviewed the timing of the notice in relation to the consolidation of the lots at 3609 and 3611 Spring Garden Street and determined that 3611 Spring Garden Street had been under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction at the time the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a permit for demolition and new construction. He suggested that he and Mr. Farnham would have to discuss this matter with the Chair of the Historical Commission, but suggested that the Committee members just keep it in mind.
- Ms. Cooperman reminded the Committee members that they were only making a recommendation to the Historical Commission, and suggested that they make a determination based on what they found to be historically appropriate.
- Mr. Cohen commented that he was sympathetic to those requesting that the vacant parcel at 3611 Spring Garden Street remain within the boundaries of the district so that the Historical Commission maintained oversight of it.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that she was not aware of any recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior to exclude vacant lots from historic districts and she was

inclined to recommend that the parcel remain within the proposed boundaries. The other members of the Committee agreed with Ms. Cooperman's suggestion.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Gabriel Gottlieb supported nomination.
- Amy Lambert supported the nomination on behalf of the University City Historical Society. She expressed her support for the inclusion of the vacant lot at 3611 Spring Garden Street.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:**

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The row at 3611-31 Spring Garden Street was designed by Henry E. Flower and constructed about 1895.
- Though currently vacant, the building that previously occupied the lot at 3611 Spring Garden Street had originally been constructed as part of the row.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The district exemplifies the Flemish Renaissance Revival style of architecture, satisfying Criterion D.
- Architect and Willis Hale-disciple Henry E. Flower designed the row of buildings, therefore satisfying Criterion E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the 3611-31 Spring Garden Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

|                                                             |            |           |                |               |               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>ITEM: 3611-31 Spring Garden Street Historic District</b> |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D and E</b>                   |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>MOVED BY: Milroy</b>                                     |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>SECONDED BY: Cohen</b>                                   |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>VOTE</b>                                                 |            |           |                |               |               |
| <b>Committee Member</b>                                     | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Abstain</b> | <b>Recuse</b> | <b>Absent</b> |
| Emily Cooperman, chair                                      | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Suzanna Barucco                                             | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Jeff Cohen                                                  | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Bruce Lavery                                                | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Elizabeth Milroy                                            | X          |           |                |               |               |
| Total                                                       | 5          |           |                |               |               |

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 3:18 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.