

**THE MINUTES OF THE 460TH STATED MEETING OF THE
Philadelphia Historical Commission
13 December 2000
Commission Conference Room, 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Melissa Heller Batzer, Office of City Council President, Director of Economic Development
James Cuorato, City Representative and Director of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
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 Community Development
Caroline Wischmann

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Mark Zecca, Esq., Senior Attorney, City of Philadelphia Law Department

Also

Keith Hobbs, Lance R. Kraemer Associates
Julie Panasson, The Lighting Practice Incorporated
Michael Bach, Pennsylvania Hospital
Joshua L. Grimes, Esq., 315 Arch Street
Alson Alston, Owner 2226 Green Street
Stephen Allen
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Marilyn Kutter, Schnader Harrison
David Franke, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates Incorporated Architect
Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade and Bolender Architects
Anthony Ciocca, Cuba Libre
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Piero Grimaldi, Grimaldi Architecture
Truman Gilbert, 2228 Green Street
Neale Quenzel, John Milner Associates
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company
Paula Zyats, 2228 Green Street
John Corcoran
Loretta Corcoran
Belmont Freeman, Belmont Freeman Architects

Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Michael Prifti, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Carl Massara, Carl Massara and Associates
Jeffrey Yablonovitz, 1706 Delancey Street
Ronald Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 460th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:20 A.M.

Minutes of the 459th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ward and duly seconded, the Commission approved the minutes of the 459th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 8 November 2000 as corrected. The corrections included Mr. Sklaroff's asking that the minutes reflect that he did not oppose the removal of the shutters at 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street, but he believed that the Commission lacked the authority to impose a condition upon the removal of non-historic shutters. He added that he had recused himself on this question. Mr. Sklaroff also noted that the minutes should reflect that the ad hoc committee on roofing did not meet to consider 2125 Porter Street and that Mr. Tyler had met with the applicant and resolved the matter as authorized by the Commission on 8 November 2000. Mr. Wilds pointed out an omission in the vote on 128 League Street.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 28 November 2000.

315-19 Arch Street

315 Arch Street Partners, L.P., Ronald Kaplan, Owners
Joshua L. Grimes, Applicant
DATE: 1916
PROPOSAL: Legalize and install windows

The Architectural Committee voted to approve the removal of the windows and their replacement with the Zippy Grid aluminum window system as well as the smaller operable window. They delegated to Mr. Thomas and the staff the review of the muntin configuration and operable windows, a recommendation to the Commission.

The application calls for legalizing work begun without a permit. The applicant seeks to remove the original steel industrial sash from the visible north and west facades of the building and replace them with aluminum sash with applied muntins that do not match the muntin pattern of the historic sash. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6.

Joshua Grimes, Esq., attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the revised proposal. The revised submission shows an operable slider window with a grid and a division of six and four panes of glass within each sliding sash with the meeting rails overlapping. The proposed muntins will be mounted on insulated glass. The Committee thought the profile appropriate and close to the original.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the revised submission with an operable sash with a grid with staff to review details. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James abstained.

800 Spruce Street, Widener Building, Pennsylvania Hospital

Pennsylvania Hospital, Owner

Michael W. Bach, Architect

DATE: 1969; altered 1983

PROPOSAL: Addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the addition with staff to review details.

The proposal calls for adding several floors onto an existing modern hospital building at Pennsylvania Hospital. Staff recommended approval of the project. Mr. Tyler added that he has seen the site and believes that the plans offer a good solution for the hospital's shortage of space.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James abstained.

100 Leverington Avenue

Flatrock Partners, L.P., Owner

Carl Massara, Architect

DATE: c. 1877

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation and large addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the adaptive reuse of the historic building and addition of a large new building with staff to review details. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the massing of the new building, with staff to review details, contingent upon the recommendation that the elevator shaft have a flat roof and that grillework be placed in the parking garage window openings. The Architectural Committee, with the exception of Mr. Atkin, recommended approval of the windows with real brick arches with staff to review details.

