

**THE MINUTES OF THE 768TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 AUGUST 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:

Commissioner	Present	Absent	Comment
Zachary Frankel, Chair (Real Estate Developer)	X		
Kimberly Washington, Esq., Vice Chair (Community Development Corporation)	X		
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., Committee on Historic Designation Chair (Historian)	X		
Thomas Holloman (City Council)		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	
Mina Monavarian (Philadelphia City Planning Commission)	X		
Ibriz Muhammad (Commerce Department)	X		
Kyle O'Connor (Department of Public Property)	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
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:

Hanna Stark, Preservation Alliance
Harry Leong
Kathi Maschoft

Lance Rothstein, Greenhill Farms Preservation Club
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
Sam Xu, Constrecture LLC

The following persons attended the meeting on Zoom:

Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
Abbey Lewis
Amy Krulik
Arielle Harris
Brian Flanagan
David Fecteau, PCPC Staff
David Traub, Save Our Sites
Diane Hedrich
Evan Litvin, LO DESIGN
Greg Prichard
Henry Clinton, Esq.
Jay Farrell
Jay Rockafellow, DAS Architects
Jean Allen
Jeffrey Cruse
Jerry Boyce
Jihad Ali
Jim Onesti
John Kromer
Joyce A. Smith
Judith Robinson
Julia Hayman
Justino Navaro, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation
Kimberly Haas, Hidden City Philadelphia
Krista Gebbia, Chestnut Hill Conservancy
Lori Arnold
Lorraine Gomez
Lynn Nichols
Michelle Allen, Allen Learning Partners
Morgan S. Allgrove-Hodges
Naché Patoir
Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society
Patricia Freeland, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
Rabbi Lipa Brennan
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
Sandy Carter
Stephanie M. Pennypacker
Steve Masters, Esq.
Steven Peitzman
Tash Rayon
Yerachmiel Kanoff

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, 767TH STATED MEETING, 10 JULY 2026

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:05

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 767th Stated Meeting, held 10 July 2026. No comments were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 767th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 July 2026. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adoption of the Minutes of the 767th Stated Meeting of the PHC					
MOTION: Adopt minutes					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

ADDRESS: 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Remove marquee; install storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 19R Chestnut Partners LP

Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Chestnut Square Associates LP

History: 1928; Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater; Hoffman & Henon, architects

Individual Designation: 8/9/2008

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The applicant for 1910 Chestnut Street has requested to continue the application from the August 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission to the September 2026 meeting.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:05:31

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to continue the review of the application for 1910 Chestnut Street to the September 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Continuance					
MOTION: Approve continuance					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JULY 2026

CONSENT AGENDA

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Frankel asked the Commissioners, staff, and public for comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 124 and 126 S. 7th Street. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Consent Agenda					
MOTION: Adopt Architectural Committee recommendation for Consent Agenda item					
MOVED BY: Thomas					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1018 WINTER ST

Proposal: Demolish and reconstruct upper floors with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ken Leong and Marie Chin

Applicant: Sam Xu, Constrecture LLC

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 4/25/1974

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing the main front block, roof, and a portion of the rear ell of 1018 Winter Street and reconstructing the main block with an additional floor and new roof with dormer. Construction of a new second and third story and roof deck are proposed at the rear. The building was constructed in 1830 and retains a high level of historic integrity with its form, features, and materials. The property at 1018 Winter Street is individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Although the rear of the property includes a parking area, the back of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way.

This project was first presented at the 24 February 2026 meeting of the Architectural Committee and the 10 April 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission. It proposed substantial demolition of the front of the building. The Architectural Committee recommended denial. The applicant presented a significantly revised application to the Historical Commission that maintained the historic front wall, roof, and main block and focused the new construction to the rear of the building. The Historical Commission commended that applicant and said the revised application was moving the project in the right direction. The Commission asked the applicant to continue to develop the revised proposal and provide a structural engineer's report on the building, owing to its poor condition. The Commission did not approve or deny the application but instead remanded the application back to the Architectural Committee for an additional review because of the magnitude of the revisions between the Committee and Commission meetings.

The application submitted for this meeting includes the requested structural report and a revised scope of work. The application is substantially different than the version presented at the 10 April 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish the front main block of the building including the front wall and roof with dormers, as well as a one-story portion of the rear ell.
- Rehabilitate a portion of the rear ell, construct an extension at the first floor, and construct second and third stories.
- Construct roof deck.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The application proposes a significant amount of demolition to the front of the building; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 2.

- If the front wall and roof must be replaced, as recommended in the structural report, they should be replaced in-kind and not include an additional floor level.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed alterations to the front façade do not meet Standard 9 in terms of scale and proportion.
 - The proposed increase in size and massing at the rear of the property overwhelms the original form and environment of the historic building and does not meet Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed demolition and new construction permanently alter the historic building's form and integrity; therefore, the application does not meet Standard 10.
- *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 location of the proposed pilot house at the rear of the property could meet the Roofs Guideline if other aspects of the application were revised to meet Standards 2, 9, and 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:07:08

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Architect Sam Xu and owner Harry Leong represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- Although the structural engineer's report documented the poor condition of the front wall, gable roof, and dormer and recommended their demolition, further investigation has not been completed to determine if these elements could be repaired and retained and the building preserved.
- If replacement of building elements is necessary, the replacement must match the existing in material, form, scale, and detail.
- To satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the proposal must maintain the

front façade and roof of the building and locate any additional square footage at the rear of the building.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application fails to satisfy Standard 2, owing to the significant demolition proposed to the front of the building. If the front wall and roof must be replaced, as recommended in the structural report, they should be replaced in-kind and not include an additional floor level.
- The proposed alterations to the front façade do not meet Standard 9, owing to the destruction of historic features and the scale and proportion of the proposed new construction.
- The application fails to satisfy Standard 10 because the proposed demolition and new construction would permanently alter the historic building's form and integrity.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1018 Winter St					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: McCoubrey					
SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 124 AND 126 S 7TH ST

Proposal: Alter rears of buildings; restore storefronts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: JR Sansom Partners LLC

Applicant: Reed J. Slogoff, Pearl Properties

History: 1876, Collins & Authenrieth, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Jewelers' Row Historic District, pending

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

OVERVIEW: The one-story commercial buildings at 124 and 126 S. 7th Street are very small; each is about 13 feet wide and 18 feet deep. They have flat roofs. They were constructed as one-room retail shops in 1876. This application proposes to incorporate them into the residential high-rise development that will be constructed to the south and west of them on the lot at 708 Sansom Street. The Historical Commission reviewed and commented on the high-rise development in April 2024.

The small buildings would be used as entrances to the interior motor court of the high-rise building. Sections of the side and rear walls, roofs, and the interior party wall would be removed to incorporate the buildings into the larger project. The front facades of the buildings would be restored to their historic appearances, with the exception that the single step below each storefront door would be removed for accessibility reasons. The restoration can be guided by insurance surveys and historic photographs.

Historically, only the front facades of the buildings were visible from the street. The side and rear walls were party walls shared with adjacent properties but have been exposed with recent demolitions. The flat roofs of the one-story buildings are hidden behind bulking storefront cornices. Therefore, the storefronts were the only parts of the buildings visible from the public right-of-way historically and are therefore the only character-defining features of the buildings. The historic preservation ordinance defines demolition at Section 14-203(88) of the Philadelphia Code as "the razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building." With the removal of the rear walls, part of the side wall of one building, and parts of the roofs, one could claim that the work proposed in this application constitutes a demolition in the legal sense. However, the removals of the proposed sections of the buildings would not result in a "razing or destruction ... in significant part" because the historic characters of the buildings would survive intact after the parts are removed. The removals would not satisfy the definition of a demolition in the legal sense. Moreover, categorizing these reviews as demolition reviews would have an inherent risk. These very small buildings (less than 200 sf each), which are not accessible and neither have nor have room for adequate restroom facilities, could not be reasonably adapted for any purpose and therefore would undoubtedly qualify for complete demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance. Integrating them into the new development is likely their only option for retention and restoration.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Alter rears of buildings
- Restore storefronts

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The*

removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

- The historic character of the properties will be retained and preserved. No distinctive materials features, spaces, or spatial relationships will be altered or removed. The application satisfies Standard 2, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.
- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - Deteriorated features of the storefronts will be repaired and lost features will be replaced in kind based on documentary and physical evidence. The application satisfies Standard 6, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The storefronts are the only character-defining features of the buildings. The proposed work will restore all features that characterize the properties. No character-defining features will be inappropriately altered or removed. The application satisfies Standard 9, provided the storefront restoration details are reviewed and approved by the staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the south wall is a minimum of nine feet in length, the storefront details replicate those seen in the 1959 photograph, and the historic buildings are protected during construction, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1601 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Amend approval of façade materials

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mt. Vernon Commons LLC

Applicant: Naché Patior

History: 1859; Robert Purvis House; storefront, 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Dan Shachar-Krasnoff, daniel.shachar-krasnoff@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application calls for amending the Historical Commission's July 2023 approval for the rehabilitation of the Robert Purvis house. The developer seeks approval to substitute cast stone for marble on the front façade's stoop and door surround, owing to the high cost of marble. The applicant is determining the viability of cast stone for the water table.

The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist, writer, and lecturer who resided at the property for the final years of his life—ca.1875 to 1898. Over the last few decades, the property languished and was subject to multiple violations, proposed but unimplemented projects, and court orders, culminating in an Act 135 conservatorship. The City demolished the rear ell to abate a dangerous condition in 2012. After years of deterioration and legal proceedings, the property is being rehabilitated.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Amend approval of façade materials.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The only remaining portion of the original building, the main block, had a storefront installed c. 1920. That intervention removed the original entryway and marble stoop. Two large openings for storefront windows were cut into the masonry on the front façade and side wall at the first story, and a new corner entrance was constructed.
 - The application proposes to substitute the approved marble of the stoop and door surround with cast stone, owing to the high cost of the marble. They are unsure if they will propose cast stone or brick at the water table. While suboptimal, the staff sees the use of cast stone as the best solution to complete construction of the residential front. If cast stone is used for all marble elements on the front façade, the work complies with Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, if the water table, as well as the surround and stoop are built with cast stone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness of the application and pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:18:44

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Shachar-Krasnoff presented the application to the Historical Commission.
- Developer Naché Patior and contractor Brian Flanagan represented the application.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lori Arnold commented in support of the application.
- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the application.
- Justino Navaro of the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation commented in opposition to the application.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property at 1601 Mount Vernon Street is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District, owing to its association with Robert Purvis, a Black anti-slavery activist.
- The Historical Commission approved plans for the building's rehabilitation at its July 2023 meeting.
- The developer of the property seeks to substitute cast stone for marble for the stoop and door surround and omit the water table entirely.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- Cast stone can sufficiently match marble for the door surround and stoop, in this case, in design and color, satisfying Standard 6.
- A water table is not required because the original material is no longer extant and the building's significance is derived from Robert Purvis's residency.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 1601 Mount Vernon St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADDRESS: 4275 VIOLA ST

Proposal: Completely demolish building; stucco party wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Haverford Square Viola LLC

Applicant: Francis Henriquez, FH Demolition

History: 1897, Henry E. Flower, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Contributing, 12/11/2009

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

OVERVIEW: The property with a three-story rowhouse at 4275 Viola Street is classified as contributing in the Parkside Historic District. The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) cited the property as Imminently Dangerous on 25 June 2026 (CF-2026-075935). L&I indicated on the violation poster hung on the building that the owner needed to obtain a permit to repair the “rear side wall” and the “interior.” In response to the violation, a demolition contractor working for the property owner submitted application DP-2026-00768 to L&I and the Historical Commission requesting approval for the complete demolition of the building. Plans submitted with the demolition application call out the rear of the rear ell as the “area of potential collapse.” Photographs taken by the L&I inspector show a collapse at the rear of the rear ell.

The property at 4275 Viola Street has been neglected for many years. The current owner, Haverford Square Properties, purchased 4275 Viola Street on 14 May 2023. L&I issued Imminently Dangerous violations for the property on 31 December 2021 (CF-2021-122157), 12 January 2023 (CF-2023-003176 and 003177), 17 May 2025 (CF-2025-044552), and the current violation on 25 June 2026. On 12 September 2025, L&I issued make-safe building permit RP-2025-006366 to a contractor working for the current owner to address the deterioration and repair the rear ell to comply violations CF-2023-003177 and CF-2025-044552, but no work was ever undertaken and the permit for the repair work expired on 25 June 2026.

The staff conferred with the head of the unit at L&I that administers Imminently Dangerous violations and he indicated that the violation can be complied with a make safe permit allowing the applicant to partially demolish the rear section of the building under the direction of a registered architect or engineer. Also, the applicant submitted an engineer’s report on the condition of the building that indicates that the rear ell of the building must be demolished, owing to its condition, but that the main, front block can be repaired.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Completely demolish building
- Stucco party wall

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City of Philadelphia’s historic preservation ordinance enumerates restrictions on demolition and stipulates that:

- No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building ... unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.
 - The application does not attempt to demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted and therefore fails to justify the complete demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. The building should be repaired as proposed in the make-

safe building permit RP-2025-006366 issued in 2025. If the repair cannot be safely accomplished because of additional deterioration, the rear ell should be demolished and the front, main block stabilized and sealed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:46:59

PRESENTERS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance stated that her organization opposes the demolition of the building.
- Arielle Harris of RePoint opposed the demolition of the building.
- Jean Allen, a resident of Viola Street, opposed the demolition of the building.
- Joyce Smith, a resident of Viola Street and the president of the Community Development Board of East Parkside, opposed the demolition of the building.
- Julia Hayman opposed the demolition of the building.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites opposed the demolition of the building.
- Evan Litvin, a licensed architect and a significant commercial property owner in the neighborhood, opposed the demolition of the building.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society opposed the demolition of the building.
- Jihad Ali, a resident of Parkside Avenue, opposed the demolition of the building.
- Michelle Allen, a resident of Viola Street, opposed the demolition of the building.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) cited the property as Imminently Dangerous on 25 June 2026 (CF-2026-075935).
- The Imminently Dangerous violation can be complied without completely demolishing the building. The violation can be complied with a make safe permit allowing the applicant to partially demolish the rear section of the building under the direction of a registered architect or engineer.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The application does not attempt to demonstrate that the complete demolition of the building at 4275 Viola Street is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adapted and therefore fails to justify the complete demolition under Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. The building should be repaired as proposed in the make-safe building permit RP-2025-006366 issued in 2025. If the repair cannot be safely accomplished because of additional deterioration, the rear ell should be demolished and the front, main block stabilized and sealed.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by

unanimous consent.

ITEM: 4275 Viola St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 22 JULY 2026

ADDRESS: 7001-09 GREENHILL RD

Name of Resource: Morris Estate Houses

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Kathryn Maschhoff & Paul Anziano

Nominator: Greenhill Farms Preservation Club

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

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the properties at 6953 and 7001-09 Greenhill Road as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Constructed between 1916 to 1919, the pair of buildings represent an “unusual paired residential complex” of two stone houses with a shared twin garage and reflect the environment in an era characterized by the Colonial Revival style with English stylistic overtones, satisfying Criterion C. Additionally, the houses represent a special example of a paired dwelling site that reflects local vernacular architectural of the eighteenth century and they embody the distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style through their textbook use of historically inspired forms, materials, and compositions, satisfying Criterion D. Additionally, the properties comprise a significant masterwork of the architectural firm of Mellor, Meigs & Howe, a significant partnership that influenced the built environment of the Philadelphia region, satisfying Criterion E. Finally, the buildings at 6953 and 7001-09 Greenhill Road satisfy Criterion J for their strong association with the early twentieth-century subdivision and development of Green Hill Farm, which was developed from the Morris Estate in West Philadelphia.

The reviews for both properties were initially scheduled to be performed at the 21 January 2026 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, but the owners on 6953 Greenhill Road were

granted a continuance to the 22 July 2026 meeting. The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination for 7001-09 Greenhill Road at the 21 January meeting and voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7001-09 Greenhill Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D and E. At the 13 February 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission, the Commission voted to continue the review of the nomination and remand it to the Committee on Historic Designation so that the nominations for both 6953 and 7001-09 Greenhill Road could be reviewed simultaneously to ensure that both property owners have an equal opportunity to participate in the deliberations about the historical significance of the properties.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nominations demonstrate that the properties at 6953 and 7001-09 Greenhill Road satisfy Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7001-09 Greenhill Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E and J.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:03:59

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Till presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Steve Masters and Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- Kathryn Maschhoff, the owner of 7001-09 Greenhill Road, supported the nomination.

DISCUSSION:

- Ahead of the review for the nomination of 7001-09 Greenhill Road, Mr. Masters asked the Historical Commission to revoke the continuance of the review of the nomination for 6953 Greenhill Road that the staff had granted. He referenced the email sent to the owners of 6953 Greenhill Road granting the continuance and the minutes from the 13 February 2026 meeting of the Historical Commission at which Mr. Farnham promised not to grant additional staff continuances so that the two Greenhill Road nominations could be reviewed simultaneously.
- Mr. Reuter and Mr. Farnham confirmed that the Executive Director and staff of the Historical Commission did have the authority to grant the continuance being contested. They explained that the earlier promise not to grant additional continuances applied to review of the nomination by the Committee on Historic Designation, not the Historical Commission. The two nominations for the Greenhill Road properties were, in fact, reviewed simultaneously at the 22 July 2026 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Furthermore, the Historical Commission cannot simply place the nomination for 6953 Greenhill Road on the agenda for review at this meeting.
- Without a motion or vote, the Historical Commission agreed that the continuance was properly granted and that the matter could not simply be placed on the meeting's agenda at that time.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites commented in support of the nomination. He highlighted the importance and influence of Mellor, Meigs & Howe.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination.
- Lance Rothstein, a neighbor and member of the Grenn Hill Farms Preservation Club,

commented in support of the nomination.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property represents an important example of the Colonial Revival style of architecture.
- The architectural firm of Mellor, Meigs & Howe was a significant design firm of the time in Philadelphia.
- The property represents a significant example of the development of the Morris Estate into the Green Hill Farms residential neighborhood in the early twentieth century.
- The nomination includes an unusually large amount of documentary evidence from the period of the construction to support the significance of the property.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the building reflects the environment in an era characterized by the Colonial Revival style with English stylistic overtones, satisfying Criterion C.
- The nomination demonstrates that the house is an unusual example that reflects the local vernacular architecture of the eighteenth century and embodies the distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style through textbook use of historically inspired forms, materials, and compositions, satisfying Criterion D.
- The nomination demonstrates that the property comprises a significant masterwork of the architectural firm of Mellor, Meigs & Howe, a prominent partnership that influenced the built environment of the Philadelphia region, satisfying Criterion E
- The nomination demonstrates that the property satisfies Criterion J for its strong association with the early twentieth-century subdivision and development of Green Hill Farm, which was developed from the Morris Estate in West Philadelphia.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 7001-09 Greenhill Road satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 7001-09 Greenhill Rd MOTION: Designate MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas			X		
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	10		1		2

ADDRESS: 520 QUEEN ST

Name of Resource:

Proposed Action: Rescind Designation

Property Owner: 2622 West Hagert Street LLC

Individual Designation: unknown

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application requests the rescission of the designation of the property at 520 Queen Street. The property was apparently individually designated at some point in 1973, but the designation is not documented. However, all designations on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places were confirmed when the new preservation ordinance was adopted in 1983. At the time of designation, a circa 1860 house stood on the site. This building had been altered prior to its designation to include a garage door spanning the full width of the first-floor front façade.

The Historical Commission approved an application for the rehabilitation of the front façade and the construction of a rear addition in 2018. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a building permit based on the Historical Commission's approval on 19 December 2019. Work commenced on the project in July 2020. On 23 July 2020, a front dormer was removed that was outside the approved scope of work and the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation noting that a dormer had been removed and that an engineer's report on the safety of the property was needed. On 24 July 2020, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a stop work order owing to demolition work exceeding the scope of the issued permit. The stop work order stated that the demolition contractor had removed interior areas and load-bearing walls outside the scope of the approved permit. Owing to the illegal demolition work, the building became structurally unsound, and the contractor completely demolished it. The party walls of 518 and 522 Queen Street were also damaged during the work.

For administrative purposes, the Historical Commission's staff approved a demolition permit for 520 Queen Street at the request of the Department of Licenses and Inspections on 16 November 2020, after the demolition had been completed. The Department required the applicant to file an accurate demolition permit before a new construction permit could be filed.

In September 2021, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of an application that proposed a three-story building on the parcel. During that review, the property owner was informed that, absent the rescission of the property from the Register, the Historical Commission is legally obligated to require the reconstruction of the building pursuant to Section 14-1007(3) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance. This section states that "any person who alters or demolishes a building ... in violation of the provisions of this Chapter 14-1000 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a building permit issued by the Historical Commission shall be required to restore the building ... involved to its appearance prior to the violation." That application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission.

Section 5.14.b.1 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations authorizes the Commission to remove entries from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places when the qualities that caused the original entry on the Register have been lost or destroyed. In this case, the building was presumably designated owing to its age. That quality was lost with the demolition. There is no longer a basis for the designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission rescind the designation of 520 Queen Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, because the qualities that caused its original entry have been destroyed.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend denial of the request to rescind the designation of 520 Queen Street.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:38:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the rescission request to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Henry Clinton and property owner Jerry Boyce represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Clinton summarized the history of the circumstances surrounding the designation of the property and the demolition of the building. He explained that Mr. Boyce purchased the property in poor condition in 2017. He stated that Mr. Boyce had no intention of demolishing the building. He explained that Mr. Boyce has hired a reputable architecture firm to design a new three-story building for the site that is in keeping with the other buildings on the block, with a brick front and no metal panels. He asked that the Commission approve the rescission so that the new building can be permitted and constructed. He asked Mr. Boyce to speak briefly about the costs incurred for the original building permit.
 - Mr. Boyce stated that he spent approximately \$25,000 from his initial meeting with an architect to the submission of the drawings to the Historical Commission in 2020. He confirmed that his intention was not to demolish the building, as

evidenced by his expenses for the rehabilitation project.

- Ms. Cooperman commented that there had been no implication from the Committee on Historic Designation that Mr. Boyce came into the project with the intention of demolishing the building.
- Ms. Monavarian provided information about the new construction design protections already in place at the site, owing to the Queen Village Neighborhood Conservation Overlay, should the historic designation of the property be rescinded. She explained that, absent the historic designation of the site, the Planning Commission's staff would review the building permit for new construction and ensure that it is in compliance with the design guidelines for the overlay, which includes facade materials, size of windows, and habitable room on the ground floor, among other things. She noted that requiring a reconstruction of the building is not possible because the former building did not conform to the current zoning of the site. She summarized that the rescind then build approach would lead to new construction that would be more compatible with the surrounding context. If the designation is maintained and not rescinded, the reconstruction requirement that would be imposed by the Historical Commission that would include a garage entry at the front façade would result in a less satisfactory building.
 - Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Monavarian and the staff's recommendation to approve the rescission of the historic designation. He agreed that allowing the review of the new construction to go through the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay process would be much more effective than having it reviewed by the Historical Commission.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that the Committee on Historic Designation was concerned that this rescission would encourage demolition without approval. She commented that there were questions about the role of the inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the end result of new construction, absent the Historical Commission's reconstruction requirement, will be a three-story flat-roof building rather than a two-story building with a dormer, and garage at the first-floor front.
 - Ms. Cooperman suggested that the garage door entry was pre-automobile and was more like a stable door originally.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society commented in opposition to the rescission request. He commented that the approval of the rescission would mean that there is no penalty for allowing a demolition by neglect.
- Arielle Harris commented in opposition to the rescission request. She commented that it would set a bad precedent for owners of historic properties if the Historical Commission did not require a reconstruction of the building. She commented that, as a former employee of the Department of Licenses and Inspections, the coordination should have been done in such a way that prevented the complete demolition. She questioned why less-invasive techniques were not considered.
- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance commented in opposition to the rescission request. She commented that an approval of the rescission would effectively reward illegal construction activities.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The property at 520 Queen Street was apparently added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places at some point in 1973, but the addition to the list is not documented. However, all properties listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, whether documented or not, were confirmed at the time that the new preservation ordinance was adopted in 1983.
- At the time that the property was added to the Philadelphia Register, a circa 1860 house stood on the site. This building had been altered with a garage door spanning the full width of the first-floor front façade prior to its addition to the Register.
- The building at 520 Queen Street was completely demolished in 2020. The lot remains empty. There are differing accounts as to how and why the building was demolished.
- The property is not located within a historic district listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It is, however, located within the Queen Village Neighborhood Conservation Overlay, which would trigger review by the Planning Commission's staff of new construction should the historic designation be rescinded.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- A denial of the rescission allows the Historical Commission to maintain authority over the review of building permit applications for new construction on the site.
- Absent the rescission of the property from the Register, the Historical Commission is legally obligated to require the reconstruction of the building pursuant to Section 14-1007(3) of the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance. This section states that "any person who alters or demolishes a building ... in violation of the provisions of this Chapter 14-1000 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a building permit issued by the Historical Commission shall be required to restore the building ... involved to its appearance prior to the violation."

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the request to rescind the historic designation of the property at 520 Queen Street. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 4.

ITEM: 520 Queen St MOTION: Denial of rescission request MOVED BY: McCoubrey SECONDED BY: Cooperman					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)		X			
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)		X			
Rabauer	X				
Thomas		X			
Treat (DPD)		X			
Total	7	4			2

ADDRESS: 3135-49 W MONTGOMERY AVE

Proposed Action: Rescission

Property Owner: Joseph Williams, 3135-49 Montgomery Ave, LLC

Applicant: Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission's staff is proposing that the Commission rescind the designation of the property at 3135-49 W. Montgomery Avenue because no historic resources remain at the site. The Historical Commission designated the property in July 1993 for the synagogue building that stood on the site. The synagogue, Temple Beth Israel, was designed by the architectural firm of Sauer & Hahn and completed in 1907. The nomination is included below. The large domed roof of the building collapsed in 2020. The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) declared the collapsed building Imminently Dangerous on 2 August 2020 and then demolished the building under Demolition Permit DP-2020-001911 to abate the public safety hazard in late 2020. The scope of work on the demolition permit was listed as "the complete demolition of a commercial property as part of the City of Philadelphia demolition program." The Notice of Violation is included below. At the time of the demolition, L&I reported to the Historical Commission that the framing of the collapsed roof was pushing outward on the exterior walls of the synagogue along Morris Street and Montgomery Avenue and the remaining building needed to be demolished immediately in the interest of public safety. After the building was demolished, the site was cleared, as photographs below show. There are no longer any historic resources at the site. Moreover, there are no designated properties or districts in the vicinity of this site. On 10 March 2023, after the site was cleared, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application to construct 14 townhouses on the site. Construction of those townhouses has begun.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the request to rescind the designation of the property at 3135-49 W. Montgomery Avenue because the historic building

was lost in an unanticipated collapse, the remaining building was demolished legally, and no historic resources remain at the site.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend approval of the request to rescind the designation of the property at 3135-49 W. Montgomery Avenue because the historic building was lost in an unanticipated collapse, the remaining building was demolished legally, and no historic resources remain at the site.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:03:47

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the rescission request to the Historical Commission.
- Attorney Henry Clinton represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that the townhouses under construction at the site are well designed, and the designation should be rescinded.
- Arielle Harris of RePoint stated that there should have been better coordination between the Historical Commission and the Department of Licenses and Inspections. She asserted that the City should provide some mitigation to offset its demolition of the historic building.
- Steven Peitzman stated that the City's enforcement efforts are insufficient.
- Oscar Beisert of the Keeping Society stated that the property should remain designated as a punishment for the property owner who neglected the historic building.
- Commissioner Thomas stated that he was involved with this property several years ago and explored options for repairing the large domed roof. He indicated that repairing the roof was not feasible for the congregation that owned the property.
- Mr. Reuter, the Historical Commission's attorney, informed the audience that the City's Law Department did, in fact, undertake a significant enforcement action against the entity that owned the property at the time of the collapse. He stated that significant liens and fines were placed on the property.
- Mr. Farnham rejected the claims that the communication between the Historical Commission and the Department of Licenses and Inspections was insufficient. He stated that he was in constant contact with the Department regarding this building after the collapse. He noted that the Department demolished the building after the collapse because it determined that the structure posed an imminent danger to the public.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) declared the collapsed building at 3135-49 W. Montgomery Avenue Imminently Dangerous on 2 August 2020 and then demolished the building under Demolition Permit DP-2020-001911 to abate the public safety hazard in late 2020.
- After the building was demolished, the site was cleared. There are no longer any historic resources at the site.
- On 10 March 2023, after the site was cleared, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application to construct 14 townhouses on the site. Construction of

those townhouses has begun.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The designation of the property at 3135-49 W. Montgomery Avenue should be rescinded because the historic building was lost in an unanticipated collapse, the remaining building was demolished legally, and no historic resources remain at the site.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of the property at 3135-49 W. Montgomery Avenue because the historic building was lost in an unanticipated collapse, the remaining building was demolished legally, and no historic resources remain at the site. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 3135-49 W Montgomery Ave					
MOTION: Rescind designation					
MOVED BY: Cooperman					
SECONDED BY: McCoubrey					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 580 PELHAM RD and 333 W UPSAL ST

Name of Resource: The Wolstenholme Twin

Proposed Action: Designate

Property Owner: Jim Onesti, Phila Prop LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Heather Hendrickson, heather.hendrickson@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate 580 Pelham Road/ 333 West Upsal Street, known as the Wolstenholme Twin, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends the property satisfies Criteria D, E, and J. Under Criterion D, the nomination contends that the Wolstenholme Twin embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Flemish Renaissance Revival style. The nomination documents that the architectural firm of

Boyd & Boyd designed the twin house and argues that the house satisfies Criterion E because the architectural firm's accomplishments have significantly influenced the development of the City of Philadelphia and the region. Finally, under Criterion J, the nomination asserts that the Wolstenholme Twin, as part of the larger Pelham real estate development, and housing prominent Philadelphia businessmen, is representative of the early economic, social, and historical heritage of the West Mount Airy community as it transitioned from a large private estate to a modern suburb of Philadelphia.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 580 Pelham Road and 333 West Upsal Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 580 Pelham Road and 333 W. Upsal Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, J, and additionally Criterion H.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:22:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.
- Hanna Stark of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner. Mr. Farnham noted that the property owner, Jim Onesti, had been in attendance over Zoom earlier in the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Greg Prichard commented in support of the designation.

HISTORICAL COMMISSION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The Historical Commission found that:

- The building was sited as an architectural gateway to the Pelham development.

The Historical Commission concluded that:

- The property satisfies Criterion D, as it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Flemish Renaissance Revival style.
- The property satisfies Criterion E, as a design by the architectural firm of Boyd & Boyd, whose accomplishments have significantly influenced the development of the City of Philadelphia and the region.
- The property satisfies Criterion J, as a representative of the early economic, social, and historical heritage of the West Mount Airy community as it transitioned from a large private estate to a modern suburb of Philadelphia.
- The property satisfies Criterion H, owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, which represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community or City.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 580 Pelham Road and 333 W. Upsal Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, J, and H and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: 580 Pelham Rd and 333 W Upsal St MOTION: Designate MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:28:32

ACTION: At 11.46 a.m., Ms. Cooperman moved to adjourn. Ms. Washington seconded the motion, which was adopted by unanimous consent.

ITEM: Adjournment MOTION: Adjourn MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Washington					
VOTE					
Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Frankel, Chair	X				
Washington, Vice Chair	X				
Cooperman	X				
Holloman (City Council)					X
Lech (L&I)	X				
McCoubrey	X				
Michel					X
Monavarian (PCPC)	X				
Muhammad (Commerce)	X				
O'Connor (DPP)	X				
Rabauer	X				
Thomas	X				
Treat (DPD)	X				
Total	11				2

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.

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.