

**THE MINUTES OF THE 766TH STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 JUNE 2026, 9:00 A.M.  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET, WITH REMOTE OPTION ON ZOOM  
ZACHARY FRANKEL, CHAIR**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

Mr. Frankel, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and announced the presence of a quorum. The following Commissioners joined him:

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Zachary Frankel, Chair (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)	X		Arrived 9:16am
Ibriz Muhammad (Commerce Department)	X		Arrived 9:18am
Donna Carney (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Thomas Holloman (City Council)	X		
Kyle O'Connor (Department of Public Property)	X		
John P. Lech (Department of Licenses & Inspections)	X		
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C, Architectural Committee Chair (Architect)	X		
Stephanie Michel (Community Organization)	X		
Franz Rabauer	X		
Robert Thomas, AIA (Architectural Historian)	X		
Matthew Treat (Department of Planning and Development)	X		

The meeting was held in person at 1515 Arch Street, with the option for applicants and the public to participate via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

- Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kristin Hankins, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Heather Hendrickson, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Ted Maust, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Josh Schroeder, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Alex Till, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the meeting in person:

- Annie Liang-Zhou, University of Pennsylvania

Anthony Falcone  
Arielle Harris, RePoint  
Barbara Hoekje, Ridge Park Civic Association  
Cheryl Feldman, Ridge Park Civic Association  
Erin Wiser, Heritage Consulting  
Hannah Rosenberg, SGRA  
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City  
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department  
Mark Rubin  
Michael Phillips, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Misha Wyllie  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance  
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown  
Amy Cousins  
Andrea Salomon  
Claire Donohue  
Dave Sharrow  
David Traub, Save Our Sites  
Della Langan  
Diane Hedrich  
Emma Dooling  
George Poulin  
Jan Weinstock  
Jay Farrell  
Jim Lynch  
Katherine Missimer, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Kathy Dowdell  
Kenton Goo  
Kevin Michals  
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Lexi Smith  
Lori Arnold  
Marlene Schleifer, Ridge Park Civic Association  
Maurica Washington  
Michaelle Bond  
Nancy Pontone  
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society  
Paul Toner, Esq.  
Phyllis Rudi  
Rev. Richard Brown  
Rustin Ohler, HDOA  
Ryan Solimeo, HDOA  
Sally Linnett  
Sara Stroman  
Sarai Flores  
Shannon Thompson  
Stephen Tornone  
Steven Peitzman

Suzanna Barucco  
Tina Krovetz  
Trinity Green  
Yuhua Wang

DRAFT

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 765TH STATED MEETING, 8 MAY 2026**

**START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:05:46

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Frankel asked the Commissioners, staff, and members of the public if they had any suggested additions or corrections to the minutes of the preceding meeting of the Historical Commission, the 765<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting, held 8 May 2026. No comments were offered.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 765<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 May 2026. Ms. Michel seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 765<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the PHC</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adopt minutes</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Thomas</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Michel</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair					X
Muhammad (Commerce)					X
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

## **REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2026**

### **AGENDA**

#### **ADDRESS: 4238-40 CHESTER AVE**

Proposal: Construct eight townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: SHRW Clark Park LLC

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: Undeveloped land

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 7/12/2024

Staff Contact: Alex Till, [alexander.till@phila.gov](mailto:alexander.till@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes constructing eight houses at 4238-40 Chester Avenue in the Southeast Spruce Hill Historic District. The site is currently an open lot that is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. Therefore, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the undeveloped site is review-and-comment only, meaning that the Historical Commission and its advisory Architectural Committee may offer non-binding comments on the application at public meetings, but may not approve or deny it.

Each of the proposed buildings will be four stories tall with a garage entrance on the first floor and a tall mansard roof on the fourth. They will be primarily clad with charcoal colored Hardie plank siding and composite metal panels, with a small amount of brick around each entryway. Each building will also feature a roof deck with pilot house. Mansard roofs are plentiful on other buildings in the historic district, but the proposed mansards are much taller. The new buildings will be located on the boundary of the historic district though there are views of the sides and rear from within the district.

#### **SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct eight townhouses.

#### **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 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.*
  - The new structures will be compatible with the overall size and scale of the historic district.
  - The new structures will not be compatible with the massing and architectural features of the historic district. The dark-colored, contemporary cladding materials are incompatible, and the mansards are out of proportion with the nearby historic houses.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The application does not satisfy Standard 9. The mansards are too tall and the cladding materials are inappropriate. In addition, the application should include more streetscape renderings and photographs showing the proposed houses in context with the historic buildings in the historic district.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:06:18**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites suggested that additional views showing the site in context with the surrounding buildings would be helpful.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The site at 4238-40 Chester Avenue is currently an open lot that is classified as non-contributing in the historic district. The Historical Commission has “review and comment” jurisdiction only over this application.
- The application was revised after receiving comments from the Architectural Committee. Revisions include redesigning the shape and overhang of the mansards and changing their cladding material.
- The proposed new houses for the site fit within the general character and scale of buildings in the district, but the proportions of the mansards are too tall and the extended first floors with garages are not in keeping with the character of the district.
- Removing the top portions of the mansards that serve as a parapet for the roof decks and replacing them with railings would be one way to address the mansard height and would permit easier maintenance.
- The proposed materials used contain too much dark-colored siding and should incorporate more brick or masonry.
- The pilot houses could be redesigned with a sloped roof to make them less obtrusive.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application partially satisfies Standard 9. The new buildings will be compatible with the overall size and scale of the historic district but will not be compatible with the massing and architectural features of the historic district. The dark-colored, contemporary cladding materials are incompatible, and the mansards are out of proportion with the nearby historic houses.

**ADDRESS: 2108 SANSOM ST**

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Matthew Germinaro and Kate Hanlon

Applicant: Adam Zangrilli, Zangrilli Design

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, [theodore.maust@phila.gov](mailto:theodore.maust@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes constructing a rooftop addition on a two-story former carriage house that is classified as contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

The application includes preliminary floor plans and a section drawing showing a mansard roof treatment at the third-floor level and a partial fourth floor with a roof deck set back from the front elevation.

Renderings suggest the appearance of the building with the proposed addition but appear to have been produced using generative artificial intelligence and depict inconsistent proportions, window configurations, and the existing building's relationship to surrounding buildings. Given the discrepancies between these images, it is difficult to evaluate the overall visual impact of the proposed work.

In 2018, the Historical Commission approved a rooftop addition to this property proposed by a previous owner, which included a third floor set back 11 feet, 3 inches. A roof deck and pilot house on top of the addition were to be set back an additional 12 feet, 6¼ inches. That application went through various iterations with the aim of minimizing the visibility before being approved by the Historical Commission.

The Historical Commission has approved small additions and roof decks on a number of former carriage houses in this historic district. Generally, approved rooftop additions or decks have been set back from the primary façade to mitigate visibility. In one exception at 2110 Chancellor St, where the size of the lot precluded a setback, the additional third floor was designed in a contemporary style to differentiate it from the historic building.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Construct third floor, partial fourth floor, roof deck and pergola.

**STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:**

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

- *Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*
  - The use of a mansard roof may create a false sense of historical development that does not reflect the true history of the building.
- *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.*
  - The section drawing suggests the height of the proposed third floor is in scale with the existing buildings, but the quality of the other images makes this compatibility difficult to fully evaluate.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
  - The third floor of the addition as proposed would be highly visible and, depending on the setback of the fourth-floor elements, they may also be visible from Sansom Street. A visibility study should be included with a future application for final approval.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted 6 to 0 to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:16:50

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- No one represented the application.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The third-floor addition, as proposed, would be visible from the public right-of-way.
- A setback from the front elevation, similar to the one reviewed and approved in 2018, would allow the project to meet the Standards.
- If a third-floor mansard is found to be compatible in terms of massing, it should be more contemporary in style to differentiate it from the historic building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The submitted renderings show an addition that is not sufficiently differentiated from the historic building and thus does not satisfy Standards 3 or 9.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the in-concept application, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 2108 Sansom St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

**ADDRESS: 3331 POWELTON AVE**

Proposal: Legalize window replacement and masonry work

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Yuhua Wang and Andrew Jefferson Xiao

Applicant: Yuhua Wang

History: 1883

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Powelton Village Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/2022

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes legalizing windows installed and masonry work completed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit at 3331 Powelton Avenue. This residential property is located at the corner of Powelton Avenue and N. 34<sup>th</sup> Street. Owing to its location, the front and side facades are visible from the public right-of-way. Most existing windows were non-historic, but some may have dated to original construction.

In June 2025, the staff was notified of exterior work on the property, specifically the removal of multiple window sashes and masonry infill on the third floor. The staff communicated with the owner and advised them that future window replacement or exterior masonry work would require the Historical Commission's approval. Several months later, despite this guidance, the Commission's staff observed that new vinyl windows had been installed throughout the building and the original wood brickmolds were removed for installation of the new windows. Third-floor rear windows were built down, and smaller windows were installed. Since the third-floor windows' plank frames had been removed, it also appears that a steel lintel may have been installed.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted work on 2 May 2026. Soon thereafter, the applicant was made aware of the violations on the property, prompting this request for legalization. The property is licensed for eight rental units. Owing to the fact that the building has more than two units, a building permit is always required to replace windows regardless of whether it is designated as historic or not. In this instance, because the property is designated as historic, a building permit and the Historical Commission's approval is always required to replace windows.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- Legalize windows installed and masonry completed without a permit or approval.

**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.*
  - The new vinyl windows do not match the old windows in design and the brickmolds are missing. Brick infill, pointing and steel lintel installation on the third-floor windows was poorly done and does not appear compatible with historic building. This application fails to satisfy Standard 6.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:23:08

**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Property owner Yuhua Wang represented the application and spoke at length about the circumstances of the window replacement and masonry work.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- George Poulin spoke against approval of the legalization application.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The applicant's proposal to replace the historic wood brickmolds but maintain the vinyl replacement windows in place does not meet the Historical Commission's requirements for replacement windows on primary facades.
- Most of the windows were replaced with vinyl windows prior to the designation of the property as historic in 2022, but original brickmolds were still extant along with several Queen Anne windows and a few other windows on the west elevation. The historic brickmolds and windows were removed by the applicant during the recent window replacement activity.
- The vinyl replacement windows are smaller than the original windows and do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in terms of details and material.
- The build down of the third-floor rear window openings may not resolve the water infiltration issue from the roof. It is possible that the cause is unrelated to the window size and location.
- The applicant would benefit from engaging a preservation architect, preservation contractor, or window company that specializes in historic windows to resolve the violation.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 6, as the new vinyl windows do not match the old windows in design and the original brickmolds were removed. The brick infill, pointing and steel lintel installation on the third-floor windows was poorly done and is not compatible with historic building.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Holloman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 3331 Powelton Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Denial</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Holloman</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 20 MAY 2026**

**ADDRESS: 459 ROXBOROUGH AVE**

Name of Resource: Galilee Baptist Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Galilee Baptist Church

Nominator: Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, [daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov](mailto:daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the Galilee Baptist Church at 459 Roxborough Avenue as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 14-1004(1) of the Philadelphia Code. The nomination contends that Galilee Baptist Church satisfies Criterion J by exemplifying the cultural, social, and historical heritage of community. The Galilee Baptist Church has been an important Black community institution in the Roxborough/Manayunk neighborhood for 125 years.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 459 Roxborough Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 459 Roxborough Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:47:39

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Rev. Richard Brown represented the property owner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- None.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- Galilee Baptist Church has been an important Black community institution in the Roxborough/Manayunk neighborhood for 125 years.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Galilee Baptist Church satisfies Criterion J by exemplifying the cultural, social, and historical heritage of community.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 459 Roxborough Avenue satisfies Criterion for Designation J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 459 Roxborough Ave</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate, Criterion J</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

**ADDRESS: 132 N 10TH ST**

Name of Resource: Tetlow Manufacturing Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Teresa C. and Ronald M. Lee

Nominator: Annie Liang-Zhou

Staff Contact: Alex Till, [alexander.till@phila.gov](mailto:alexander.till@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 132 N. 10th Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The five-story brick commercial building was constructed c. 1885 by Henry Tetlow as the factory of the Tetlow Manufacturing Company, an

early cosmetics manufacturer. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D. Henry Tetlow introduced a number of influential changes to the cosmetics industry in the nineteenth century including his discovery of the use of zinc oxide as a non-toxic and inexpensive base for face powders. For its association with Tetlow and the history of the cosmetics industry in America, the property satisfies Criterion A; it has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation, and is associated with the life of a person significant in the past. In addition, the property satisfies Criterion D because it is a remarkably intact example of a late nineteenth-century industrial building that embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate and Romanesque styles.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 132 N. 10th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 132 N. 10<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 00:51:22

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Annie Liang-Zhou represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property at 132 N. 10th Street was the location of the Tetlow Manufacturing Company factory from 1885 to 1922.
- Henry Tetlow and the Tetlow Manufacturing Company had a significant influence on the cosmetics industry in America and the development of consumer culture and the growing impact of women as an economic force.
- The Tetlow Manufacturing Company building is an important surviving example of late nineteenth-century industrial architecture.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion A for its association with Henry Tetlow and the history of the cosmetics industry in America.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion D as a remarkably intact example of a late nineteenth-century industrial building that embodies distinguishing characteristics of late nineteenth-century architectural styles that feature round arches.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 132 N. 10<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Carney seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 132 N 10<sup>th</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria A and D</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Carney</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

**ADDRESS: 5604 N 5TH ST**

Name of Resource: National Bank of Olney

Review: Designation

Property Owner: Roselia Marquez Torres and Hue Ton

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Ted Maust, [theodore.maust@phila.gov](mailto:theodore.maust@phila.gov)

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 5604 N. 5th Street, historically the National Bank of Olney, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The two-story, Art Deco-style cast-stone bank building was constructed in 1927 and 1928. The nomination contends that the property meets Criteria for Designation C and D, that it reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies distinguishing characteristics of that style. The nomination claims that the bank represents the shifting trends of the design of neighborhood banks away from classical models toward a more modern form known as the Art Deco style during the late 1920s. The nomination further argues that the building is eligible under Criterion for Designation E – is the work of an architectural firm whose designs have significantly influenced the development of the city, state, or nation – owing to the national prominence of the architects, Simons, Brittain & English, as specialists in designing banks, especially for small or medium-sized towns.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5604 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5604 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:58:30**

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Maust presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The nomination persuasively argues for the relevance of the architecture firm of Simons, Brittain, & English, though it has previously been relatively unheralded.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property reflects the evolving design language of banks in the late 1920s, and satisfies Criterion for Designation C.
- The building embodies the style which came to be known as Art Deco, satisfying Criterion for Designation D.
- The building is the work of the firm of Simons, Brittain, & English, whose bank designs significantly influenced the architectural development of communities in Philadelphia and around the country, satisfying Criterion for Designation E.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 5604 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Michel seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 5604 N 5<sup>th</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria C, D, and E</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Michel</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

**ADDRESS: 4889 UMBRIA ST**

Name of Resource: Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Kerd Associates with Genesis Properties and GMH Communities

Nominator: Ridge Park Civic Association

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

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 4889 Umbria Street in Roxborough and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Buildings associated with the former Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company stand on the site. The nomination proposes designating the older buildings along Umbria Street, the larger one-story manufacturing building and the smaller power plant, both of which were constructed in 1926 and 1927. The nomination excludes from its boundary the newer buildings along Lemonte Street and the newer beer distributorship building and vacant land along Parker Avenue. The nomination contends that the older Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company buildings are significant under Criterion J for their role in Manayunk's textile industry. The nomination claims that the buildings are significant under Criterion E for their association with architect and engineer William Dyer. The nomination also asserts that the complex of buildings satisfies Criterion H because it is a long-established and familiar visual feature of the Manayunk neighborhood.

The property is currently being redeveloped, and the equitable property owners have submitted a letter stating that they would not oppose the designation of the two buildings if the boundary is amended to exclude the small amount of open space at the rears of the buildings.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the nominated portion of the property at 4889 Umbria Street satisfies Criterion for Designation J, but not Criteria E and H.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted 4 to 0 with 1 abstention to recommend that the property at 4889 Umbria Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, H, and J and to express no objection to amending the boundary of the designation to include the buildings only, with no open land, as requested by the property owner.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:05:18

**PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Paul Toner, consultant Oscar Beisert, and Cheryl Feldman and Marlene Schleifer of the Ridge Park Civic Association represented the nomination.
- Attorney Michael Phillips represented the property owner.

**DISCUSSION:**

- Mr. Phillips stated that his clients would not oppose the designation of the buildings if the boundary was revised to exclude the open space at the rears of the buildings.
- Mr. Thomas stated that he supports revising the boundary to include the buildings only, without any open space.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that revising the boundary would be acceptable because industrial buildings often have no buffer or open space around them, unlike many

residential and institutional buildings.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Krista Gebbia of the Chestnut Hill Conservancy supported the nomination.
- Sara Stroman supported the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman supported the nomination.
- Barbara Focia supported the nomination.
- Arielle Harris supported the nomination.
- Tina Krovetz of the Ridge Park Civic Association supported the nomination.

**HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company manufacturing building and power plant were constructed in 1926 and 1927.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company buildings are significant under Criterion J for their role in Manayunk’s textile industry.
- The Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company buildings are significant under Criterion E for their association with architect and engineer William Dyer.
- The Manayunk Plush Manufacturing Company buildings satisfy Criterion H because it is a long-established and familiar visual feature of the Manayunk neighborhood.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4889 Umbria Street satisfies Criteria for Designation E, H, and J and to designate it as historic with the revised boundary including the buildings only and no open space, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 4889 Umbria St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Designate, Criteria E, H, and J, with revised boundary</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Washington</b>					
<b>VOTE</b>					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O’Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **ADDRESS: 428-34 N 4TH ST**

Name of Resource: National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Mark H. Rubin

Nominator: Misha Wyllie

Staff Contact: Alex Till, alexander.till@phila.gov

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 428-34 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The two-story commercial building was constructed in 1966-67 to serve as a union hall for the National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, which owned the property until 1990. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The former union hall was constructed amid widespread demolition of the surrounding neighborhood as part of the Callowhill East Redevelopment Project, and thus the nomination argues that it exemplifies the economic and political heritage of the community in the era of urban renewal, meeting Criterion J. Addressing Criterion D, the nomination cites the post-war turn to Modern architecture in the United States and contends that this building reflects the built environment of that era. Finally, the nomination cites Criterion C and describes the subject property as embodying the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style—New Formalism.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the property at 428-34 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 428-34 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING:** 01:26:35

#### **PRESENTERS:**

- Mr. Till presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Misha Wyllie represented the nomination.
- Attorney Michael Phillips, property owner Mark Rubin, realtor Anthony Falcone, architect Stuart Rosenberg, and historic preservation consultant Erin Wiser represented the property owner.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

- Ms. Wyllie summarized the nomination and why she believes the property is worthy of designation. She emphasized that she believes there is room for potential development on the lot without sacrificing the building.
- Mr. Phillips requested that he be allotted more than the usual 10 minutes to give a robust response to the nomination. He described the impact of a designation as conflicting with the public interest and stated that Gift of Life, an organ transplant non-profit, has an agreement to purchase the property to expand its mission to facilitate organ transplants in Philadelphia and that the subject property is uniquely situated to fulfilling this goal. To that end, he introduced his witnesses to comment in response to the proposed nomination, Messrs. Rubin, Falcone, and Rosenberg, and Ms. Wiser.

- Mr. Phillips responded to a Commissioner's question asking about the timing of the acquisition of the subject property by Gift of Life. Mr. Phillips stated that the agreement overall is confidential but that they are in the final stages of the purchase.
- Mr. Rubin recounted his past work as a developer helping to restore several historic buildings in the city. He stated that the subject property has been used as his personal office space since he purchased it in 1993. He described the agreement he has with Gift of Life to sell it the property so that it may use it to expand its programming and how the property would be ill-suited and difficult to renovate and reuse as is. He explained that Gift of Life is unwilling to pursue the purchase if the property is designated as historic.
- Mr. Falcone summarized the real estate potential of the subject property. He described the building as needing a "gut rehab" to accommodate any potential new commercial tenant and suggested it would be quite difficult to find a buyer who would not seek to demolish the existing building to develop the site.
- Mr. Rosenberg summarized the existing building's footprint and current use compared to the allowed zoning in the area. He also provided several mock-up architectural renders for potentially constructing a new building on the site and explained how the site cannot be efficiently utilized unless the existing building is removed. He additionally described the challenges with working around the existing building, owing to its central placement on the lot.
- Ms. Wiser argued against the subject property's architectural significance. She described alterations to the windows and storefront area as negatively impacting its integrity and challenged the nomination's argument that it is an example of New Formalism, owing to its small size and vernacular nature. She also compared it unfavorably to other, more notable examples of mid-century architecture in Philadelphia and argued that it would be difficult to adaptively re-use the building under the Historic Tax Credit program.
  - Ms. Cooperman responded to many of Ms. Wiser's points, noting that the Committee on Historic Designation cited the imperfect argument for New Formalism and asserting that it is a smaller scale, vernacular example of the style. She also pointed out that Ms. Wiser's arguments against significance mostly focused on the requirements for a National Register nomination and that nominations to the Philadelphia Register are evaluated differently.
- Mr. Phillips summarized the owner's position that the building is not significant and that designating it would run counter to the public interest by preventing Gift of Life from utilizing the property to advance its mission.
- Mr. Thomas commented that the property does meet at least one Criterion for Designation but acknowledged that the argument for not designating it in the public interest is compelling.
- Mr. Thomas, Ms. Cooperman, and Mr. McCoubrey commented that they would like to see some kind of guarantee that, if the Historical Commission declines to designate the property owing to promote the reuse of the property in the public interest, the expansion of Gift of Life to the property will move forward.
  - Mr. Rubin and Mr. Phillips reiterated that Gift of Life wants to purchase the property to expand its premises to further its mission and currently has an agreement of sale in place to buy the property.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if they could choose to designate the property now with the condition that it be withdrawn at such a time when concrete building plans are in place.
  - Leonard Reuter clarified that, if the Historical Commission chose not to

designate the property, it would then no longer have any authority to impose any conditions on it. However, the Law Department may be able to enter into an agreement with the property owner to ensure that the property is used to further the non-profit's mission if it is not designated.

- Ms. Washington, Mr. Frankel, Ms. Cooperman, Mr. Reuter, Mr. Phillips, and Mr. Rubin debated the best way to ensure the property would only be demolished for Gift of Life to expand its operations and not for any other reason. The Commissioners asked if they could be provided with evidence of Gift of Life's development intent in the form of a zoning approval or other concrete plans within a certain amount of time.
  - Mr. Rubin and Mr. Reuter highlighted that the issue with that is that Gift of Life does not yet formally own the property and has no representative in attendance to agree to any such terms.
  - Mr. Phillips and Mr. Rubin offered to enter into an agreement that the building would not be demolished while it is still under Mr. Rubin's ownership. Mr. Phillips further offered to inform the Historical Commission if the sale to Gift of Life does not occur for any reason to potentially allow the nomination to be submitted again.
- Ms. Washington summarized the issue by saying that the Historical Commission is sympathetic to the public interest argument for Gift of Life to utilize the property for its operations, but that they would like to have some kind of evidence demonstrating that it will use it as such if it is not designated.
  - Mr. Rubin reiterated that Gift of Life will purchase the property from him to further its mission if it is not designated.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society commented in support of the nomination and also acknowledged the public interest argument against designating it.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance commented in support of the nomination and also acknowledged the public interest argument against designating it. He suggested potentially leaving the nomination in place until such a time that Gift of Life can submit concrete plans to develop the site. He also questioned the timing of the potential agreement of sale related to that of the submission of the nomination.
  - Mr. Rubin responded by stating that Gift of Life has signed an agreement to purchase the property from him already but that they requested the details of that agreement not be made public.
- Arielle Harris of Repoint commented in support of the nomination and suggested there is a possibility to develop the site without demolishing the building.

#### **HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building at 428-34 N. 4th Street was constructed by the National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association in a vernacular modern architectural style in 1966 and 1967.
- Gift of Life is a non-profit dedicated to coordinating organ transplants and seeks to use the property at 428-34 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street to expand its operations. The reuse of the property by Gift of Life will advance the public interest.
- The current owner of the property at 428-34 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street has pledged that he will not demolish the building until Gift of Life has finalized its purchase.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the property embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, New Formalism, satisfying Criterion C.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property exemplifies the post-war turn to Modernist architecture in the United States and contends that this building reflects the built environment of that era, satisfying Criterion D.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property was constructed amid widespread demolition of the surrounding neighborhood as part of the Callowhill East Redevelopment Project, and thus it exemplifies the economic and political heritage of the community in the era of urban renewal, satisfying Criterion J.
- The public interest in the expansion of Gift of Life to the property at 428-34 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street exceeds the public interest in the preservation of the building.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 428-34 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J and is worthy of listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but to decline to designate the property at this time. Mr. Holloman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: 428-34 N 4<sup>th</sup> St</b>					
<b>MOTION: Decline to Designate</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Cooperman</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: Holloman</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:52:20**

**ACTION:** At 12:11 p.m., Mr. Frankel moved to adjourn. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

<b>ITEM: Adjournment</b>					
<b>MOTION: Adjourn</b>					
<b>MOVED BY: Frankel</b>					
<b>SECONDED BY: McCoubrey</b>					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
Carney (PCPC)	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	13				

### **PLEASE NOTE:**

- Minutes of the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its advisory committees 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](http://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.

DRAFT