This project is reviewed under the Manayunk Ordinance, §§PM-703.1.2 and 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

The proposal calls for adding a large residential wing along the canal behind the historic mill building which faces Leverington Street. Plans show the cutting of a vehicle entrance through the previously altered east end of the façade to allow access to the required parking. A number of blocked in openings will receive their historic wood window treatments.

In addition, the proposal calls for doubling the size of the existing driveway with egress through an arch within the building. The long and narrow new building in a mill style echoes the historic character of industrial Manayunk without mimicking an actual mill building. The complex will have parking at grade under the new addition.

The proposal shows the elevator shaft with a peaked gable roof; however, the Committee suggested a flat roof. The Commission members thought the gabled roof more appropriate.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the addition of grilles in the openings of the garage and with a gabled roof on the elevator shaft. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

4129-35 Main Street

Daniel Neducsin, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition and new construction

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolitions and proposed new construction and the project's rear massing, with staff to review all details, with several exceptions. The exceptions included a wood and glass entrance door, wood true divided light windows on the old buildings and metal windows on the new construction, the existing steps to remain, and enlarged windows with no projecting bays.

The review of this submission occurs pursuant to the Manayunk Ordinance, §§PM-703.1.2 and 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

The proposal involves combining two houses and an open lot into a new Main Street commercial space with residential units above and behind. The developer seeks to demolish the houses except for the facades. He will construct a new building using the roof ridge to hide several front roof decks. The public currently views the rear of the houses from Station Street. The plans show the first floor windows of the houses enlarged and with projecting display cabinets.

Mr. Brownlee expressed concern about enlarging window openings under the Manayunk Ordinance. Mr. Scott stated that the proportions will not remain the same. Mr. Tyler thought that retaining the dimensions within the existing openings and not having paired windows still gives a residential feel. Mr. Thomas stated that the residential sills are high and commercial sills should be lowered; however, the existing should be photographed and documented.

Daniel Neducsin, the owner cited locations of lowered window proportions in the area.

Mr. Baron spoke to how the staff has handled the lowering of sills. He stated that the sills on the cited location were extremely high, not original, and of varying heights. Mr. Scott recommended that wherever possible, the sill height be maintained.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. Spilove passed the gavel to Mr. Brownlee and Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

2226 Green Street

Alson Alston, Owner

Piero Grimaldi, Architect

DATE: c. 1866

PROPOSAL: Development of multi-family dwelling

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review all details, contingent upon the rear third story having a mansard roof and all windows being 1/1 painted wood. The Architectural Committee recommended staff to review the details of any future proposal regarding the replacement of the front retaining wall.

The proposal involves the development of a multi-family residential structure. After previous review by the Committee and Commission, the applicant returned with a revised final application. The revisions include a façade without a garage, a setback of four feet along the mansard adjoining the western property line, and reduced construction at the rear. Mr. Baron explained that visibility of the rear massing would exist from both 23rd and Brandywine Streets. The rear has both been shortened since the last review and windows have been added. The front berm will be retained with a set of steps to match those adjacent to the west.

Alson Alston, the owner, and Piero Grimaldi, Architect, attended the meeting to answer questions. Mr. Alston has been receptive to the Committee and Commissions recommendations and believes the size comparable with the neighboring houses.

Paula Zyats, 2228 Green Street, stated her opposition to the rear massing owing to its not stepping down and that the rear façade is an important element of the new construction. Allen Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association, spoke to express its opposition to the construction. Patricia Friedland wrote a letter stating that this construction is an intrusion on a very important block and this property is presently a garden and designed as a garden. Loretta Cocoran, 2230 Green Street, also expressed concerns about the massing. Michael Sklaroff, Esq., a neighbor expressed concerns about the massing and design and believed the neighborhood should be treated as Rittenhouse Square or Society Hill Districts.

