

**THE MINUTES OF THE 441st STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 May 1999**

**Commission Conference Room, One Parkway, 1515 Arch St., 18th Fl.
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Carol Lawrence
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Urban Development
Caroline Wischmann

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Kristin Cardi, Historic Preservation Planner
Elizabeth Harvey, Historic Preservation Planner
R. Scott Jacob, Executive Secretary
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Reed Axelrod, Reed Axelrod Architects
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association (SHCA)
Matthew DeJulio, SHCA
Richard Meyer, Richard Conway Meyer Architect
David Anderson, Richard Conway Meyer Architect
Robert Cavalier
Philip Steinberg, East Falls Community Council
W. E. Taylor
Rebecca Stoloff, SHCA
Cynthia Kishinchand
Janet Greenstein Potter
Barry Hossack, Capitol Sign
Noel Eisenstat, Redevelopment Authority
Samuel Gordon, Kunz Gordon Architects
Phillip Kunz, Kunz Gordon Architects
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association
Jonathan Weiss, Esq.
Alike Strakes, Preservation Alliance
Carl Zucker, Esq.
Jean Paul Gulle
Kevin Kimmel, Ewing Cole Cherry Brott, Architects
Steven Kaufman, Community Ventures

Jose Almiñana
Mary Werner DeNadai, John Milner Architects
Karolin Frank
Norman Tissian, SHCA

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 441st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 440th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 440th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 14 April 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 9 April 1999, David Brownlee, Chair

The Commission reviewed the proposal to add the 200 Block of Port Royal Avenue and Skidoo Street to the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Ms. Spina described the streets and presented photographs.

Port Royal Avenue, 200 Block

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the vote, but not the discussion.

Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Perri objected to the designation of this block of Port Royal Avenue claiming that it will impede development in that location. Ms. Kaplan noted that the city can apply to alter the street after designation.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to designate the 200 Block of Port Royal Avenue. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried with seven votes. Mr. Perri, Mr. James and Mr. Ward dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

Skidoo Street

Cynthia Kishinchand who resides near Skidoo Street read a letter supporting its designation, and submitted articles she wrote regarding the history and importance of this small street.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to designate Skidoo Street. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Wilds dissented.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 April 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair.

250 South 5th Street

Town Sport International, Owner
Virginia Kieffer, Applicant
DATE: c. 1980
PROPOSAL: Signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal as submitted, but approval using the existing metal frame at the front entrance for the signage and the metal logo letters reduced by half, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves adding awnings and signage to a gymnasium at the base of a modern apartment building. He stated that the Committee objected to the amount of signage on this building and asked the applicant to reduce it by using the existing metal frame at the front entrance for the signage instead of attaching another frame to it. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee preferred that the applicant attach a panel of the proposed front sign to the existing metal frame, and that the Committee wanted the metal logo letters reduced in size by half.

Norman Tissian of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Civic Association does not object to the proposal as submitted. The Commission did not agree with the recommendation of its Architectural Committee, and voted to approve the proposal as submitted.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Perri seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

537 Spruce Street, ne corner at South 6th Street

John Carter, Owner

Reed Axelrod, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Alterations and additions

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Three Committee members voted to recommend approval in concept, with the applicant to return for a discussion of the roof shape and other details. Two of the Committee members voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves extensive alterations to a contributing building within the Society Hill (and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West) Historic District, built c. 1970. The alterations entail removing the mansard roof from several sections of the L-shaped structure and adding a floor with a new half gable roof. The architect seeks to cut new windows on the 6th Street facade. He also plans additions for inside the courtyard out of the view of the public.

Reed Axelrod, architect for the proposal, showed the Commission a model demonstrating the appearance of the new roof and additions. He stated that the new standing seam metal roof will not rise to the cornice line of the neighboring three-and-a-half story building. Mr. Axelrod explained that the proposal will provide more storage and mechanical equipment space, as well as accommodate the design modifications of the interior. The new roof over the corner stair "tower" will enable the extension of the stairs to the new floor.

Mr. Tyler explained that this house was constructed under Redevelopment Authority controls during the "Redevelopment Period" of Society Hill, which forms part of the statement

of significance for the historic district, and recommended that the Commission not approve the proposal. Mr. Tyler and Mr. Brownlee spoke of the importance of treating this designated building in the same manner as any other designated structure, despite its recent construction. Mr. Brownlee noted, however, that the Commission does occasionally approve alterations and additions to buildings dating from much earlier periods if the changes conform to *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. He asked the Commission to consider whether this proposal respects the massing and context of the building. Commission members thought that the building will still contribute to the district in that it retains the brick and follows the same fenestration rhythm. The architect maintained that the proposed alterations will increase the level of sophistication, and simulate the scale and materials of other buildings of the neighborhood, while preserving the "quiet" nature of the building.

Elizabeth Armour of the Society Hill Civic Association voiced strong objections to the proposal, and did not think it conforms in any way to *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Commission members acknowledged Ms. Armour's concerns, but thought the proposal respects the massing and context of the building and warranted approval without further review by the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve the proposal as submitted, without further review by the Architectural Committee. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Brownlee abstained.

The Commission interrupted the report of the Architectural Committee to consider the Report of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 30 April 1999, Wayne Spilove, Chair.

401-417 West Johnson Street, Mayfair House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Andres Perez, Commissioner, Department of Public Property, Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition

Mr. James recused himself from the discussion and the vote owing to his position as designee of the Commission for Andres Perez, applicant for the proposal.

Mr. Tyler explained that the City of Philadelphia seeks approval to demolish the Mayfair House apartment building on the grounds of financial hardship. He explained that the applicant intends to demonstrate that the lack of economic viability and prospects for reasonable reuse of the building do not justify its rehabilitation. Mr. Tyler stated that the applicant provided the Committee on Financial Hardship with an extensive report detailing this lack of viability, the cost of rehabilitation and various failed attempts to reuse the building.

Ms. Kaplan, who sits on the Committee for Financial Hardship, spoke regarding the difficult and regrettable choice that Committee had to make concerning the fate of the Mayfair House. She explained that the report submitted to the Committee by Mr. Eisenstat clearly demonstrated the necessity of demolishing the building.

Robert Solvibile, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections, stated

that the demolition will be out for bid sometime in mid June, and that the demolition will probably begin sometime in mid July, after the removal of the asbestos. The City proposed transferring the vacant land to Fairmount Park.

J. Randall Cotton of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance holds a facade easement on the property. He explained that the Alliance's easement was acquired in 1981 when Mayfair House was an occupied and commercially viable property and stated that the Alliance recognizes that over the last ten years the property has existed in a deteriorated state causing concern to its neighbors and community. He discussed extinguishing the easement.

Mr. Sklaroff thought the City should hold the property free and clear from any controls of the Preservation Alliance after demolition to avoid leaving the Alliance any jurisdiction over the land once it passes to Fairmount Park.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Committee on Financial Hardship's recommendation to find financial hardship. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. James recused himself.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the demolition of the Mayfair House. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. James recused himself.

The Commission returned to the Report of the Architectural Committee.

2300 Spruce Street, a.k.a. 300 South 23rd Street

T. L. Wolfson Inc., Owner

Philip DiDonato, Hoodco Inc., Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Visible ductwork

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal including the removal of the small roof top deck over the rear portion of the building.

Mr. Thomas explained that this submission revisits the ductwork proposal seen last month, but with the addition of an HVAC unit and additional code information. Last month the Committee voted to recommend approval of placing the ductwork and a fan on the roof of the one story rear portion of the building next to an existing rear deck on the subject property. Last month, the Commission voted to send the issue back to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant has met with the Center City Residents Association regarding the revised proposal, and reported no opposition from that organization. Mr. Perri explained that the Department of Licenses and Inspections does approve ductless vents, but will not permit the use of a ductless vent in this location owing to the amount of food preparation expected in the kitchen and the type of equipment. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the revised proposal or the removal of the small roof top deck over the rear portion of the building.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

313-315 Chestnut Street

Chemical Heritage Foundation, Owner

Richard Meyer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 313 Chestnut Street - 1953; 315 Chestnut Street - 1865

PROPOSAL: Demolition and replacement of the facade at 313 Chestnut Street; alterations to 315 Chestnut Street

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Denial of:

1. Removal of the facade of 313 Chestnut Street.
2. Replacement of the greenish-gray glazed bricks with red brick.

Approval of:

1. The glass curtain wall on the side facade

The Committee also suggested that it would approve a scheme to lower the sills of the center windows of 313 Chestnut Street as well as the flanking windows.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves removing a 1953 Classical Revival facade and replacing it with a contemporary glass and brick facade, installing a glass curtain wall on the stuccoed side facade, and replacing the greenish-gray glazed brick return of 315 Chestnut Street with red brick along the east wall of the old bank and to either side of the proposed glass front curtain wall on 313 Chestnut Street. A few years ago, the Commission approved the expansion of the center column of windows on the facade of 313 Chestnut Street to provide more light and a better view of Independence National Historical Park. That proposal was never executed.

Richard Meyer, architect for the proposal, presented the history of the two buildings with a series of drawings, maps and photographs to illustrate the progression of the structures and their relationship to each other. He also stated that the proposal to replace the greenish-gray glazed brick return of 315 Chestnut Street with red brick along the east wall of the old bank no longer forms part of the proposal. Mr. Meyer described future plans to build on the vacant lot just east of 313 Chestnut Street.

Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members objected to removing the facade of a designated building, and suggested the applicant consider executing the previously approved proposal to expand the center column of windows on the facade of 313 Chestnut Street by lowering the sills. He also explained that the Committee did not object to the glass curtain wall on the side facade. At the Committee meeting, the architect was informed about the Committee on Financial Hardship, the Committee on Historic Designation to discuss de-designation of 313 Chestnut Street, and the Board of Licence and Inspection Review. Mr. Thomas noted that the Committee also suggested that it would approve a scheme to lower the sills of the center windows of 313 Chestnut Street and the flanking windows.

Several Commission members strongly objected to allowing the demolition of a designated facade, and debated the possibility of de-designating 313 Chestnut Street. Mr. Sklaroff thought the Commission should approve all aspects of the proposal.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, including the lowering of the sills, as suggested by the Committee, with staff to review and approve details. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which failed in a tie vote.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to suggest that the applicant request the rescission of the designation

of the property as prescribed in the Ordinance. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with eight votes. Mr. Brownlee dissented.

Owing to the absence of any actions by the Commission on this application as submitted, Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed three months. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Brownlee left the meeting.

401 North Broad Street

401 North Broad Street Associates, Owner
GTE Internet Working Inc., Tenant
Daniel Cobbett, Applicant
DATE: 1929-1931
PROPOSAL: Louvers in the front facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal as submitted, and to approve the placement of louvers on a side location pending the receipt and review of a revised drawing.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing louvers on the front facade of the building in place of existing windows. He explained that the architect presented the Committee with a revised scheme showing louvers in only one of the windows, but that the Committee still objected to the replacing any of the front windows with louvers. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee asked whether the louvers could go into side windows west of the decorative headhouse portion of the building instead of at the front. The tenant might have to rent one more bay of the building to gain access to that portion of the side elevation.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and to deny the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Leland Street, North 800 Block

City of Philadelphia, Owner (Awaiting a decision from City Council to strike it from the City Plan)
Steven Kaufman, Applicant
DATE: early 20th Century
PROPOSAL: Alterations to street

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with new drawings reflecting the appropriate placement of the paving stones with the stretcher perpendicular to the street, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Atkin dissented.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves incorporating the 800 block of North Leland Street into a housing development. Most of the street will be relaid with the historic material, although without a curb and at a different grade. The plan shows the granite block laid with the long direction of the block, i.e., the stretcher parallel to the street, although the current pattern of block has the stretcher perpendicular to the street. The applicant seeks to build a housing unit at one end of the street bed of this block.

Mr. Thomas stated that some Committee members objected to the proposal to cut off

the end of the block with a housing unit, and that the applicant explained that retaining the entire block of the street would necessitate the loss of a housing unit. When asked if the housing unit could be relocated to the large grassy field to the side of the street, the applicant explained that it would disturb the symmetry of the entryway to the street. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee discussed the possibility of placing a jog in the street to direct the cartway to a proposed pathway running between two of the housing units. Mr. Thomas noted that, owing to the number of asphalt and concrete patches, it appears that not enough paving material from this block remains to restore this block in its entirety. New granite blocks are available, although funds for their purchase would exceed the project's budget. Mr. Baron showed the Commission revised plans showing the paving blocks oriented correctly.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Germantown Avenue, Broad Street to Hunting Park Avenue

Charles Denny, Streets Department, Applicant

DATE: c. early 20th century

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct roadway in asphalt

Architectural Committee Recommendation: To refer the issue to the Special Committee set up specifically to deal with this proposal.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal revisits the application to reconstruct Germantown Avenue from Broad Street to Hunting Park Avenue. This portion of Germantown Avenue currently consists of granite block between the trolley tracks and asphalt from the tracks to the curb. Evidence indicates that granite block exists under the asphalt portion as well. These blocks of Germantown Avenue appear on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as part of the recently designated Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

At its last meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed the Architectural Committee's recommendation regarding the application, and decided this proposal requires more investigation. The Commission voted to refer the issue to a special committee consisting of representatives from

the City Planning Commission, Streets Department, Commission staff, interested parties from the neighboring community with Mr. Thomas as Chair. The Special Committee will serve as a fact-finding body to assist the Commission in making its final decision.

Mr. Tyler announced that the Special Committee met on 3 May 1999, and decided to meet again prior to the Commission's final ruling. The Commission will revisit this application after the next Special Committee meeting.

2051 Appletree Street

Jean Paul Gulle, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of legalizing the new windows as contrary to The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The

Committee hoped the Commission would consider both the applicant's and the building's special circumstances.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner seeks to legalize vinyl one-over-one windows he installed without a permit. A bank administers several houses on this block, as well as this property before the applicant purchased it. The bank had also installed inappropriate windows on this house as well as others. The thirty-year-old designation photos for the row show two-over-two wood windows. Mr. Thomas stated that only two houses on the block now have the appropriate replacement windows. The applicant, a first-time homeowner, stated that he was not informed of the building's designated status, and that his contractor told him he did secure a permit for the work.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee acknowledged the owner's good intentions and that this block of rowhouses has suffered much insensitive alteration since designation, but could not recommend approval of the proposal in recognition of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. The Commission agreed that this block of historic buildings has suffered much insensitive alteration since designation, and to approve the proposal because the applicant replaced inappropriate, non-historic windows.

Mr. James made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove turned the Chair over to Mr. Bumb and excused himself from the meeting.

306 Delancey Street

Robert Cavalier, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1775

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for a rear addition and deck. The addition will have minimal visibility from St. Peter's Way. He stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

5926 Germantown Avenue

Engelos Farfaras, Owner

David Gilfillan, Applicant

DATE: c. 1780

PROPOSAL: Rebuild storefront

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal with a simplified design using square heads for the windows and plain brackets, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves building a new wood storefront as a modification of the aluminum one constructed without a permit after a car accident demolished

the former storefront. Several months ago the Committee and Commission asked the owner to clad the new aluminum storefront elements in wood to complement the building better. The proposed storefront contains some literal historic elements. The brackets were made for another project but never used, and the applicant could purchase them at a discounted rate. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee found the proposal too ornate and asked the applicant to simplify the design using square heads for the windows and plain brackets.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

3700 Spruce Street, University of Pennsylvania Quadrangle

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1895

PROPOSAL: Landscaping renovations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for renovations to the Penn Quadrangle most of which will be reviewed at staff level. The University proposes several landscaping changes which do not qualify as restoration. This constitutes "phase one" of a three-part plan. The University will re-grade the interior courtyards to drain away from the building. The plans call for widening and in some cases altering the size and shape of the pathways. A proposal based on historic photographs calls for the installation of gray concrete pavers to resemble bluestone. An areaway will be enlarged to facilitate installation and maintenance of new electrical service. Mr. Baron showed the Commission samples of the proposed paving material.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee agreed to recommend approval of the enlargement of the areaway, re-grading, the demolition of the existing paths, the installation for one year of temporary paving, the removal and temporary installation of the iron fence pending its restoration at a later phase of the proposal. A new granite and cast stone paving pattern will be installed at the Spruce Street entrance portal.

In addition, staff recommends review and comment by the University's Cultural Resources Committee and conditioning any permit approval of a new landscape plan on the photographic recordation of existing conditions in the Quadrangle for deposit with the Commission along with representative historic photographs of the complex.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1910 Rittenhouse Square Street

Mary Parenti, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1890 - 92

PROPOSAL: Cut garage in rear (facing Manning Street)

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for a garage and curb cut at the rear of the house facing Manning Street. Manning Street contains a mix of garages and fronts of houses to the west of this property. Mr. Thomas stated the Committee did not object to the proposal.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1420-1434 Pine Street, se corner at 15th Street, Pierce College

Pierce College, Owner

James Mergiotte, Applicant

DATE: 1420-1424 Pine Street - 1897; 1426-1434 Pine Street - c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Rear additions, alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

- 1. The gate and fence and the additions between the rear ells, with an anodized metal facing material and the proposed marquees at the entrances to the additions reduced in width.*
- 2. The rooftop vents, painted a neutral color.*
- 3. Placing louvers in the rear dormers, with a six-over-six muntin grill in front of the louvers to mitigate their appearance. All with staff to review and approve details.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal revisits an already approved rear addition to Pierce College. The addition itself has been reduced in size. New visible HVAC units will sit on the roof of the addition and the taller Pierce College building at the corner of Carlisle and Pine Streets.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the already approved aspects of the proposal including the rear ell fill-ins and the fence/gate, but requested a few changes. He explained that Committee members expressed concern over the use of Dryvit as a facing for the additions, and recommended using an anodized metal facing material, and also wanted the applicant to reduce in width the proposed marquees at the entrances to the additions. The applicant was amenable to these changes.

Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members acknowledged the necessity for the new mechanical units on the roof(s), but asked for the installation of a six-over-six muntin grill in front of the rear dormer louvers to mitigate their appearance, and did not object to the roof vent if painted a neutral color.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

127 South 22nd Street

S. D. T. Holdings Inc., Owner

Bruce Myers, Applicant

DATE: 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll-down grate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of legalizing the roll-down grate, and to approve the installation of an interior security grate.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal requests the legalization of an exterior solid roll down gate installed without a permit. Vandals broke the window twice causing the owner to have the gate installed. Stuart Teacher, owner of the building, was apparently told that an

interior treatment was not possible owing to the lack of space between the ceiling and the top of the window. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee recommended placing it inside with the housing exposed at the top of the window and concealing it. Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Baron informed the Commission that the applicant cannot meet with the Commission for two months owing to prior obligations, and requests a deferment of the Commission's decision until that time. Commission members agreed to table the issue until the 14 July 1999 Stated Meeting. Mr. Wilds also wanted the record to state that the Commission will vote on this application as submitted at that time.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the issue until the 14 July 1999 Stated Meeting. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

261 South 20th Street, ne corner at Manning Street

Philadelphia Restaurant Partners, LP, Owner

Neil Richmond, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Rebuild exterior duct

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Tabling the issue until staff examines the location to determine whether the vent could run up the wall of the interior court of the rear building ell.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for removal and reinstallation of the large kitchen exhaust duct on the building at the corner of Manning and South 20th Street. He stated that the Committee asked if the duct could run up the wall of the inner court of the rear building ell, and that the applicant claimed structural restrictions prevent that alternative. Mr. Baron stated that he did examine the location and determined that it is possible to place the duct in the inner court at the rear of the building.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal as submitted, and to approve placing the duct in the inner court at the rear of the building. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

941 Lombard Street

Thomas Reda II, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Roof deck on visible rear ell

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with the deck and stair rails painted to match the existing painted elements of the building.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the construction of a roof deck and stair on the visible rear ell of this building. He stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal, but wanted the deck and stair rails painted to match the existing painted elements of the building.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

311 South American Street

Kimberly Beauchamp, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1845

PROPOSAL: Flower boxes

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the installation of a flower box similar to the one approved by the Commission a few months ago for the house across the street. He stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Addendum

236 Walnut Street, se corner at South 2nd Street

Anthony and Marie Cerroni, Owners/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Facade treatment for new construction

Mr. Tyler showed the Commission renderings depicting two different facade treatment possibilities for the new house currently under construction at this site. He explained that the Commission reserves a forty-five-day period for comment relating to new construction on vacant land within local historic districts.

One of the schemes follows the originally approved design, but with the brick continuing to the base, instead of stone. The other scheme follows the same layout, but with Georgian Revival detailing. The Commission agreed to approve either scheme.

Mr. Ward made a motion to approve either of the two proposed facade treatment schemes. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary