

**THE MINUTES OF THE 723RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**THURSDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2022, 9:00 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
ROBERT THOMAS, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

Mr. Thomas, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair (Architectural Historian)	X		
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Mark Dodds (Department of Planning and Development)	X		
Kelly Edwards, MUP (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Patrick O'Donnell (Department of Public Property)	X		
Sara Lepori (Commerce Department)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
John Mattioni, Esq.	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)		X	
Jessica Sánchez, Esq. (City Council President)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq. (Community Development Corporation)		X	Arrived 1:18 pm

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

The following staff members were present:

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Supervisor
Kerrian France, Historical Commission intern
Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner II
Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner I
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons attended the online meeting:

Ann Marie Doley
Keith Coleman
Mike Simone
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society

Lorelle Becton
Mary Pat Tumelty
Connie Lotz
Alan Lee
Coley Gestetner
Mordecai Terebelo
Joseph McCarthy
Mark Harris
Desjeneé Davis
Richard DeMarco, Esq.
Neil Sklaroff, Esq.
Rich Giordano
Clint Steib
Kathy Dowdell, Farragut Street Architects
Ethan J. Rhodes
Heather Sheridan
Chris Strom
Nina Curlett, East Mt. Airy Neighbors
Jerry Givnish
Jon Tilley
Elizabeth Milroy
Russell Fulton
Steven Peitzman
Nancy Pontone
J.M. Duffin
Kareem James
Carolyn Healy
Jean Wrice
Michael Nix, Esq.
Param Doshi
E.W. Bank
Jack DeRoche
Kenwyn Smith
Ivonne Valle
Dennis Carlisle
Andrew Goodman, Council Member Gauthier's Office
Kenneth Kramer
Mary Anne Layden
Elaine Lander
Jay Farrell
Terrance Arter
Linda Bell
Gregory Harris
Jennifer Laverty
Kimberly Witmer
Phil Berryman
George Poulin
Raymond
Kate Schoener
Mike Lehman
Alex Charnov

Emaleigh Doley
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Carolina Pena, Parallel Architecture
Shlomo Rottenberg
Nancy Drye
Rhonnie Lancaster
Jacqueline Sykes
Mark Brack, Powelton Village Civic Association
Constance Winters
Kaitlin Orner
Bruce Benedon
Amy Lambert
Laura Lacy
Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
Casey Bechtel
Aaron Wunsch
George Thomas, Ph.D.
Desjenee Davis, Esq., Philadelphia Law Department
John Phillips
Anabel Pena, Parallel Architecture
Todd Lacy
Allison Weiss, SoLo
Mason Carter
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Edward Dover
Suzanna Barucco
Gregory Fisher
Chinmay Nerurkar
Marjorie Russell
Novilette Russell
Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Greg Paulmier
Joan Weiner
Katay Lezenby
Brian McGuire
Alina Macneal
Meredith Trego, Esq.
Gregory Harris
Meredith Ferleger, Esq.
Chris Lezenby
Debra McCarty
Susan Wetherill
Yossi Levy
Suzanne Ponsen, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Helma Weeks
Janelle Avant
Hsing-Yuan Chen, Sky Design Studio
Abdul-Rahim Muhammad
Khemsuda Spearman
Anne McNiff
Michael Mattioni

Deborah Gary
 Gertrude Dunlap
 Jeffrey Cohen
 Brett Spearman
 Lisa Holgash
 Tom Beck
 Joan Roush
 Nicholas Roush
 Adrienne Fernandez
 Douglas Ewbank
 Matt Masterpasqua

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 722ND STATED MEETING, 14 OCTOBER 2022

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:00

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 722nd Stated Meeting, held 14 October 2022. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 722nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 October 2022. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 722nd Meeting					
MOTION: Adoption of minutes					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

ADDRESS: 8835 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Julia Hebard Marsden House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Chestnut Hill Hospital LLC

Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the former Julia Hebard Marsden house and stable, two buildings on the Chestnut Hill Hospital campus, at 8835 Germantown Avenue and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the buildings satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the house and stable are highly representative examples of the Colonial Revival “country houses” that appeared in Chestnut Hill following the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the buildings were designed by the nationally significant and Philadelphia-born architect Charles Barton Keen. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the residence and stable contributed to the neighborhood’s status as an elite residential enclave at the turn of the twentieth century.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the former residence and stable at 8835 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:30

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the review of the nomination to the November 2022 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property will remain under the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Granting a continuance under the circumstances is appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of 8835 Germantown Avenue to the November 2022 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 8835 Germantown Ave.
MOTION: Continue to Nov. 2022 CHD
MOVED BY: Thomas
SECONDED BY: Cooperman

VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 3101 W PASSYUNK AVE

Name of Resource: Point Breeze Gas Works

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Gas Works

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the designation of the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue. A related nomination proposes the designation of a portion of the property at 3143 W. Passyunk Avenue. The nominations for the two properties are identical, except for the two-page nomination form. This nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, although some Criteria are not applied to all resources listed in the nomination. The site is inaccessible to the general public and subject to significant safety and security restrictions; therefore, aerial imagery was utilized to identify and catalog the resources. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination contends that the Point Breeze Gas Works, which expanded as the city's population grew, was one of the city's largest employers in the mid-to-late nineteenth century and is one of the oldest surviving gasworks. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that many of the structures embody characteristics of the Gothic Revival style. It also notes that later structures were designed in the Jacobean Revival style. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the earliest buildings of the Point Breeze Gas Works were built under the leadership of John Chapman Cresson, an influential figure.

At the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue, the nomination proposes the following numbered structures as contributing to the historical significance:

- 1, 2, and 5 - purifying houses, which date to the 1850s with later additions;
- 3 - remnants of a wall of a coal house;
- 6 and 7 - shops, which date to 1859;
- 8 - locomotive shop, which dates to 1859 and had a second floor added; and,

- 9a and 9b - office and garage, which date to the early twentieth century.

The site is very large and most of the land is vacant. Most of the buildings associated with the historic gasworks have been demolished. The site is currently used by the Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW) for the storage and distribution of liquefied natural gas. Access to the site is strictly controlled and visitors are not permitted. Persons with business at the site must be accompanied by PGW staff and wear protective gear including flame-retardant suits. The nominated buildings are primarily unused or used for storage.

PGW objects to the nomination and has retained an attorney and preservation consultant to represent its interests before the Historical Commission. The preservation consultant has submitted a report refuting the claims of the nomination. The report concludes that the gasworks does not merit designation because:

- this gasworks was not the city's primary gasworks;
- the Gothic Revival architectural style is not a legitimate basis for designation because
- the choice of the style was inappropriate for an industrial complex;
- the buildings have been altered many times and have lost integrity;
- this gasworks was not significant in the city's history or in the history of gas technology;
- John Chapman Cresson was not an influential designer and may not have been a
- designer or engineer at all;
- the site does not exemplify any aspect of any community, but is an abandoned industrial
- area cut off from the rest of the city; and,
- the site is inaccessible, poses safety hazards, and is subject to myriad safety and
- security restrictions.

The staff had planned to visit the site with PGW staff on 25 February 2021 and then report on its findings to the Committee on Historic Designation but was compelled to cancel the site visit because the safety risks at the site were deemed unacceptably high for City staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff initially offered a compromise recommendation that sought to protect the most important buildings from demolition while limiting the impact on PGW, but, in light of Mayor Kenney's letter, the staff must recognize the significant safety and security concerns associated with the site and recommend against any designation.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, and to limit the designation to buildings 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 8, and 9a, with a period of significance of 1855-1929. Ms. Barucco seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the request to continue the review of the nomination to the February 2023 meeting of the Historical Commission and explained that the attorney representing the property owner is awaiting a court decision which may be relevant to the Commission's review of the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Granting a continuance under the circumstances is appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to continue the review of 3101 W. Passyunk Avenue to the February 2023 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3101 W. Passyunk Ave.					
MOTION: Continue to Feb. 2023 PHC					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 5920 GREENE ST

Name of Resource: Thomas C. Potter House

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: K&A Insurance Agency

Nominator: West Central Germantown Neighbors

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5920 Greene Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Colonial Revival dwelling, constructed in 1892, satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. Under Criterion C, the nomination contends that the Potter House reflects the environment of suburban, residential architecture of the upper classes of Germantown and Philadelphia in an era characterized by the Colonial Revival style. Under Criterion D, the nomination outlines how the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style. Lastly, under Criterion E, the nomination states that the Potter House is the work of Mantle Fielding, Jr., an

architect whose work significantly influenced the architectural development of Northwest Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5920 Greene Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:09:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the request to continue the review of the nomination to the November 2023 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation and noted that the property owner provided a letter regarding the request which was provided to the Commissioners in advance.
- Suzanne Ponsen of West Central Germantown Neighbors represented the nominator and expressed non-opposition to a continuance request, owing to the property remaining under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.
- Property owner Keith Coleman and attorney Michael Nix represented the property. Mr. Coleman explained the reasons for requesting one additional year. He explained that he recently hired a new attorney. Mr. Nix confirmed that he was recently hired and needs time to learn the process and come up to speed on the nomination. He estimated that he would need at least three months for the work. He suggested a three-month continuance with the ability to request additional continuance time if needed.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The matter is scheduled for review by the Committee on Historic Designation on 30 November 2022. The property owner is requesting an addition twelve months of continuance. The Historical Commission typically grants continuances of shorter time periods than one full year.
- The property will remain under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction during the continuance period.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Granting a three-month continuance under the circumstances is appropriate.
- The property owner may present a request to the Historical Commission for additional continuance time if needed prior to the March 2023 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of 5920 Greene Street to the 15 March 2023 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 5920 Greene St. MOTION: Continue to March 2023 CHD meeting MOVED BY: Mattioni SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2022

CONSENT AGENDA

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:22:35

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Mattioni recused from the review of the consent agenda matter for 705, 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street, owing to his law firm's involvement in the project.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Thomas asked the Commissioners, staff, and public for comments on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Brett Spearman asked about the process for the review of 832 S. Front Street.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 705, 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street, and 832 S. Front Street. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda MOTION: Approval of Consent Agenda MOVED BY: Thomas SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni				X	
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	10			1	2

AGENDA

ADDRESSES: 705, 711, 713, AND 717 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear additions, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 705 717 Pine Street Associates

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture Studio

History: 1835

Individual Designations: 4/30/1957

District Designations: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct rear additions, replace windows, and install new roofing at 705, 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street. The roofing scope can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rears or sides that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.

At its 27 September 2022 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for a similar scope and voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Recommendations were made to redesign the Delancey Street facades to appear more like fronts of homes rather than rears. The Committee also recommended removing the overbuild from the scope for 705 Pine Street. The applicant withdrew the application shortly after the Committee meeting so as to incorporate comments from the Committee in a revised design.

The application has since been revised in response to Committee comments. At 705 Pine Street, the massing of the addition at the rear has been entirely moved off of the existing historic

rear ell and held to just the rear wall of the rear ell, which is landlocked and not visible from any public right-of-way.

At 711, 713, and 717 Pine Street, which run through to Delancey Street at the rear, the scope has been revised to provide for an improved pedestrian experience on the block, but still conform to zoning requirements, which are driving much of the massing and design. In the prior application, existing garage and roll-up doors fronting Delancey Street were retained. The application has been revised to instead use black steel gates in lieu of the existing solid garage doors, and red brick on the facades facing Delancey Street.

The staff notes that the Architectural Committee focused much of its recommendations on making these additions appear to be fronts of houses in order to be compatible with the residential streetscape. Since that time, the staff has walked the block and determined that the Committee may not have been provided with complete information as to the streetscape during the prior review. On the 700 block of Delancey Street, only one residential building fronts the block, which was constructed in the early 2000s. There are two very large parking structures for Pennsylvania Hospital, and several ancillary hospital buildings, which are residential in scale but do not read as fronts of houses. The remaining structures fronting Delancey Street are the one-story garages in question. The staff notes that, while the existing block is not residential in character, most of the structures are red brick and therefore the change to red brick in this revised application will help these additions to be contextual in materials. The staff suggests that, given the existing streetscape of this block, it is appropriate for these additions to read as rear additions.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct rear additions on four properties.
- Replace windows on four properties.
- Install new roofing on four properties.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - o Replacement of front façade features dating to a 1973 renovation, such as window sash to match the historic appearance, satisfies Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed rear additions are differentiated yet compatible with the historic properties and their environment in massing, size, scale, and architectural features, satisfying Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the material on the side walls of the additions is changed to

brick or red stucco, the decks are changed to Juliet balconies or roof terraces to eliminate support posts, and the gates are changed to solid garage doors set into brick walls to create the appearance of carriage house entries, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 832 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and detached rear structure

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Thelma Rachubinski

Applicant: Carolina Peña, Parallel Architecture

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a rear addition with deck on the historic building at 832 S. Front Street and construct a three-story detached structure at the rear fronting S. Howard Street. The application also proposes solar panels, roofing, and window replacement. The roofing scope can be approved by the staff. The staff can also approve window replacement, provided shop drawings accurately depict the new windows within the existing masonry openings. The front façade windows and any windows at the rear that are visible from the public right-of-way should match the appearance of the historic windows.

The existing building has a two-story rear addition. This application proposes an additional story with deck, using the existing rear dormer as the access to the new rear deck. There is currently a one-story non-historic parking structure at the rear on S. Howard Street, which would either be removed or built upon to create a three-story detached in-law suite with parking at the ground floor and living space above. This building would be clad in brick at the front and Hardi panels at the visible side.

The application proposes the addition of solar panels on both the front and rear gable of the existing building, and also on the flat roof of the new rear building. The Commission staff routinely approves solar panels which are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way or are not located on historic fabric.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct additional story on existing two-story rear addition, with deck.
- Construct three-story detached structure at rear.
- Install solar panels.
- Replace windows and roofing.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature*

will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

- o Replacement of front façade features such as windows and doors to match the historic appearance satisfies Standard 6.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The proposed additional story on the existing rear addition does not destroy historic materials which characterize the property and is compatible with the historic property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o The proposed detached three-story structure along S. Howard Street is differentiated from the old, and compatible with the massing, size, scale and materials of other three-story houses on this small block, satisfying Standard 9.
 - o Solar panels should be installed on rear slopes and/or other locations not easily visible from the public right-of-way. Panels should be installed flat and not alter the slope of the roof. The installation of panels must be reversible and not damage the historic integrity of the resource. As proposed, the solar panels on the rear roof slope and the flat roof of the new structure satisfy Standard 9. The solar panels proposed for the front roof slope will be highly visible and not compatible with the historic building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - o The proposed rear addition and detached rear structure does not alter the essential form and integrity of the historic property, and could be removed in the future; therefore, the application meets Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided solar panels are not installed on the front slope of the roof on the historic house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided the material on the side wall of the rear structure is changed to brick or stucco, the new window openings are similar in scale to adjacent buildings, the brick piers on the first floor of the rear structure are widened, solar panels are omitted from the front roof slope of the historic building, and the insulation in the historic building is reviewed for thermal properties to ensure it does not cause premature deterioration of historic brick, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1717-19 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Alter rear ell; demolish garage; construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Mount Vernon Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio, LLC

History: 1859; new façade added, 1890

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify and add to the property at 1717-19 Mount Vernon Street in the Spring Garden Historic District. The western half, or 1719 portion, of the double-width property features a three-story brick main block and rear ell constructed c. 1859 and refaced in 1890, and a one-story frame rear addition. The eastern half, or 1717 portion, has historically remained undeveloped except for a garage constructed between 1910 and 1916 at the rear of the lot and a historic iron fence at the front of the lot.

This application proposes to demolish the garage and selective portions of the rear ell and to construct additions. In August 2022, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for this property that called for the complete demolition of the rear ell, garage, second and third floor side walls of the main block and removal of the historic fence along the eastern half of the property. At that time, the Architectural Committee found that the garage was a non-historic element of the property but encouraged the retention of the existing iron fence and rear ell. Following that meeting, the applicants revised the design to incorporate the existing gate, to eliminate the previously proposed underground parking that would have necessitated a curb cut and removal of the fence, and to retain additional portions of the rear ell and main block walls. At its meeting on October 25th, the Architectural Committee recommended approval with several provisions. The applicants have since revised their design to address many of the concerns of the Committee, including increasing the setback of the southern addition from 6 feet 4 inches to 8 feet; revising the façade color of the addition to be more in keeping with the existing building and altering the window configuration of the first floor of the addition; and setting the northern addition back an additional 10 inches from the existing rear ell bay.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish garage and portions of rear ell
- Construct additions

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o Although largely enveloped by the proposed additions, the plans retain much of the original fabric of the main block and rear ell. The height, materials, and punched window openings of the southern addition proposed along Mount Vernon Street are consistent with the scale, massing, materials, and features of the Spring Garden Historic District. However, the minimal 6-foot setback from the gate does not

adequately convey the sense of a garden side yard, altering the spatial relationships that characterize the property. The application partially satisfies this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the southern addition is set back farther from Mount Vernon Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following:

- The setback of the southern addition is increased to approximately 10 feet;
- The color and material of the façade of the southern addition is compatible with the historic building to which it attaches;
- The first-floor windows of the southern addition are further studied;
- The northern addition is set back from the bay window of the rear ell;
- Details of the cornice and fence modification are submitted for final approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:26:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The revised application addresses most of the concerns of the Architectural Committee.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- An eight-foot setback from the sidewalk line to the façade of the addition is an acceptable setback.
- Additional study and details of the exposed side wall of the historic building are needed to show how the proposed cladding and capping connect the historic building and addition.
- The in-concept application satisfies Standard 9.
- No formal action is needed for an in-concept application.

ADDRESS: 1939 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Alter side stair and add ADA life; legalize rear addition, windows, and paint

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elevated Management LLC

Applicant: Hsing-Yuan Chen, Sky Design Studio

History: 1889; Willis Hale

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Significant, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the current exterior appearance of the property at 1939 Diamond Street, and to install a wheelchair lift and modify the steps at an existing side entrance on N. 20th Street to accommodate the lift.

This building has been altered many times recently beyond the scope of and without building permits. Most recently, under the current ownership, the first-floor exterior stucco was painted blue, an existing rear addition was altered, and glass was inserted into historic openings at the upper floor. Prior to the current ownership, in early 2018, historic windows were removed, and inappropriate vinyl windows were installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The Historical Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses and Inspections inspect owing to the window replacement, and a violation was issued in late September 2022.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize exterior work including rear addition alterations, painting, and window replacement.
- Install wheelchair lift and modify steps at side entrance.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - o The vinyl windows which replaced historic windows in 2018 do not match the old in appearance or materials.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - o The blue paint over stucco and alterations to the rear addition are incompatible with the architectural features of the property.
- *Accessibility Guideline | Recommended: Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.*

- o The proposed wheelchair lift and modifications to the steps will provide the required accessible entrance at the side of the property and will not impact character-defining features of the exterior.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the wheelchair lift and modification to side entrance steps, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline. Denial of the legalization of recent exterior work including window replacement, painting, and rear addition alterations, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the wheelchair lift and modification to side entrance steps, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline; denial of the legalization of recent exterior work including window replacement, painting, and rear addition alterations, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:31:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the revised application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Hsing-Yuan Chen and owners Patros and Persefoni Kapotas represented the applicants.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Linda Bell stated that owner should have researched the City's building permit requirements prior to starting work on this building.
- Jay Farrell pointed out that the building originally was part of a ten-building row designed by Willis Hale.
- Rhonnie Lancaster inquired about the property's future use.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The owner was initially not aware of historic designation and did not apply for building permits.
- The vinyl windows, which replaced historic windows, were installed in 2018 by a prior owner.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- To enclose the fourth-floor space in compliance with preservation standards, the glass should be tinted dark glass and set back from the openings. The windows should appear as open portals, rather than openings with windows.
- Since the original brick exists under the stucco and was historically visible, the paint color of the stucco should match the tone of the original brick masonry.
- The vinyl windows do not match the original windows in appearance or materials; therefore, the windows do not satisfy Standard 6.
- The blue paint over stucco and alterations to the rear addition are incompatible with the architectural features of the property; therefore, the paint and alterations to the rear addition do not meet Standard 9.
- The revised wheelchair lift and modifications to the steps will provide the required accessible entrance at the side of the property and will not impact character-defining

features of the exterior; therefore, the wheelchair lift and step modifications do meet the Accessibility Guideline.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application, provided the top-floor windows have dark glass and are sufficiently set back in the openings, appropriate doors and windows are installed in the rear addition, the stucco is painted the color of the brick, and the vinyl windows are replaced with appropriate windows on a four-year schedule, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1939 Diamond St.					
MOTION: Approval of revised application with conditions					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DHCD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 19 OCTOBER 2022

ADDRESS: 221 W UPSAL ST

Name of Resource: Jesse A. Tilge House

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Estate of Joseph Dorfman

Nominator: Historical Commission staff

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

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

The nomination contends that the Jesse A. Tilge House satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. The nomination argues that the house embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Queen Anne style, satisfying Criterion D. The nomination also argues that George T. Pearson, the

architect of the house, is a designer who has significantly influenced the development of the City of Philadelphia, satisfying Criterion E.

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:09:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Barry Dubrow and estate executor Mordecai Terebelo represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Dubrow stated that his client did not oppose the designation, but did want the rear of the property excluded from the designated area.
 - o The Commissioners agreed to limit the designated area to the front half of the property, which includes the historic house.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin noted that he found evidence that George T. Pearson was the architect of the house in a diary in the special collections library at the University of Pennsylvania. He supported the nomination.
- Lori Salganicoff supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Jesse A. Tilge House at 221 W. Upsal Street embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Queen Anne architectural style.
- Noted architect George T. Pearson designed the Jesse A. Tilge House at 221 W. Upsal Street.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

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

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 221 W. Upsal Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, and to designate the front portion of the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 221 W. Upsal St. MOTION: Designate; Criteria D and E; amend nomination to reflect revised boundary and include documentation of architect MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 4841 GERMANTOWN AVE

Name of Resource: Joseph P. Bolton Store and Residence

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Venture Philly LLC

Nominator: SoLo/Germantown Civic Association

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

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

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

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

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:27:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Allison Weiss and Oscar Beisert represented the nominator.
- Attorney Neil Sklaroff, preservation consultant George Thomas, architect Logan Dry, and Yossi Levy represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Weiss said they stand by their nomination as submitted and plan to submit a nomination for the adjacent two buildings attached to 4841 Germantown Avenue in the near future. She asked that the Commissioners designate the building.
- Mr. Beisert said that despite the report submitted by the owner's representatives, he stands by the nomination he authored. He argued that the building is an important example of the Second Empire Style and possesses distinguishing characteristics of the style. Mr. Beisert summarized additional arguments contained within the nomination. He pointed to the community support for the nomination as evidenced by more than 40 emails and letters sent to the Historical Commission. Mr. Beisert disputed many of the assertions made by Mr. Thomas in his report, which cited numerous errors in the nomination.
- Mr. Sklaroff stated that he, along with Mr. Thomas and Mr. Dry, were present at the meeting to oppose the nomination. He said that the facts are such to be insufficient to support the nomination. Mr. Sklaroff said the decision of the Commission to add a property to the historic register is discretionary and noted that regulations allow for the Commissioners to consider the status of a property at the time of designation. He said the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a zoning permit for a redevelopment project for the site which requires the demolition of the building. Mr. Sklaroff continued that a zoning permit would typically be their entitlement to build what is illustrated on the plans as long as they meet the technical requirements of the building code. He noted that the Commissioners will hear from the project architect who will describe the time, effort, and expense that has gone into the plans to redevelop the property. Mr. Sklaroff commented on the need for substantial evidence to support the Historical Commission's decision and noted how this differs from the Committee on Historic Designation. He continued that the Committee focuses on the merits of the nomination and the Committee members are individuals with established areas of expertise and at liberty to share their opinions and insights during the deliberations. Mr. Sklaroff said the Committee is not a quasi-legislative body and is not required to follow ordinary rules of procedure or elements of due process. He said the Committee chair allows 10 minutes for the owner, who is in opposition to designation, to refute the nomination. He pointed out that the

Committee chair, Ms. Cooperman, is liberal in that interpretation and often allows the owner additional time for owner. Mr. Sklaroff said the owner in opposition does not have the opportunity to cross examine the nominator or witnesses and no opportunities to ask questions. He added there is also no time allowed for owner to follow up on the Committee's comments. Mr. Sklaroff said that, owing to the paucity of facts included in the nomination, the Committee members substituted their own opinions. He continued that those opinions may reflect beliefs, but they are not founded on an undisputed documented record. He stated as an example that during the Committee's discussion, the location of the building was found to be on an important historic corner and representative of the history of urbanization of Germantown after the Civil War. Mr. Sklaroff stated that this information is not included in the nomination itself and there is no evidence of this transition of the community in the nomination record. He continued that the only support for this finding is the Committee members' opinions devoid in the record of the foundation of facts. Mr. Sklaroff said that the Committee felt free to make its decisions based on probability and opinions. He said the Historical Commission on the other hand is a quasi-legislative body, moored to reality by the City Charter, the Philadelphia Zoning Code, Criteria, the Commission's Rules and Regulations, and fundamental due process. Mr. Sklaroff stated that, for the Commission's decision to be upheld, it must be based on substantial evidence in the record, which must be based on substantial evidence in the record that a reasonable mind can accept as adequate to support a conclusion. He said among the critical issues presented by the nomination is the admission by the nominator that it was prepared in haste and the omission of the remainder of the row was based on time and resources even though the row was a cohesive group that should have been the subject of the nomination. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that a zoning permit was issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspection on 29 June 2022 and Historical Commission's staff received a nomination on 5 July 2022. He noted this is beyond mere coincidence. Mr. Sklaroff then reviewed key elements of the response report he and Mr. Thomas submitted to the staff and Commissioners. He also spoke about the Committee of Historic Designation's discussion regarding the 4841 Germantown Avenue nomination, which is documented in the meeting minutes and recording. Mr. Sklaroff said that in order to support the designation of the property, the Committee members focused on what may have been the cultural development of the area. He detailed comments of specific Committee members and pointed out that these were opinions of Committee members, not established fact, and noted the evidence just is not in the record. Mr. Sklaroff continued that one Committee member requested adding Criterion I to the recommendation, owing to the high probability that there are historic artifacts on the property related to the Revolutionary War battle in Germantown, even though the battle was not nearby. He said they believe there is no documented facts in the record to support the inclusion of Criterion I other than the noted opinions of the Committee members. Mr. Sklaroff questioned Criteria for Designation C and D, especially the meaning of Criterion C. He said Mr. Thomas will address Criteria C and D more in his presentation.

- Mr. Dry, an architect, summarized the new construction plans and elevations proposed for the property. He said that he contracted with owners in April 2021 and began reviewing the corner parcel, which is zoned CMX-2.5. Mr. Dry said he and his client worked through the design process with multiple iterations of floorplans and building massing and eventually settled on an eight-unit multi-family building with commercial space. He pointed to zoning permit activity and other engagement with

City agencies. He noted the nomination was submitted soon after the zoning permit was issued.

- Mr. Sklaroff pointed out the City's property assessment of the property has recently decreased. He said it was assessed at \$188,000 in 2021 and at a lower rate of \$127,000 in 2022. Mr. Sklaroff noted that it is unusual for the City's Office of Property Assessment to decrease the assessment rate.
- Mr. Thomas, a preservation consultation, said he wished to start with the assertions that Mr. Beisert made about how the nomination is not really a document about Joseph Bolton and this is based on facts. He noted that the name of the building is given as the "Joseph P. Bolton Store & Dwelling" and noted that the nomination provides extensive information on how Bolton likely lived at the building. Mr. Thomas said the condition of the building is "Poor," owing to the ongoing deterioration, rather than "Fair," as checked on the nomination form. He said that the occupancy is said to be "Unknown" but that it is evident that there is currently a store on the ground floor and people living in the building. Mr. Thomas pointed out the date that the nomination was submitted and noted that date's relationship to the zoning approval date. Mr. Thomas remarked on the Historical Commission's staff suggestion that all three connected buildings should have been nominated and he agreed that the row of buildings should have been treated as a whole rather than selecting one of the three for the nomination. Mr. Thomas said that the nominator's claims they did not have sufficient time to put together a nomination for all three properties is patently ridiculous. He indicated his disagreement with the nomination's assertion that 4841 Germantown Avenue should have been included in the East Logan Historic District, as that building and the buildings in the district differ significantly in form and history. Mr. Thomas pointed out errors in the nomination related to Bolton's ownership and occupancy. He also said there was obviously a previous owner to Mr. Bolton in the 1880s. Mr. Thomas also pointed out the inaccuracies in the nomination's description of exterior materials. He said the nominator does not appropriately discuss condition and integrity issues. He highlighted the extreme deterioration of the extant garage. Mr. Thomas stated the garage should be demolished as soon as possible to protect the owner and building. Mr. Thomas also questioned the architectural style examples cited as related to and influences on the nominated building. He focused on the use of the mansard in development and construction during the period in which 4841 Germantown Avenue was constructed. Mr. Thomas said that the larger questions include how this building fits into the built fabric and the style of mid nineteenth-century Philadelphia. He said all of the examples provided in the nomination postdate the construction of the nominated building and clearly did not influence its design. Mr. Thomas showed and reviewed examples of additional buildings in Philadelphia with mansard roofs and discussed the influences of Second Empire style. He questioned how the examples of style, especially that of the Second Empire, actually relate to the nominated building. Mr. Thomas reviewed points of the Committee members' discussion from the October 2022 Committee on Historic Designation meeting. He disputed Committee members' comments about developer William Rotch Wister, the location of the Battle of Germantown as it related to the nominated property, urban development in Germantown, and discussions of architectural style. Mr. Thomas summarized that 4841 Germantown Avenue is not an important building, the building has nothing to do with Mr. Bolton, the facts of the nomination are weak or non-existent, and the amendments of the Committee on Historic Designation do not pan out. He stated the building should not be designated.
- Mr. Mattioni questioned the addition of Criterion I. He said he did not see anything related in the nomination to support this and believes that there must be some

evidence to support the inclusion of this Criterion for archaeology. Mr. Mattioni observed that the addition of Criterion I was added at the Committee level rather than by the nominator and he finds that troubling.

- Ms. Sanchez asked Mr. Sklaroff for a timeline of the permit approvals and nomination submission.
 - o Mr. Sklaroff noted that project team began working on the overall project in May 2021 and received the zoning permit on 29 June 2022.
- Chair Thomas said he is concerned with the overall row of three buildings as a unit. He noted the nomination is just for the one property, but it should be for the three properties.
- Ms. Cooperman asked Mr. Farnham to explain to the Commissioners how proposed designations have been handled by the Commission in the past, specifically in situations where permits have been issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.
- Mr. Farnham said in this case a zoning permit was issued prior to the submission of the nomination. He said the City's preservation ordinance gives the Historical Commission the authority to review building and demolition permits. Mr. Farnham said that the preservation ordinance indicates the Historical Commission's jurisdiction to review building and demolition permits begins on the day that the Historical Commission sends notice informing the property owner that the Historical Commission will consider a designation of the property. He continued that, in this particular case, the owner obtained a zoning permit but did seek or obtain a building or demolition permit prior to the Historical Commission sending the notice letter informing the property owner of consideration of the designation. Mr. Farnham said that, at this point, the Commission has the authority to review any subsequent building and demolition permit applications and has the authority to deny those permit applications. He explained that, in the past, the Commission has taken into consideration development proposals that were in place at time of notice where the owner has not applied or obtained the demolition permit or building permit but had invested in a project and had obtained other entitlements from the City such as a zoning permit. He said that, in cases like that, the Commission has looked at the significance of the property proposed for designation and the public interest in the property being designated and weighed those factors against the investments already made by the property owner and the potential of sending a message to the real estate community that should not invest in Philadelphia because this might not lead to construction projects. He added that the Commission has made these decisions in many ways in the past and they are always difficult decisions. Mr. Farnham said that what the Commission is doing is weighing the public interest in the preservation of this building against the public interest in providing a transparent and predictable development process.
- Mr. Reuter said the Historical Commission can certainly take into consideration development plans that are in place at the time of notice. He said he wished to clarify a statement made earlier by the owner's representatives. Mr. Reuter said that it does not appear that this project went before the Planning Commission at a public meeting. He said that the project appears to be by-right and what they have received in terms of approval is a stamp from the Planning Commission's staff for the zoning permit.
 - o Mr. Sklaroff responded that he wished to point out to the extent that any additional agencies needed to be consulted, such as the Philadelphia Water Department or Streets Department, that would have been flagged by the plans

examiner. He noted that the owner and his team followed the processes and obtained the approvals that they needed to get the zoning permit. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized that the issuance of the zoning permit meant that, as long as they satisfied the building codes, they could build the design documented by the plans; the nomination has intervened in that orderly process.

- Mr. O'Donnell asked why the two adjacent properties in this row were not nominated along with 4841 Germantown Avenue.
 - o Mr. Farnham said that the nominator claimed that he did not have the resources or time to prepare the additional nominations quickly or thoroughly.
- Mr. O'Donnell asked when the zoning permit application was submitted. He noted that it sounds like it was in the process for one full year and went through various agencies for review.
 - o Mr. Sklaroff responded that he was not involved with that process, but the development of the plans started by the architect as early as May 2021.
 - o Mr. Lech said he can respond to this question. He said the zoning permit application was started in Eclipse on 8 June 2022.
 - o Mr. Dry said they started working on the project in 2021 and filed in Eclipse for the zoning permit on 8 June 2022. He noted the review process took approximately one month. The zoning permit was issued on 29 June 2022.
- Chair Thomas asked Mr. Beisert why all three buildings in a row were not included in the nomination.
 - o Mr. Beisert said the nomination of all three was always in their future plans along with a larger Germantown Avenue Historic District nomination. Mr. Beisert questioned how the City could approve the future development of this single building when it is clearly connected to the other two buildings. He noted that connected buildings have been nominated and designated in the past. Mr. Beisert added that, if the law allows this to be regulated and designated by the Historical Commission, even if a zoning permit has been filed, then it is lawful, and one could argue that it would be in the public interest.
- Mr. Levy spoke as one of the building owners. He responded to some of the concerns about the building currently being occupied but slated for demolition. He stressed that an owner cannot legally file for demolition while the building is occupied so that should not be a concern. Mr. Levy said that, while many people wish to see the building preserved, these individuals are not aware of the cost of maintaining an older building or aware of exactly the condition on the interior. He said that the owners appreciate Germantown Avenue and they have spent time exploring a new design for something that works with the area.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ms. Mehley stated that the Historical Commission has received approximately 40 public comment emails and letters in support of the nomination.
- Mark Harris supported the nomination.
- Joan Roush supported the nomination.
- Mason Carter supported the nomination.
- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, supported the nomination. Mr. Steinke asked the Commission to consider continuing the nomination to allow time for the two adjacent buildings to be added to the nomination.
- Ann Marie Doley supported the nomination.

- Constance Winters stated that the zoning of Germantown Ave as CMX-2.5 has incentivized development and resulted in far too many demolitions of existing buildings. She commented that the current zoning is not correct and that local community organizations should be given the opportunity to provide feedback to the City Planning Commission on the current zoning for this area and the challenges they are facing.
- Greg Paulmier supported the nomination.
- Adrienne Fernandez of the Swampoodle Neighborhood Parcels Association, supported the nomination.
- Emaleigh Doley, director of the Germantown United Community Development Corporation, supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.
- Jim Duffin supported the nomination.
- Aaron Wunsch supported the nomination.
- Kimberly Witmer, a tenant of 4841 Germantown Avenue, supported the nomination.
- Amy Lambert supported the nomination. She agreed with Mr. Steinke that the nominators should be allowed more time to include the two adjacent properties.
- Nina Curlett, board member of East Mount Airy Neighbors, supported the nomination.
- Mike Simone supported the nomination.
- Jerry Givnish supported the nomination.
- Laura Lacy supported the nomination.
- Linda Bell, board member of East Mount Airy Neighbors, supported the nomination.
- Jack DeRoche supported the nomination.
- Suzanne Ponsen, president of West Central Germantown Neighbors Association, stated that her organization supports the nomination.
- Kareem James, a tenant of 4841 Germantown Avenue, supported the nomination.
- Lori Salganicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy, supported the nomination. She encouraged the Commission to consider the nomination immediately and add the adjacent two buildings as an amendment later.
- David Traub supported the nomination.
- Mr. Farnham noted that the next speaker, Jeffrey Cohen, is a member of the Committee on Historic Designation. He observed that it is unusual if not unprecedented for a member of the Committee to address the Historical Commission about a nomination that he has reviewed as a member of the Committee. He asked the chair to decide whether it was appropriate for Mr. Cohen to speak as a member of the public.
 - o Chair Thomas agreed to let Mr. Cohen proceed.
 - o Jeffrey Cohen said he was heartened to witness the level of public support for the nomination. Mr. Cohen noted that, in a process that is participatory, such as the nomination process, nominations are not perfect. He said the Committee and Commission must discern between minor mistakes and fatal errors in nominations. Mr. Cohen said that he believed the errors pointed out by Mr. Thomas and other representatives of the owner are not fatal errors. He stated the process of the nomination of properties by the general public is participatory, and in order to make this work, there must be allowances for insignificant errors or errors that can be easily remedied. He noted that many of the issues that Mr. Thomas identified could be resolved and integrated into the nomination and make the nomination stronger.

- Novilette Russell stated that, whatever the outcome is from this process, she hopes it is for the best of the nearby community.
- Mr. Farnham stated that the staff received an email during the review from Councilperson Bass stating she supports the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building maintains a high level of architectural integrity and original details.
- There is strong public interest in the preservation and designation of the building.
- The Department of Licenses and Inspections has approved a zoning permit for the redevelopment of this property.
- The property owner has have not yet applied for building and demolition permits to undertake the redevelopment project documented in the zoning permit.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The building reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, the Second Empire style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The garage should be considered a non-contributing portion of the property.
- There is insufficient documentation in the nomination to support the addition of Criterion I.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4841 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the garage considered non-contributing. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 2.

ITEM: 4841 Germantown Ave. MOTION: Designate; Criteria C and D MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)		X			
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)		X			
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	8	2			3

ADDRESS: 6376-80 GERMANTOWN AVE

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

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Neighborly Living LLC

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

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

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

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:59:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nominator and stated that he prepared the nomination on behalf of the property owner.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ann Marie Doley, the adjacent property owner, commented in support of the nomination.
- Allison Weiss, representing So/Lo Germantown Civic Association, commented in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- A mixed-use commercial and residential building, erected in 1889 and known as J.F. Rausenberger's Bee Hive Meat Market, stands on the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

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

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 6376-80 Germantown Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 6376-80 Germantown Ave.					
MOTION: Designate; Criteria C, D, and J					
MOVED BY: Carney					
SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington					X
Total	9				4

POWELTON VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Various

Nominator: Powelton Village Civic Association

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a historic district consisting of 935 properties in the Powelton Village neighborhood of West Philadelphia. The nomination argues that the Powelton Village Historic District is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The period of significance for the district begins in 1851, the year assigned to John Hare Powel's original plan for "Powelton" and the division of the Powel and Baring estates, and ends in 1931 with the construction of the Sarah Van Rensselaer Hall, a women's dormitory for Drexel University. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the Powelton Village Historic District represents the arc of West Philadelphia's development from large early nineteenth-

century estates owned by a select few, to a suburban enclave for Philadelphia's growing middle class, which included industrialists and other entrepreneurs, many of whom owned businesses located along the edges, making these boundaries integral to the district's significance. Under Criteria C and D, the district reflects popular mid-nineteenth century suburban development patterns and is characterized by mid-to-late nineteenth century architectural styles, including an inventory of Italianate, Second Empire, Queen Anne, and other Revival styles. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the district includes works of many important Philadelphia architects, including Wilson Eyre, T.P. Chandler, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, Willis G. Hale, and Addison Hutton, among others.

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

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:07:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Mark Brack of the Powelton Village Civic Association and consultant Kathy Dowdell represented the nominator.
- Numerous property owners attended the review.
 - o Jacqueline Sykes noted her family ownership of two properties.
 - o George Poulin supported the nomination.
 - o Alina Macneal supported the nomination.
 - o Debra McCarty supported the nomination.
 - o Mary Pat Tumelty supported the nomination.
 - o Terrance Arter opposed the designation and requested that a portion of the 3800 block of Spring Garden Street be excluded from the district.
 - o Joan Weiner supported the nomination.
 - o Connie Lotz supported the nomination.
 - o Douglas Ewbank supported the nomination.
 - o Mike Lehman supported the nomination.
 - o Bruce Benedon supported the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub supported the nomination.
- Amy Lambert supported the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- There was discussion at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting about the importance of cultural significance, which can be more challenging to capture than architectural significance but is also important.
- The more recent cultural and social significance of the Powelton Village neighborhood is not addressed in the current nomination, which focuses on the earlier history and architecture of the neighborhood owing to the limited changes to the architecture during the twentieth century.
- Very early maps of Powelton Village showed Haverford Avenue as the northern boundary of the neighborhood, but subsequent development patterns indicated that Spring Garden Street was the northern boundary of Powelton Village.
- A nomination does not have to address every single aspect of significance for a property or district but is a chapter in a longer story of a neighborhood.
- An amendment or separate nomination could be submitted later that addresses the more recent cultural and social history of the Powelton Village neighborhood or to expand the boundaries of the district to include additional blocks if appropriate.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

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

ACTION: Ms. Carney moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the Powelton Village Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the following inventory amendments: the properties at 3829 Lancaster Avenue and 424 N. 33rd Street are reclassified as Non-contributing; and the properties at 3613 through 3631 Spring Garden Street are classified as Significant. Ms. Edwards seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ITEM: Powelton Village Historic District MOTION: Designate; Criteria A, C, D, E, and J MOVED BY: Carney SECONDED BY: Edwards					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards	X				
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	10				3

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 4501 POPLAR ST

Name of Resource: Stephen Smith Home

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Miron Poplar Realty LP

Nominator: Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

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

The nomination contends that the Stephen Smith Home satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. Under Criteria A and J, the nomination argues that the property housed an important Philadelphia institution that was among the earliest in the United States to provide residential care to elderly African Americans. Additionally, under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property is significant for its association with Hobart Calvin Jackson, the longtime administrator of the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons and a national leader in the administration of elderly care. The nomination makes no claims about architecture or style.

In 2015, the staff of the Historical Commission reviewed and rejected as incorrect and incomplete a nomination for the same two buildings. The staff concluded at that time that, although the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons was undoubtedly historical significant, the two subsidiary buildings proposed for designation, which were constructed later

than the institution's primary buildings and which were abandoned, in very poor condition, and slated for demolition, could not adequately represent the history of the site and did not merit designation as historic.

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 04:50:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Amy Lambert, George Poulin, and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Attorney Richard DeMarco, preservation consultant George Thomas, and property owner Colev Gestetner represented the property.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Lambert, Mr. Poulin, and Mr. Beisert summarized the historic significance of the property as outlined in the nomination.
- Mr. DeMarco stated that the poor condition of the property is relevant and should be a critical consideration of the Historical Commission when it determines whether to designate the property as historic. He stated that, if the Commission designates a property in this condition, it is then requiring the owner to maintain and restore the property, which is not feasible with this property. He stated that the property was made derelict by a City demolition that cut off the property from utilities, power, and heat, rendering it unusable and unrestorable. He stated that the Commission must consider the condition of the property, and also must consider that a prior nomination for the property was rejected by the Commission's staff as incorrect and incomplete in 2015. He explained that his client, the operator of the nursing home on the larger site, had to purchase this property from a speculator to ensure vehicular access to the nursing home, and that it was purchased in order to demolish the structures to have better access for the nursing home operation. He stated that the property is a source of nuisance activity and the owner continues to pay to secure the property. He opined that a designation of the property will lead to the owner returning to the Historical Commission with a financial hardship application. He stated that the near neighbors have concerns about the nuisance activity on the site.
- Mr. Thomas presented his slides outlining the reasons against designation of the property. He explained that the building is sealed and has no heat, no sewer access, and no central air. He described it as a remnant of a building that once functioned. He reiterated that the City condemned and demolished the central building on the site in 2009, which removed all of the heating connected to the subject building, leaving the subject building unable to be utilized. He explained that the Preservation Alliance submitted a nomination in 2014 for the property, which Mr. Farnham rejected as incorrect and incomplete in 2015, and suggested a state historic marker to convey the significance of the property. The following year, the nursing home

operation made plans to demolish the building but did not have the funds to do it at that time. He explained how the site came to be subdivided and how the City sold this property out from under the operator of the nursing home upon demolition of the central building, which forced the nursing home operator to buy the property from the speculator at twice the original cost in order to have access for staff, residents, and ambulances. He explained that the owner took steps necessary to prepare for demolition of the building but lacked the funds to do the demolition and instead had to mothball the building. Mr. Thomas showed photographs of the poor condition of the building. He stated that it is not within the nursing home's budget to make extreme repairs to the building to bring it back into use. He stated that the owner is constantly battling vandalism at the site. He discussed the suggestion by the Committee on Historic Designation that the site is significant for archaeological potential owing to the proximity of the former Olive Cemetery. He showed newspaper evidence that the remains had been removed from Olive Cemetery in 1923 and reinterred at Eden Cemetery. He noted also that excavations took place over the years, and a school was constructed on the former location of the cemetery. He stated that there is no public interest in designating the property, and that the nomination failed to document how the City's actions left the subject building abandoned and unusable. He stated that the nursing home is entirely dependent on Medicare funding, and that a designation of the property runs the risk of undermining the future of the nursing home.

- Mr. Gestetner, the property owner, described the nursing home operations and why they had to purchase this property. He explained that all residents at the facility are critically ill and that there are daily calls made to 9-1-1 for the residents, and that the property in question is necessary to provide proper ambulance and police access to the nursing home. He described the condition of the property at the time of purchase as being poor, with the buildings abandoned and criminal activity taking place in the building. He explained that upon purchase, money was invested to secure the building, but it was still abandoned, unusable, badly deteriorated, and with no possibility of connecting utilities. He stated that the building was not demolished because of financial constraints. He stated that Councilwoman Blackwell supported the mission of the nursing home to provide jobs and nursing care for residents of West Philadelphia. He stated that the nursing home facility does not have the budget to maintain this property.
- Mr. DeMarco reiterated that the Historical Commission needs to consider the impact of historic designation on the property owner, and that where regulation becomes overly oppressive, it becomes a taking.
- Mr. Poulin commented that the condition of the property is indicative of decades of disinvestment within African American communities. He suggested that the Historical Commission consider a compromise.
- Mr. DeMarco clarified that the 1901 infirmary building and the 1961 building are not separate, stand-alone buildings. He stated that there are no stairs in the 1901 building, and it would be nearly impossible to preserve one without the other, so the idea of preserving only the 1901 building is not feasible.
- Mr. Mattioni asked about preserving the 1901 building and excluding the 1961 building.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that the Historical Commission has not been provided evidence from an architect or qualified engineer as to the condition. She stated that the Historical Commission can technically designate ruins.

- Ms. Cooperman stated that the Historical Commission needs to determine what is in the public good. She noted that the Commission previously recognized the significance of Stephen Smith with the designation of his home. She opined that one interpretive plaque is inadequate to recognize the significance of this site.
 - o Ms. Washington agreed and asked about the feasibility of only preserving the 1901 infirmary building.
 - o Ms. Carney agreed that amending the designation to include only the 1901 infirmary building is preferable.
- Mr. Lech noted that a historic atlas shows an interior fire stair in the 1901 infirmary building, so unless it was removed, there is still an interior stair.
- Ms. Cooperman questioned if this is a public interest argument owing to the nursing home operations and the importance of that institution to the public.
- Mr. Lech suggested that designating only the 1901 infirmary building would reduce the financial hardship to the owner.
- Mr. Mattioni asked if designating only the 1901 infirmary building is within the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission may reduce a boundary proposed in a nomination, but it cannot expand a boundary.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, commented in support of the nomination.
- Deborah Gary commented that a state historic marker is not sufficient to represent history, and that partial demolition could be considered rather than complete demolition.
- Edward Dover, an adjacent neighbor, commented in support of designation of the former infirmary.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The institution known as the Stephen Smith Home was founded in the Society Hill neighborhood in 1864. Stephen Smith died in 1873. The Stephen Smith Home moved to its current location in 1881. The main historic buildings of the Stephen Smith have been demolished and replaced.
- The property includes two subsidiary buildings of the Stephen Smith Home, formerly the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons.
- Both buildings are abandoned, in poor condition, and were purchased with the intent of demolition to allow access to the nursing home facility which owns the property.
- The infirmary was constructed in 1901. The addition to the infirmary was constructed in 1961. The institution's main historic buildings were previously demolished.
- The nomination makes no claims about architecture or style.
- Amending the boundary to make the 1961 building non-contributing would allow for the Commission's staff to approve the demolition of the 1961 building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property housed an important Philadelphia institution that was among the earliest in the United States to provide residential care to elderly African Americans, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The property is significant for its association with Hobart Calvin Jackson, the longtime administrator of the Home for the Aged and Infirm Colored Persons and a national leader in the administration of elderly care, satisfying Criterion A.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4501 Poplar Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the 1961 Infirmary Addition considered non-contributing. Mr. Lech seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 2.

ITEM: 4501 Poplar St. MOTION: Designate; Criteria A and J; Infirmary Addition non-contributing MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Lech					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards					X
O'Donnell (DPP)		X			
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni		X			
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	6	2			5

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 06:10:40

ACTION: At 3:13 p.m., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Mattioni					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Thomas, Chair					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Dodds (DPD)	X				
Edwards					X
O'Donnell (DPP)	X				
Lepori (Commerce)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
Mattioni	X				
McCoubrey					X
Michel					X
Sánchez (Council)	X				
Washington	X				
Total	8				5

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission 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.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.

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.