Mr. Thomas stated that the issue of massing is important to the Committee and Commission. Mr. James said that if sympathetic massing in the rear is an issue, the Commission should see a block plan to determine this question. Some Commission members believed that the applicant has submitted compromises in response to previous comments and suggestions and should not have to go back to the Committee. Owing to a change in the architectural design; however, some members thought the applicant should return to the Committee.

Ms. Batzer said the matter should be tabled until the applicant met with the civic association. Mr. Tyler stated that the Commission needed to take some action today and recommended deferring a decision for a period not exceeding two months. Mr. Wilds thought photographs of the rear of the houses should be taken by the staff.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to defer the proposal for a period not to exceed two months. Ms. Wischmann seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

1719-29 Spring Garden Street

John J. Dougherty, Owner

Robert N. Poston, Applicant

DATE: 1972

PROPOSAL: Glaze front arcade of non-contributing building

Mr. Baron explained the proposal to glaze the ground floor arcade of this non-contributing structure in the Spring Garden Historic District.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the glazing as shown by the submitted. Owing to the non-contributing status of the structure, the Architectural Committee stated that plans can be reviewed at staff level, thereby eliminating review at the Commission level.

1939-41 Spring Garden Street, NE corner of 20th Street

Stanley Skalski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Legalize repointing

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the repointing contingent upon the repainting of the front cornice.

The proposal calls for legalizing the repointing of two houses with an overly hard mortar containing no lime. The pointing has extremely wide and uneven joints. The staff attempted to stop the work as it happened but was ignored. The owner, Stanley Skalski, claims he did not know the buildings were historic and yet he had received explicit notification letters and has previously applied for permits to the Commission for these properties. Staff recommended approval of the repointing since removal of the mortar would further damage the brick. Staff also recommended that this approval be subject to some additional restoration on the building, such as painting the front cornice.

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

Mr. Spilove, Chair, recused himself and passed the gavel to Mr. Brownlee.

410 South Front Street

Philadelphia Hotel Partners, LLC, Owners

Roger Zampell, Applicant

DATE: 1974

PROPOSAL: Demolition and new construction

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the project, with staff to review the details, contingent upon the canopy's not extending more than four feet over the sidewalk.

This proposal, previously approved in concept, calls for the demolition of the non-contributing glass and steel building in the head house shopping mall and its replacement with a 10-story brick and stucco clad hotel and residential tower. The plans show a two-phase entryway from South 2nd Street; the first a planted walkway and the second a barrel vaulted covered walkway. The staff recommended approval of the project. Mr. Baron noted that a previous concern regarding the neighboring building's chimney was resolved. Roger Zampell, the applicant, confirmed that the hotel is in the process of purchasing that building and plans to seal the chimney in question.

Mr. Brownlee expressed concern about the South 2nd Street entrance with the two pylons. Mr. James questioned the use of stainless steel for the pylons and thought they should be brick.

Roger Zampell, the applicant said that the barreled vault is a canvas material in an off white color.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with a change in the material of the piers from metal to brick or another masonry. Ms. Batzer seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Spilove recused himself.

Mr. Brownlee returned the gavel to Mr. Spilove.

14-18 North Front Street, SW corner of Church Street

Luca Sena, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: 1828-36

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows and cornices

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the windows on 18 N. Front Street. The Architectural Committee recommended that all windows be replaced according to previously approved drawings with staff to review details. The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the cornice overhang, painting of stucco, and legalization of the copper cornice at 16 N. Front Street subject to its being painted cream color.

The proposal involves legalizing work done on three properties that form a hotel. Some of the work, including changing the windows at 14 N. Front Street and installing a copper cornice at 16 N. Front Street, has no permit. Work on 18 N. Front Street does not follow the approved plans. The approved drawings call for 6/6 true divided light windows with staff to approve shop drawings and a small cornice on the additional floor at the rear to minimize its visibility. Instead, the contractor built the project with windows that have applied muntins, the wrong light pattern and wide plank frames instead of the thin original clam shell molding that existed at the start of the project. The cornice on the new construction features a foot and a half overhang that calls attention to the new construction. In addition, an area that was to have red brick colored stucco was stuccoed in an orange color. The staff recommended denial of the legalization and would like the applicant to install new windows with the correct frames and light pattern.

