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### 1. Address of Historic Resource

- **Street address:** 4058 Chestnut Street
- **Postal code:** 19104
- **Councilmanic District:** 3

### 2. Name of Historic Resource

**Historic Name:** 4058 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street

**Common Name:** 4058 Chestnut Street

### 3. Type of Historic Resource

- X Building
- [] Structure
- [] Site
- [] Object

### 4. Property Information

- **Condition:** [ ] excellent [ ] good [ ] fair [ ] poor [ ] ruins
- **Occupancy:** [x] occupied [ ] vacant [ ] under construction [ ] unknown
- **Current use:** Apartment House

### 5. Boundary Description

Please attach a plot plan and written description of the boundary. **SEE ATTACHED SHEET.**

### 6. Description

**SEE ATTACHED SHEET.**

Please attach a description of the historic resource and supplement with current photographs.

### 7. Significance

- Attach the Statement of Significance.  
  [See Attached Sheet]
- **Period of Significance (from year to year):** from 1872 to 1921
- **Date(s) of construction and/or alteration:** 1872-1876
- **Architect, engineer, and/or designer:** Unknown
- **Builder, contractor, and/or artisan:** Unknown
- **Original owner:** Thomas H. Powers
- **Other significant persons:** Unknown
**Criteria for Designation:**

The historic resource satisfies the following criteria for designation (check all that apply):

- (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; or,
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation; or,
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style; or,
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen; or,
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation; or,
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation; or,
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif; or,
- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community or City; or,
- (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.

### 8. Major Bibliographical References

Please attach a bibliography.  
SEE ATTACHED SHEET.

### 9. Nominator
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<tr>
<th>Name with Title</th>
<th>University City Historical Society</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th><a href="mailto:info@uchs.net">info@uchs.net</a></th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
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<td>Date</td>
<td>August 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
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<td>P.O. Box 31927</td>
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<td>(215) 387-3019</td>
</tr>
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City, State, and Postal Code: Philadelphia, PA 19104

Nominator ☐ is ☒ is not the property owner.
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5. BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION
The boundary description of the 4058 Chestnut Street is as follows:

ALL THAT CERTAIN lot or piece of ground with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, SITUATE on the South of Chestnut Street at a distance of 25 feet Eastward from the East side of 41st Street in the 27th Ward of the City of Philadelphia; thence extending Southward 93 feet to a point; thence Eastward 2 feet, 3 inches to a point; thence extending Southward 6 feet, 7-1/2 inches to a point; thence extending Eastward 22 feet, 9 inches to a point; thence extending Northward 41st Street 99 feet, 7-1/2 inches to a point on the said South side of Chestnut Street; thence extending Westward along the same 25 feet to the first mentioned point and place of the beginning. with the east side of 41st Street the first mentioned point and place of beginning.

BEING number 4058 Chestnut Street.

Lot No. 82
Tax Account No. BRT NO. 88-1603000

Figure 1. The lot numbers related to 4042-4060 Chestnut Street. Source: City of Philadelphia.
Figure 2. The boundary for the subject property is in blue. Source: Parcel Explorer.
6. ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION
Located on the southeast corner of Chestnut Street and 41st Street, 4058 and 4060 Chestnut Street comprise the east and west sides of a semi-detached twin that stands in a row of twin houses that comprise the Thomas H. Powers Development: 4046-4060 Chestnut Street. The houses stand three-and-one-half stories tall, each measure three bays across, and are built of primarily of red brick; however 4060 Chestnut Street has been parged with beige stucco. Originally, the main section of each house featured a side-gable roof with paired end chimneys and a central dormer. A five-bay service wing originally extended south from the main block, dropping from three to two stories in the terminal bay. Built in pairs, each wing had a shed roof that formed a gable with its adjoining neighbor. This gable ran perpendicular to the main roof and dropped to a low hip above the terminal bay. 4058 Chestnut Street retains its original two-over-two wooden sash windows, while 4060 Chestnut Street has vinyl replacement windows.

Stylistically, the Chestnut Street houses amount to a restrained interpretation of the Italianate. Their paneled doorway reveals, bracket-and-dentil cornices, and segmental-pediment dormers with paired, round-headed sash are all hallmarks of the style. In other respects, though, these buildings are simply refined versions of a standard Philadelphia type. Their facades consist of top-quality pressed brick laid in running bond with exceedingly thin mortar joints. While the distinctively Italianate features are rendered in wood, the lintels, sills, and raised basements are clad in smooth-faced sandstone. Other refinements include chamfers at the bottom of sills,
round-headed doorway arches built of thin-mortared soldier bricks, and ornamental iron gateways on marble thresholds across intervening alleyways.

All of this frontal finery contrasts with the stark treatment of the side walls. These are built of a softer brick and are blind on the main block. There are windows in the rear wings but these are smaller than those on the front and generally equipped with wood surrounds (stone lintels on basement windows are the exception). However, even the rear zone is not entirely devoid of ornament. A corbelled brick cornice on the three-story portion of the wing echoes the same feature on the rear wall of the main block, and the upper (frame) half of the two-story extension has Italianate brackets and window heads.

Accompanying photographs indicate the how these buildings have changed over time. While it is impractical to itemize all of these alterations, it is important to note the most significant ones. Like its neighbors at 4054 and 4056 Chestnut Street, the original two easternmost bays have been replaced by large tripartite casement windows featuring multi-pane wood frame windows and a classical window surround with fluted pilasters and reserved entablature. The corner house at 4060 Chestnut Street historically was commercial on the ground floor, however the first floor has been modified and expanded from a Philadelphia corner store configuration to a larger modern restaurant. Despite these and lesser alterations, the string of houses remains visually coherent. The buildings’ envelopes and massing have changed little. The two easternmost twins of the Thomas H. Powers Development have been demolished within the last two years and replaced by massive four-story frame and plywood student apartment housing.

Figure 4. Looking southwest. The buildings in the foreground, 4046-48 Chestnut Street, were demolished in 2016. Source: Oscar Beisert.
Figure 5. 4058 and 4060 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.

Figure 6. Ground floor of 4060 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.
Figure 7. Looking towards the cornice of 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.

Figure 8. Casement window on the ground floor of 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.
Figure 9. Entrance door of 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: University City Historical Society.
Figure 10. Door surround of the entrance at 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.

Figure 11. Dormer window at 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.
Figure 12. Ground floor window detail at 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.

Figure 13. Alleyway between 4056 and 4058 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.
Figure 14. Rear of 4058 and 4060 Chestnut Street. Source: Kelly E. Wiles.
7. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

No. 4058 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street is a significant resource that merits designation by the Philadelphia Historical Commission and inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Located on the south side of Chestnut Street in West Philadelphia, the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation a, c, d, g, and j.

(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;

(c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;

(d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;

(g) Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif; and

(j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community.

Figure 17. J.D. Scott’s 1878 Atlas of the 24th and 27th Wards, West Philadelphia. Philadelphia: J.D. Scott, 1878. Source: West Philadelphia Community History Center.

Figure 19. Walter S. Bromley’s 1892 Atlases of West Philadelphia’s 24th, 27th and 34th Wards. (Philadelphia: 1892). Source: West Philadelphia Community History Center.

Figure 22. Looking east toward the 4000 block of Chestnut Street. Source: University of Pennsylvania Archives.

Criteria C, D, and J

No. 4058 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street is one in a group of houses that represent a house type and evolution that speaks both to Philadelphia’s rich architectural legacy and tradition, as well as the cultural, economic, social or historical heritage of the West Philadelphia. Criteria C and J are related and equally important as the architectural style, as well as the cultural and social factors are related to the developer, Thomas H. Powers. The houses reflect the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and exemplify the cultural, economic, social and historical heritage of the community.

The restrained brick twins that Thomas H. Powers erected on the 4000 block of Chestnut Street in the early to mid-1870s represent a careful calculation on the part of their sponsor. Served by the recently completed Philadelphia City Horse Car Passenger Railway, which terminated one block to the west, these houses aimed to accommodate the sorts of white-collar commuters whose influx into West Philadelphia had fueled suburban development in the area for the last two decades. The wealthiest of the new arrivals inhabited large, freestanding villas on lots that spanned one-sixth of a city block or more. A notch down on the socio-economic ladder were capacious “double houses” like those designed by architect Samuel Sloan for elegant “terraces” that stretched south of Baltimore Avenue between 40th and 42nd Streets. Ample setbacks, porches, and yards gave such houses a distinctive suburban character despite their denser configuration. Finally, there were conventional row houses, concentrated locally either along the commercial corridor of Market Street or on narrow side streets that were largely devoid of architectural pretension and served a working-class population.

Powers eschewed all of these models. Instead, he favored genteel but closely spaced twins of a sort seldom seen the area. Similar buildings had cropped up in the northern reaches of Philadelphia in the last generation, especially toward the eastern end of Spring Garden. Powers
evidently believed that the 4000 block of Chestnut Street had become sufficiently urban and urbane by the early 1870s to support genteel rental housing that nodded slightly to suburban norms in its spacing and ornament (Italianate was the preferred mode for villas) but not in other respects. Renters, he must have reasoned, had little need for large yards but would appreciate the hallmarks of refinement in their houses’ size, brickwork, metalwork, and stone. The first sets of these twins were built at the eastern end of Powers’ tract in the early 1870s. By the end of the decade there were five such pairs, extending to 41\textsuperscript{st} Street. Behind them, a row of fifteen more modest row houses filled Powers’ property on the corresponding section of Sansom Street and a small but respectable freestanding house used remaining frontage on 41\textsuperscript{st} Street. Most of this development stands today but the Chestnut Street houses are its most distinctive element. The easternmost twin (4042-4044) was demolished in early 2016 to make room for a multi-unit apartment building. Ironically, perhaps, that token nod to suburban spacing has now become a liability.

**Historic Context—4058-4060 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street**

Thomas H. Powers, the eminent “Manufacturing Chemist” and real estate developer, purchased the larger parcel that encompass the lots now known as 4042-4060 Chestnut Street from William W. Keen on April 16, 1869 for the sum of $41,666.\(^1\) 4042 Chestnut Street was complete by August 31, 1869, when Thomas H. Powers purchased Policy No. 7508 for fire insurance from the Mutual Assurance Company. He paid $153 for a policy insuring a house worth $7500.\(^2\) Attached, 4044 Chestnut Street was completed at the same time and insured on the same day.\(^3\) 4046 Chestnut Street was complete by September 8, 1870, when Thomas H Powers purchased Policy No. 7590 for fire insurance from the Mutual Assurance Company.\(^4\) He paid $123 for a policy insuring a house worth $6,000. Attached, 4048 Chestnut Street was completed at the same time and insured on the same day.\(^5\)

G.M. Hopkins & Co.’s *Atlas of West Philadelphia including the 24th & 27th Wards of the City of Philadelphia* of 1872 verifies that the twins at 4042-4044 and 4046-4048 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street were completed.\(^6\) Between the publication of G.M. Hopkins & Co.’s *Atlas of West Philadelphia including the 24th & 27th Wards of the City of Philadelphia* in 1872 and the publication of J.D. Scott's 1878 Atlas of the 24th and 27th Wards, West Philadelphia in 1878, the twins at 4050-4052, 4054-4056, and 4058-4060 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street were completed.\(^7\)

---

1. Deed Poll: WWK to THP, 16 April 1869, Sheriff Deed Book No. JTO 229, p. 467, District Court Records, CAP.
Like with many of his projects, Thomas H. Powers no doubt commissioned both an architect and a contractor to complete Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street. While the records for this property are not available, Thomas H. Powers made plans to develop parcels on the North and South sides of Chestnut Street between 44th and 45th Streets in the late 1870s. In renewed agreement dated April 18, 1879, the Estate of Thomas H. Powers honored a previous contract with Abraham Ritter, a contractor of Philadelphia, to construct twenty houses on the south side of Chestnut Street and twenty-fourth to the north.

…agrees to complete for the said party of the first part in a good substantial and workmanlike manner with good material and according to the best art and skill and to deliver to the said party of the first part free and discharged of all claims liens or other incumbrances…

The agreement also specified that Abraham Ritter would use the “specification” of George W. Hewitt, Architect of Philadelphia. While these specific “Articles of Agreement” were found in the Johnston-Harris Papers at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, these are the type of papers that were usually filed in the manner of a deed. This indicates the type of architect used by Powers in his development project, also proving that he must of have had some influence over the design.

After the completion of the buildings, 4046-4060 Chestnut Street were used by Thomas H. Powers and later his estate as rental properties. The Estate of Thomas H. Powers continued to own the buildings that encompass complete the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street until April 1, 1921 when they were sold to Clarence Pennington.

---


9 Deed Poll: THPE to ICP, 1 April 1921, Sheriff Deed Book No. JMH 1150, p. 25, District Court Records, CAP.
Figure 24. Page One of “Policy No. 7590 of the Mutual Assurance Company,” issued 8 September 1870, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Source: Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
Figure 25. Page Two of “Policy No. 7590 of the Mutual Assurance Company,” issued 8 September 1870, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Source: Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
**Criterion A**

No. 4058 Chestnut Street is part of a twin at 4058-4060 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street has significant character, interest, and/or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the twin-type housing and the formation of West Philadelphia as a suburb.

Constructed between 1869-1872, the twin at 4058-4060 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street was represents a transitory period of development in West Philadelphia, as previous stated under Criterion J. Located immediately upon transportation venues to Philadelphia, the buildings are set upon the street in an urban format with a store at the corner. While these are built on the street, they also offer a suburban quality in that they are essentially twin-type buildings, representing a transitory period in the development of West Philadelphia. This is further justified in a historic context previously accepted by the Philadelphia Historical Commission—Appendix A: The Suburbanization in West Philadelphia: 1804-1870s.

The building at 4058 Chestnut Street of the Thomas H. Powers Development: Nos. 4046-4060 Chestnut Street was one of a group of twins commissioned by Thomas H. Powers, the eminent chemical magnate and real estate developer, as part of a larger development of the block, representing a twin-type. With the demolition and loss of Thomas H. Powers’ primary business buildings, the plants of Powers & Weightman, his mansion at the Falls of the Schuylkill, and much of the neighborhood he grew up in at 7th and Arch Streets, the extant real estate development projects completed by him gain additional importance in representing his accomplishments and commitment to Philadelphia. The old fashion aesthetic tone of the buildings, yet with an immediate proximity to public transportation represents both the traditional and business savvy Philadelphian that Thomas H. Power was in the mid-nineteenth century. This is further justified in a historic context previously accepted by the Philadelphia Historical Commission—Appendix B: Biography of Thomas H. Powers

**Criterion G**

Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area, which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif.

This building is one of ten houses that comprised 4042-4060 Chestnut Street, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as contributing resources within the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District. This building is one of eight houses that survive among the ten NRHP-listed properties. This building satisfies Criterion G, as it is part of and related to a distinctive area, which should be preserved according to an historic cultural and architectural motif, as prescribed by the NRHP.10

---
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Appendix A: The Suburbanization in West Philadelphia: 1804-1870s

The Roots of Suburbanization in West Philadelphia: 1804-1849

The earliest impetus for development and/or expansion of Philadelphia west of the Schuylkill River was invoked by the construction of the first permanent bridge at Market Street in 1804-05, which enabled greater use of the Philadelphia and Lancaster Turnpike, established nearly a decade before the bridge. Soon after these advancements, William Hamilton (1745-1813), grandson of the famous Philadelphia lawyer Andrew Hamilton, and heir to his great estate, became the earliest developer in West Philadelphia when he began subdividing parts of his 600-acre estate for the establishment of Hamiltonville (now Hamilton Village) between 1804 and 1809. Hamilton’s development extended the Philadelphia gridiron to his side of the Schuylkill River, and his subdivision was bound by Filbert (late Green) Street at the north to Woodland Avenue at the southeast, and from 32nd (late Mansion) Street at the west to 41st (late Till) Street. In order to promote his development, Hamilton prepared a map of the proposed development, which included lots, measuring roughly one-quarter of an acre fronting major east-west thoroughfares. The map was an early real estate development tool used to entice wealthy Philadelphians to consider moving westward.

11 Charles Ellet, Jr., A Map of the County of Philadelphia from Actual Survey, 1843.
While Hamilton’s subdivision did not lead to immediate dense suburbanization, development occurred as transportation modes expanded and population increased in Philadelphia. Wealthy citizens purchased large tracts of the subdivided land for use as their own private estates in the neighborhood of Chestnut and Walnut Streets between 37th and 40th Streets. Hamilton’s labors may not have established the suburban movement in West Philadelphia, but, at this early date, his genteel clientele planted footings in the area, early on making it an upper class suburb of estates.15

West Philadelphia expanded gradually during the first decades of the nineteenth century. Commercial and industrial development huddled close to the Schuylkill River in the neighborhood of Market Street, extending nearly ten dense blocks from the riverfront. A notorious string of taverns on Market Street supported the early commerce and industry of the river-adjacent area. While the wealthy had certainly planted roots in West Philadelphia between 1804 and 1850, a decided working class population formed a community in close proximity to the wealthy residents. A residential section in Hamilton Village in and around Market Street included streets of attached houses that existed for the working class population. The wealthy Philadelphians were generally drawn to the area because of its high elevation and open space. The working class presence, however, was circumstantial to the commerce and industry and only later did their desire to remain likely relate to familiarity that came with time.16

In 1844, the town of Hamiltonville, as well as the villages of Greenville, Powelton and Mantua to the north were incorporated as the Borough of West Philadelphia. The Borough became the

15 Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”
16 Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”
17 Dr. Broomall, N.W. Corner of 33rd and Chestnut, November 1, 1903, Jane Campbell Collection, HSP.
West Philadelphia District in 1851. The decade of organizing local government west of the Schuylkill came to a head with the incorporation of all governments within Philadelphia County into one municipal body—the City of Philadelphia. Nevertheless, the need for consolidation became evermore necessary in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, as many communities across the county underwent dramatic growth. The growing population and the subsequent development exceeded the capacities of the small municipalities to provide basic public services. Local police force was essentially non-existent in this early period of increased density. Consolidation was the only way to fix the problem as these areas physically joined due to the tremendous development that had occurred.¹⁸


¹⁹ Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”

Antebellum Philadelphia experienced incredible growing pains that exhausted much of the land between the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers by the time of the Civil War. Naturally, as the population steadily grew, this intensified development in West Philadelphia in the mid-nineteenth century. By 1850, the Market Street corridor was home to a vibrant population of working class people who served both the transshipment center and the workshop.¹⁹ Situated at the center of important roads, railroads, and the river, West Philadelphia was a major transshipment area. The aforementioned taverns included at least nine inns and/or hostelries within the ten dense blocks that comprised Market Street and served much of the transient shipping population as well as locals. Among these inns and hostelries was a continuation of Philadelphia’s then well-established calling card in domestic architecture—the attached row house, proving housing for the blacksmiths and wheelwrights that overwhelmed the immediate
population, but also including boat builders and ship chandlers in lesser quantity than the former trades. Development for this class was much like it was in Philadelphia proper—a modest, but respectable Federal style that persisted and aged to become familiar and comfortable.\(^{20}\)

While Philadelphia’s population had risen by nearly thirty percent between 1840 and 1850, but the gradual, pleasant incline did not prepare the municipality for the mass influx that was to come in the next decade.\(^{22}\) As the century opened in 1850 so did the floodgates of immigrants and other resident folk, leaving both old country and outlying farmlands for the promise that came with the industrial age. In the decade that spanned before the Civil War, Philadelphia experienced its greatest period of growth, reaching just over a 365 percent rise—from inhabitants numbering 121,376 in 1850 to 565,529 in 1860.\(^{23}\) While the permanent bridge of 1804 had been an early means of stabling estate suburbs, the density of Philadelphia’s once-quaint center was perhaps the great boon to the suburbanization of West Philadelphia that would occur between 1850 and 1880.\(^{24}\)

\(^{20}\) Jackson, *Market Street, Philadelphia*.


\(^{22}\) U.S. Census Population Schedule, 1850.


\(^{24}\) Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”
The desire for expansion also coincided fortuitously with the development of a system of omnibuses that provided transportation to commuters who lived in West Philadelphia but needed to arrive at their place of business in Philadelphia proper. These omnibuses, eventually replaced by horse car lines, represent the coming of the street railway to West Philadelphia, which enabled the greater development of the area for more than just a wealthy class.  

**The Early Stages of Suburbanization in West Philadelphia, 1850-1870**

After much success as a lawyer, John C. Mitchell built a three-story stone Italianate mansion at 3905 Spruce Street in 1850 (extant). While Mitchell orchestrated the construction of this house for his own use, he began dabbling in real estate development in the neighborhood of his new dwelling. Another important house of this period was designed and constructed the same year. The eminent Philadelphia architect, Samuel Sloan (1815-1884) was commissioned by railroad

---

builder, Charles Eastwick to construct his Italianate mansion—Bartram Hall, also in West Philadelphia, but no longer extant. Sloan would go on to design several other mansions for the important men of the day that desired a fashionable retreat from the city in West Philadelphia.\(^{27}\)

Aside from the small-scale nature of these developments, another important factor was location. Mitchell’s stone house, for example, stood on a lot in what was known as West Hamiltonville. As the working class population rose in Hamiltonville during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the stratification between the wealthy and the working man grew greatly, as the suburban development moved farther away from the working elements. This trend would increase towards the mid-century, as Philadelphians with means sought refuge from density. While development had crept in this direction in the 1840s, the third quarter of the nineteenth century would see the greatest stride; indeed, the true initial stride and establishment of West Philadelphia as one of the great early American suburbs. Like Mitchell and Eastwick, other wealthy Philadelphians built substantial houses and mansions in West Philadelphia or, more specifically, in this area away from density. The eminent financier, Anthony J. Drexel, also commuted to his office from his West Philadelphia mansion.

After the District of West Philadelphia was created in 1851, Samuel A. Harrison, a tile manufacturer, and Nathaniel B. Browne, a lawyer and landowner, embarked upon one of the early developments that would prove formative to the character and growth of West Philadelphia. The project included the design and construction of a series of buildings to the southwest of Hamiltonville. Having done some initial work in the area, Sloan was a desirable candidate to devise plans for a group of detached and semi-detached houses that would comprise Harrison’s and Browne’s development. While the use of the semi-detached house in this early period was for a wealthy to upper middle class clientele, it represents an early employment of the twin. Sloan designed more than twenty residences for Harrison and Browne between 1851 and 1856.\(^{28}\) These early designs include a row of eight attached houses in the 3900 block of Locust Street and a pair of detached houses at 3803 and 3805 Locust Street. These developments were in close proximity to the wealthier residents of Walnut and Spruce Streets. The “wealthier” citizenry included important doctors, lawyers, judges, and businessman, largely related to industrial and/or financial investments.\(^{29}\)

The advent of passenger transportation in West Philadelphia was the catalyst for the availability and plausibility of expanding the net of those interested in suburban homes. Established as early as 1833 in Philadelphia proper, the omnibus lines of West Philadelphia extended from the railroad station at the foot of Market Street across the Schuylkill into Philadelphia at fifteen minute intervals throughout the day and making its last trip of the day to West Philadelphia in the late evening. Horse cars on rails replaced these lines in 1858 and served specific streets of residential development as it expanded southwest.\(^{30}\)

---


\(^{29}\) Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”

\(^{30}\) Denhoff and Franklin, “West Philadelphia: The Basic History, Chapter 2.”

Through the 1850s a number of developments were completed that attributed to forms and styles seen later in the widespread development of the suburb that West Philadelphia became in later years. For example, one of the important projects of the era was the development of Hamilton Terrace, also attributed to Sloan. Extant to-date as an extension of 41st Street between Baltimore and Chester Avenues, the project included a carefully planned row of houses that made an unique and cohesive architectural expression, maintaining a variation of type, color, and massing by architectural style and whether attached, detached or semi-detached. The corner houses were fully detached, being sold as “Elizabethan cottages,” while the twins were “double villas in the classical manner.” European-inspired, but distinctly American in architectural style, these projects established a new suburban standard in West Philadelphia, which led to the popularization of suburban lifestyle.31

While slowed due to the Panic of 1857, land speculation and development continued in West Philadelphia through the 1860s. The pre-Civil War innovations of Sloan’s, attached, semi-detached and detached houses alike and in concert were further adapted to make room for more houses appealing to a wider audience of Philadelphians.32

Charles M.S. Leslie, an enterprising conveyancer and real estate agent gone developer, proved himself during the war years. Assembling a parcel as early as 1857, Leslie began construction of Woodland Terrace in 1861.33 Naturally, Leslie chose the name Woodland Terrace due to its

---

31 Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”
32 Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”
immediate proximity to the popular pleasure ground that The Woodlands Cemetery had become since its establishment in 1840. The houses, also attributed to Sloan, were built between April 1861 and June 1862. The twenty houses within Woodland Terrace appeared as ten large mansions in the Italianate style with carefully hidden entrances at the side, but within the main elevation. Some of the houses were unfinished when sold to carpenters, plasterers, and stair builders, who retained title until the work was completed. Leslie also sold five of the houses to individual buyers for the seemingly average price of $6,100 and later less money to manufacturers. And by 1870 only two buildings in Woodland Terrace were actually owner-occupied. This suggests that the projected clientele was not present for the quality level of Woodland Terrace. However, regardless of the profit made by Leslie, the twin motif, appearing as one large mansion, is a trend that caught on like a mania within Philadelphia’s world of real estate development. Similar “unified dwellings” were occupied by residents of like-backgrounds and professional endeavors, many of whom were merchants who lived in West Philadelphia and commuted to their offices in the city. Subsequent projects by Leslie included a nearby street of six twins known as Fountain Terrace and a set of five attached houses across from the Hamilton Terrace.

Leslie’s projects were generally developed in a very carefully executed manner; however, this was not the constant model to be found during the Civil War years. Most housing built west of 40th Street required an initial outlay of capital and control of a smaller parcel of land, which led to the early manner of plot division and house types with both detached and semi-detached buildings. These projects mimicked earlier, grander developments, using Italianate and Second Empire style details, which had come to represent fashionable sets of the period. In the 4000 block of Pine is an example of a small project of the period. The first houses in this block were 4000 and 4002 Pine Street, which were three-story, white stuccoed Italianate houses built between 1852 and 1856. Benjamin Knight and the successive generation occupied the house at 4000 Pine Street from the time it was built until 1910. At 4002 Pine Street, Edward C. Warne, a wholesale jeweler, was also a real estate investor. Both represent the type of individuals who were settling in West Philadelphia. Mitchel, earlier, commissioned the design and construction of another cohesive row of buildings at 4009-4018 Pine Street, which included a design that also mimics earlier, architecturally cohesive forms. Residents included a successful contractor in one of the center houses.

The eastern section of old Hamiltonville was also under development during the 1860s. The old estate lots were subdivided and new houses, including large but like row houses and twins, were put up.

New residents in this part of West Philadelphia were less exclusively wealthy and native born, though the new developments continued primarily to accommodate
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heads of house hold who worked the central city rather than those were dependent on the local economy.37

Another important developer emerged between 1868 and 1878. Annesley R. Govett, a lumber merchant and West Philadelphia resident, completed three major projects during this period, which included an entire square of houses between Walnut and Sansom, and 34th and 36th Streets; one block along Spruce Street between 37th and 38th; and another between Pine Street and Woodland Avenue. Govett was careful in his execution; although, in a different way than Leslie had been, as these projects involved linking the quality of the house to the most desirable of his locations. His house type also varied including middle to working class houses, set upon small streets and alleys in some cases. In several cases, Govett would negotiate the sale of an entire row to a builder, including not only covenants on payment of the mortgage and terms of construction, but also design restrictions including set-back from the street. The builder would then either construct the buildings and then sell them to individuals or perhaps pass the project on to a second builder and sometimes a third. Partnerships were sometimes created. This was a mortgage financed building practice known in Philadelphia as bonus building. The practice is described extensively in the nomination for the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places for 3612-28 Lancaster Avenue, which was filed with the Philadelphia Historical Commission in the Spring of 2015.

By the 1870s, the housing boom included large, dense housing developments west of 42nd Street. Developments continued to emulate elements seen in earlier developments like Woodland Terrace, but were largely downsized in architectural effect, features and materials. The 1870s saw a widespread extension of the Philadelphia gridiron over vacant tracts of land. Landholders subdivided their land and in many cases their mansions were demolished for tracts of houses. It is during this period that the standardization of development really takes hold. This was shown by some of Govett’s work, but in a less varied fashion and appealing to a solidly middle class clientele. Repetition in design, plans and architectural motifs resonates with trends that suburbanization of the post-1880 period took on for the completion of large-scale development projects.

Among the larger projects of the early 1870s, several blocks of both Lombard Street (now Larchwood) and Osage Avenue, between 43rd and 45th Streets, were developed as part of a planned subdivision that included multiple blocks. Unlike earlier projects that encompassed one to two blocks or a single solid city block, these projects involved the design and plan of a neighborhood- and/or subdivision-like motifs as we know it today, rather than a single street or a terrace. Such developments required an extensive outlay of capital for procurement of land, construction, and paying debts. Large parcels near transit systems were ripe for this type of development and these early developers were seeking new ways to profit on a larger scale and make their projects feasible as the supply and demand of land of West Philadelphia saw a dramatic increase in property value. These larger developments took the chance of building beyond established neighborhoods because they were confident that the close proximity to wealth and transit would attract the type of buyer who could afford the new housing. The developers of this period profited and suffered from the great change in development that this

37 Miller and Siry, “The Emerging Suburb.”
period witnessed, as the older, smaller development project types faded away and newer, larger ones traded architectural variation for the demand that dramatic rises in population, as well as prosperity in Philadelphia at large required.
Appendix B: Biography of Thomas H. Powers

Daguerreotype of Thomas H. Powers38 Courtesy the Rosenbach Museum and Library.

Thomas H. Powers (1812-1878)
A birthright Quaker of Philadelphia, Thomas Henry Powers was born on October 17, 1812, one of two children of Thomas and Susan (Pearson) Powers. However, due to the early demise of his parents, who lived at 17 North Seventh Street, he was under the care of his aunts, Mary and Martha B. Pearson—his mother’s sisters, who were mantua makers and operated a dry goods store at the above-referenced address of his parents.39

At seven years old Powers was enrolled in the Ludwick School, once located in the 600 block of Walnut Street. Having shown a great aptitude in Science, Powers first apprenticed with Daniel B. Smith in 1828, who operated a pharmacy at Arch and Sixth Streets. Shortly after Powers’ apprenticeship, Smith entered into partnership with William Hodgson, Jr., an important pharmacist and chemist. Hodgson had recently purchased the “celebrated establishment” of John Bell & Co., late of Oxford Street in London. The two businessmen formed D.B. Smith & William Hodgson, Jr., which survived for nearly two decades until it was taken over by Bullock & Crenshaw in 1848.40

Powers attended the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, from which he graduated in 1833. Around this time he inherited $2,000 from a wealthy cousin, which would eventually aid him in his business ventures and allow him to care for his elderly aunts. At the same he also left the Quaker fold and became an Episcopalian which undoubtedly also help him in business. In 1835, Powers was elected a trustee of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, a post he served in for

roughly six years. After graduation, Powers continued working for Smith & Hodgson, where he eventually became a minor partner. During this time, the nascent pharmaceutical world was constantly undergoing changes and development, which led to the replacement of opium with a more refined version, morphia, as a major narcotic. Understanding that the manufacture of this drug could be a lucrative business, Powers proposed manufacturing to his partners, Smith and Hodgson, but the risk seemed to high to the otherwise solid concern.

In 1836, John Farr, an established chemical manufacturer, took an interest in the work of Powers, which led to his removal from Smith & Hodgson to work for Farr. The firm of John Farr & Co. had been founded on Coates Street, above Fourth, in which Farr’s nephew also worked—Mr. William Weightman. An earlier concern, Farr & Kunzi, also manufactured chemicals and had a solid reputation. Powers dedicated all of his energy to the business for several years, allowing, in part, the reputation of the firm to growth rapidly.

In 1841, Powers married Anna Matilda Cash, together having two children—only one of which, Mary Powers, would survive to adulthood. Also in 1841, John Farr & Co. became Farr, Powers, & Weightman, which evolved to Powers & Weightman in 1847 at the death of Farr. The company’s manufactory was removed from Northern Liberties to the Falls of the Schuylkill. One of the great successes of the firm was the more economic manufacture of alkaloids of cinchona barks in a condition of purity, for which Powers was eventually recognized by the Franklin Institute with a Gold Medal in 1874.

Powers & Weightman manufactured a number of products including the following chemicals, drugs and dyes: Acetanilid, Acetone, Butyric Acid, Chromic Acid, Citric Acid, Hydrobromic Acid, Hydrocyanic Acid, Muriatic & Nitric Acides, Sulphuric Acid, Tannic Acid, Tartanic Acid, Aloin, Alum, Ammonia Salts, Aqua Ammonia, Antimony Salts, Apioi, Barium Salts, Blue Mass, Calcium Salts, Calomel, Camphor-Refined, Carbon Bisulphide, Chloroform, Cinchon-Alkaloids & Salts, Codeine, Collodion, Copperas, Copper Salts, Ether, Ethyl Salts, Gold Chloride, Gold Oxide, Iodine, Iodoform, Iron Salts, Lead Salts, Lithium Salts, Lunar Caustic, Magnesium Salts, Manganese Salts, Mercury Salts, Morphine, Oils, Pills, Potash, Potassium Salts, Salts (medicinal), Silver Salts, Styrchnine, and Tin Salts.

Mary Powers married James Campbell Harris in 1869 and the young couple lived with the Powers at 1607 Walnut Street, then the most fashionable part of the city. Powers died in 1878, leaving the Weightman as the sole chemist, manufacturer, and financier of the firm. Powers & Weightman merged with Rosengarten & Sons in 1905, which were eventually purchased by Merck & Co.
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Miniature Portrait Presumed to be Thomas H. Powers.  

Advertisement showing the factory complex built 1825-1876 between 9th, Parrish, Brown, and Darien Streets.

View showing the laboratory complex of processing plants and storage sheds established in 1848 on Ridge Avenue near Schuylkill Falls (i.e., East Falls).