Luca Sena, owner, said that the window installer made a mistake, but is willing to change the muntin pattern on the sash of the front façade and he will have the stucco painted.

James Tayoun spoke on behalf of the owner, and asked that the Commission take into consideration the rehabilitation and development the applicant has done in the city.

The Commission discussed at some length the windows and the extent to which the applicant had removed historic fabric. During the course of this deliberation, a consensus emerged to accept the inappropriate windows on Church Street façade of 18 North Front Street subject to the application of molding to evoke the correct historical forms and the installation of correct windows and frames on the front of 18 North Front Street.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the exception of the requirement to replace the windows and frames on the Church Street façade which may remain with moldings applied to mitigate the incorrect historical appearance. This recommendation is subject to all of the sash and frames on the front façade of 18 North Front Street being removed and replaced. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Thomas recused himself.

10 South 2nd Street

Philadelphia Real Estate, Eli Haddad

David Polatnick, Architect

DATE: c. 1785

PROPOSAL: HVAC and façade screen wall

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the HVAC unit subject to the building of a brick screen wall, and denial of staining the fabric of the store front with staff to review details.

The applicant seeks to legalize a very large and highly visible HVAC unit and ductwork installed without a permit on 10 South 2nd Street. Owing to the expense of moving the unit, the applicant seeks to screen the mechanical units partially by rebuilding a part of the historic façade, now missing from the building. Staff recommended approval per Standard 6.

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

1706 Delancey Street

Jeffrey Yablonovitz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the relocation of the railing of the upper deck to reduce markedly its visibility from the street with staff to review details and a mock-up. The rail can be angled to allow the stair to remain in its present location.

This application calls for the legalization of a roof deck on this row house's top floor, and a circular metal access stair between the decks. Photographs show visibility of the decks from the rear of the building. In addition, a high level of visibility of the roof deck exists from the front and east sides of the building.

Mr. Baron stated that he visited the site and the deck has visibility from all directions even with pulling back the railing. The precedent for roof decks in the district are on rear ells and this work was done absent a permit.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association, expressed its opposition to the legalization of the deck.

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

1600-18 Arch Street, INA Building, SW corner of South 16th Street

Dennis Martin, Quinnco, 1600 Arch Street, L.P., Owner

Robert B. Graves, Architect

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: New doors and louvers

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application with staff to approve the details

This application calls for final review of new entry doors and the addition of louvers to existing windows for the rehabilitation of this office building for residential and retail use. On the Cuthbert Street facade, plans show cutting new metal doors and the installation of metal louvers

and roll-up doors. On Arch Street, the applicant proposes new doors in an existing entry and a new retail entry with glass sidelights, metal infill panels and a glass and metal door. In addition, the new entry will have granite steps and a metal railing to match existing entrances.

Robert Graves, Michael Koep and Michael Prifti attended the meeting to explain the proposal and answer questions. Mr. Graves stated that the new door's design is a single door carrying down the mullion the full width with the center section frameless glass. The Cuthbert Street entrance connects to an egress corridor with double doors and the same frameless glass detail.

Mr. James questioned the Cuthbert Street grates on the street surface, and Mr. Koep responded that the existing grating at the two new automobile entrances will be replaced with structurally heavier grating to sustain heavy traffic.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant brought in a proposal to remove a bridge between 1600 Arch Street and Suburban Station. Commission members agreed to a staff level approval of a pure restoration.

The Commission also discussed the question of rooftop mechanical equipment that had not formed a part of the submission reviewed by the Committee. Mr. Perri suggested that this become a separate application.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve a revised submission with staff to review details. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1810 Spruce Street

1810 Spruce Street Incorporated, Richard Woosnam, Owner
Kiki Bolender, Architect
DATE: c. 1910
PROPOSAL: Rear addition

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the plans as submitted.

This application calls for the addition of a two-story greenhouse stair structure above a ground floor garage on the rear of this four-story row house. Building of the addition would require the demolition of an existing one-story greenhouse on the second floor. The plans show a new glazed addition. The applicant proposes replacing five windows on the west elevation with 2/2 wood windows. There exists limited visibility of the addition since no properties front on Cypress Street. The staff recommended approval owing to its limited visibility.

The applicant presented revised plans which show the side elevation's closing up the bottom of the windows. The staff and Mr. Thomas suggested it have a brick reveal.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the revised proposal with the reveal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2114 Delancey Street

Sam and Elizabeth Washawer, Owners
David Franke, Architect
DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Roof deck and stair house

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of this proposal as submitted owing to is minimal visibility.

This application involves the installation of a roof deck and a one-story stair house on top of this row house. The plans call for the location of the roof deck toward the rear portion of the house to decrease visibility from Delancey Street. In addition, the plans show a stair house with several 2/2 windows and a glazed door on the west elevation. The staff recommended approval per Standards 9 and 10.

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

2223 Spruce Street

Elizabeth Caulk, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear vinyl windows

The Architectural Committee voted to deny the application pursuant to Standard 6.

The proposal involves legalizing the removal of wood windows and the installation of vinyl windows on the building's rear façade facing Manning Street. Manning Street has houses about half the length of the block including a front door opposite this window work. The staff recommended denial. The staff also recommended the installation of new wood windows per Standard 6.

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

237 South 18th Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Owner's Association, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Entries, awnings and marquee

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the simplified design option.

This application calls for restoration of the building's main entry doors, based on the original 1928 design, on the 18th Street façade. In addition, the applicant proposes a canopy above this entrance. The plans show the canopy as a glass and steel structure with a glass lip and letters depicting the building's name. The proposal calls for the removal of a small amount of limestone to attach the canopy. The application offers two proposals for the canopy; one with historically referenced decoration and one with a more simplified design. The application also calls for canvas awnings and a channel sign band on the two side doors. The staff recommended approval with the simpler doors and the canopy per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron stated that the owner after speaking to his board had concerns about the art glass pendants and therefore presented a revised proposal with a more historic design.

Christian Busch, architect, stated that the owners want a more traditional look similar to that of 1830 South Rittenhouse Square. The new design will not have art glass but will have black acroteria and thin cut-out letters in brass or bronze. The canopy's ceiling will be glass with only the piers illuminated.

Mr. Brownlee expressed concerns about an attempt to create an historic appearance that never existed.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Brownlee opposed the motion.

128-32 Christian Street

Charles Burdumy, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of this proposal as submitted

The application calls for a second story addition on the rear of an existing building. The plans show three, 6/6 double hung, wood windows with true divided light on the west elevation. In addition, the applicant proposes a small deck on the south elevation with a wrought iron railing atop an existing brick pier canopy. The staff recommended approval of the addition per Standards 9 and 10.

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

3905 Spruce Street, rear carriage house

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard N. Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1850

PROPOSAL: Renovations, new entryways

The Architectural Committee recommended:

- 1. Retention of the chimney pending further investigation;*
- 2. Approval of the glazing of the porch with one piece of glass;*
- 3. Approval of glazing the panels of the existing carriage doors, and*
- 4. Approval of the new entryway and window with the concrete lintel showing through in a sandstone color with staff to review and approve the details and color.*

The application calls for renovations and new entryways to an existing carriage house on the University of Pennsylvania campus. On the south elevation, plans show the removal of a defunct chimney and the glazing of an existing porch. Existing carriage doors will have wood panels removed and additional glazing installed in the bottom panels. The proposal also provides for the restoration of a window opening with 2/2 sash to match others. On the east elevation, the plans indicate the installation of a new wood door and the reopening of three original windows as well as local repointing. The west elevation plans involve the cutting of new glass and metal entry doors, new metal frame windows and a window on the second story. Plans for the north elevation

show the installation of two new windows to match others in existing infilled openings and the conversion of a door into a louvered window. In addition, the applicant proposes replacing a basement window with louvers, the removal of an existing concrete ramp and railing, the restoration of the existing hayloft doors, and local repointing.

Mr. Wilds recommended saving a panel from the carriage doors; the applicant agreed. He also questioned signage on the window details and noted that any signage should be referred to the Commission.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the revised proposal with the retention of the chimney. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Brownlee recused himself and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P., Owners

Brian J. Billings, Architect

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: Market Street doors and signs

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a new entrance with double doors and signage placed at the rear of the front arches

The application calls for new entry doors and signage for a bank in the Reading Terminal Headhouse. On the Market Street or south façade, plans show the cutting of new wood double entry doors in a storefront restored in the 1990s and new illuminated signage hanging over the door. The proposal also provides for additional signage inside the storefront.

Mr. James questioned the need for additional entrances and asked if there is a provision that each tenant has signage and if a standard has been established for future tenants. The Commission thought standards for signage a necessity owing to its closeness to the Convention Center sign.

Neal Quenzel attended the meeting to represent the three proposals for Reading Terminal Market. He stated that the designs have been submitted to Harrisburg for tax credits. He also said that the new doors will be placed in the non-historic previous entrances.

The Commission thought that approval of one sign sets a precedent, therefore an overall sign package should be implemented. The applicant stated that the signage will hang back three feet from the face of the building.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with a metal sign with cut-out letters to be reviewed by the staff. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Perri opposed the motion.

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P., Owners

F. Neale Quenzel, Architect

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: New 12th Street entry

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the entry but with a door. The window can be internally covered with paper painted a dark shade of grey with the staff to review all details.

The application calls for a new entry to gain access to a bank machine on the 12th Street façade of this building. The plans show the cutting of an open entryway in an existing three-part window to create a lobby area for the ATM machine with no doors but louvers in the upper portion.

Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P., Owners

Albert Taus, Architect

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: New Market Street entry and signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of double doors to match those on the west of the front façade, as well as the illuminated hanging sign at the rear of the loggia arch. It recommended denial of the blade sign because it conflicts with the symmetry and grandeur of the façade.

This application calls for a new entrance and signage for a doughnut store on the Market Street façade of the Reading Terminal Headhouse. The plans show a centrally located single door with sidelights. In addition, the applicant proposes exterior illuminated signage.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Perri opposed the motion.

City Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner

James Bryan, Architect

DATE: 1891-1901

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a mock-up for the Committee, Commission and staff to review details of the lighting and mounting.

This application in concept calls for the installation of a new lighting scheme to illuminate City Hall. The architects hope to work on the lighting using the scaffolding that exists for the other restoration work. Areas of concern should include visibility of the fixtures and light sources, as well as attachment to the masonry.

Hyman Myers attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the conceptual proposal. He said that after the façade renovations, lighting will be put in forty locations and thereafter a mock-up can be installed and also that other buildings will be included in this illumination.

Mr. Baron raised the issue of a mock-up for the fixtures and fasteners.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for conceptual approval. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James recused himself.

530 Walnut Street, SE corner of 6th Street

Lincoln Property Company, Owner

Robert Neas, Applicant

DATE: 1914

PROPOSAL: Masonry repair

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

This application calls for legalizing the repair and/or replacement of damaged granite on the building's ground floor level. The staff recommended approval per Standard 6 subject to cleaning the granite to match the dutchman.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Policy on the execution of the Manayunk," §§ PM-703.1.2 and 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. The Commission never adopted a policy for this issue and recommended that in the interim, the staff give approval and if this not possible, refer it to Committee and Commission. Mr. James recommended putting a committee together along with City Council to amend the Ordinance. Jane Glenn, Manayunk Neighborhood Council, asked to be included in the deliberations.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to establish a committee to work with City Council to amend the Manayunk Ordinance. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, November 2000.

Mr. Tyler asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$24.82 for Architectural Committee lunches.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes

