

**THE MINUTES OF THE 400th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 December 1995**

**Wayne Spilove, Chairperson
City Council Caucus Chamber, Room 401 City Hall**

Present

Wayne Spilove, Chairperson
David Brownlee
Duane Bumb, Commerce Department
William Candelori
Joseph James, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, City Planning Commission
Arlene Matzkin
Robert Vance, City Planning Commission
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing and Community Development
Stephanie Wolf

Joshua Grimes, City Solicitor's Office

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Lori Plavin Salganicoff, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Preservation Researcher

Also

William C. Link, Maintenance, Historic Landmarks for Living
Mary Galgon, Property Manager, Historic Landmarks for Living
Richard W. Thom, Old City Civic Association
Sallie A. Updyke, Counsel for Wills Eye Hospital
Jeff Wilson, Richard Conway Meyer Architect
Bernard Nearey, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Debora Rodrigues
George Galis
Ira Brind, 1830 Rittenhouse Square, 14A
William Schwartz, Esq.
Judith Eden, CCRA
William Wheeler, 1811 Rittenhouse Square
Larry Persofsky, 2331 North Broad Street
Bobbie Burke, CCRA
Milton Marks, Preservation Coalition
David Dobson, 2331 North Broad Street
George J. Baker, 325 S. 18th Street
Pete Quick

Mr. Spilove welcomed all in attendance to the 400th meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. This meeting also marks the 40-year anniversary of the creation of the Commission.

The 400th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission was called to order at 10:15 AM by Wayne Spilove, Chairperson, who recognized the presence of a quorum of the Commission.

THE MINUTES of the 399th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 8 November 1995, Wayne Spilove, Chairperson, were approved by unanimous vote and adopted upon a motion made by Dr. Wolf and seconded by Mr. Wilds.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE REPORT, 28 November 1995, Arlene Matzkin, Chair

1828 CHESTNUT STREET

Martin and Suzanne Kelly, Applicants

PROPOSAL: New wood 2/2 true muntin windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

The applicant seeks to install new wood 2/2 true muntin windows in the front and visible rear of the property.

A motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee was made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Dr. Brownlee. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

1901-45 VINE STREET, FREE LIBRARY OF PHILADELPHIA

George Yu, Architect

PROPOSAL: Pediment and stone restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with details to be reviewed by staff

The applicant seeks to restore and repair the stonework up at the pediment level of the Free Library. A conservator was hired to make recommendations for the interventions.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. This was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and passed by unanimous vote.

18TH AND SANSOM STREETS

First Baptist Church, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Stained glass cleaning and repair

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with details to be reviewed by staff.

The applicant seeks to clean and restore the stained glass. The existing window grates will be cleaned, repainted and replaced.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. This was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and passed by unanimous vote.

412 SOUTH ISEMINGER STREET

Arnold Kurtz, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Security door and transom grate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee voted to recommend denial of this proposal as it would hide too much of

the architecture of the building and set an important negative precedent. They recommended that the applicant could deal with security with a six panel metal door and that a metal grate could be installed inside the transom.

The applicant seeks to install a metal and glass security/storm door in front of and covering both the door and three pane transom.

A motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee to deny the application was made by Dr. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Wilds and passed by unanimous vote.

334 SOUTH 24TH STREET

Victoria Lilly, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New wood windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff review of details.

The applicant seeks to install new wood 6/6 true muntin sash in existing window openings.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. This was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and passed by unanimous vote.

237-41 SOUTH 21ST STREET

Dante Luciani, Applicant

Jeffrey Hayes, Susan Maxman Architects

PROPOSAL: New windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee Recommended approval of the proposal contingent upon the restoration of the masonry watertable on 239 S. 21st St.

The applicant, aided by his architect, made a revised proposal which included the following; on 21st Street no work would occur to the basement level windows, the first floor windows will be replaced with wood true muntin 2/2 sash, on the 2nd and 3rd floors the existing 1/1 vinyl windows will remain with a special brickmold to be installed, on the 4th floor the existing vinyl windows will be retrofitted with applied muntins that will match the depth of the historic muntins and the brick mold will be applied. In the bay windows, new wood casement windows will be installed in a three part pattern. The existing leaded transoms will remain. In each case the existing frames will be retained and any vinyl will be roughed up and painted to match the wood. The Locust Street side will match 21st St. and the historic 1922 photo but the first floor will be 1/1 and all windows will be wood and the dormer level windows will have true divided lights.

A motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee was made by Dr. Brownlee, seconded by Mr. Wilds, and passed by unanimous vote.

314 EAST WISTER STREET

Anthony Weber, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Rear additions

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

The proposal calls for raising a one story rear addition to two stories and raising a two story segment to three stories. All work will be at the rear of the property.

Dr. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

311-313 CHESTNUT STREET

Richard Conway Meyer, Architect

PROPOSAL: New front window openings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval because they did not find the addition to have enough significance to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards strictly.

This proposal involves cutting down the central windows on the front facade to allow for a view of Independence National Historical Park. The current windows begin at shoulder level on the inside of the structure.

A motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee was made by Mr. Wilds, seconded by Dr. Brownlee, and passed by unanimous vote.

1830 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Ira Brind, 1830 Rittenhouse Square

PROPOSAL: New single pane picture windows to match existing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial based on the fact that the building was designated with 1/1 sash as shown in the record photo taken at the time of designation. The loss of these windows does significant damage to this important building.

The proposal involves replacing existing single pane windows with newer single pane windows. Mr. Brind explained that his architect had told him that an owner of an historic property may always replace existing fabric to match what currently exists. He said that he and his wife also looked at a unit on the fifth floor but that they decided on the unit on the fourteenth floor because they liked having big unobstructed picture windows. Mr. Candelori said that people should be allowed to upgrade to more efficient windows. Arlene Matzkin explained that the issue here is not efficiency, because it is easy to make double glazed Argon filled windows in the correct historic configuration for the same cost. Rather the application should be denied because of the principle that the historic condition of the building, which was the condition at the time of designation, is in fact the character that the Commission is empowered to protect. The record designation photograph shows 1/1 windows, not single pane casements. The owner is asking to legalize a condition which does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and which

was achieved without Commission review. Although there are other units that have the same condition, also without Commission review, the photos show that this has altered significantly the historic character of the front facade. Members saw no difference between the protection of historic windows stacked up vertically in a condominium apartment building and the windows of rowhouses arrayed horizontally. Although the staff does not detect every violation at the time it occurs, it is important that the Commission not regard work performed after designation without a valid permit as an existing condition upon subsequent application for a permit. Mr. Spilove explained that in his experience this building is having some difficulty selling units because of the cost of renovations and that perhaps the Commission should approve this work to help stimulate investment in the building. Other members expressed the opinion that this is the most prestigious apartment building in the City and that it is all the more sought after because of its historic character. In addition, members said that this application does not rest on financial hardship. They also thought that one horizontal window bar was not an important impediment to viewing the park. Rather, Mr. Vance explained, this is really a question of whose view is being protected: the owner's view from the building or the public's view from Rittenhouse Square. In his judgment the ordinance directs the Commission to protect the historic character for the public.

Mr. Vance made a motion to follow the recommendation of the Architectural Committee to deny the proposal. This was seconded by Dr. Brownlee. The motion passed by 5 votes to 4. Commissioners Brownlee, Matzkin, Vance, Wolfe and Wilds supported the proposal while Commissioners Bumb, Candelori, James and Spilove voted against it.

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 4 December 1995,
Wayne Spilove, Chair**

103-105, 107-109 WALNUT STREET

William Schwartz, Esq.

PROPOSAL: Demolition

Financial Hardship Committee Recommendation: Approval of demolition for 103-105 Walnut Street; denial of demolition for 107-109 Walnut Street.

Mr. Tyler summarized the recommendation of the Committee. He explained that the Hardship Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of 103-105 Walnut Street based upon the violation citing the building as imminently dangerous. The Committee did note, however that this condition came about in part through the owner's neglect of the building and failing to heed the earlier violation notice of Licenses and Inspections. He reported that the Committee voted against recommending in favor of demolition for 107-109 Walnut Street inspite of findings of hardship both in the reports of Richard Cohen and the consultant hired by the Commission Reaves Lukens. The Committee

came to their recommendation because of the total lack of plan for development or reuse for this site or the larger parcel. If the owner had been able to show that it was not financially feasible to incorporate this building into a planned new development, Mr. Tyler thought that the Committee might have entered a different recommendation.

Wayne Spilove explained that he understood that if the applicant had offered to build even a low wall with landscaping that the Committee would have been willing to recommend in favor of demolition.

Scott Wilds said that he was unsure whether the Commission could require the applicant to come forward with a reuse plan, particularly in cases where we understand and agree that there is financial hardship in developing the building on its own.

Joshua Grimes, Commission council, explained that there are two parts to this question. First his reading of the ordinance suggests that the Commission can ask to see the development plan where there is one. Second he does not think that a finding of financial hardship means that the Commission must approve demolition. Because there is a clause requiring the owner to maintain the building such that it will not be demolished by neglect, the owner should not be allowed to claim hardship when it is self-imposed.

William Schwartz representing the equitable owner of the building, Joseph Pacitti, explained that he was appearing to apply for demolition under the hardship clause of the ordinance.

He explained that there is currently no plan for development of the site for a new building or for parking. He said that the former proposed development had disappeared with the passage of time and that we are in a down cycle for development. The buildings are currently in shell condition. The City has sought to compel the owner to repair these buildings without giving the option of demolition. Without specific legislation allowing this, Mr. Schwartz argued in front of Judge Nigro that this is a taking and condemnation by the City. He said that the Judge has said that 103-105 can come down, but that the owner must apply for demolition of 107-109 Walnut Street to the Commission. He related that the applicant first applied with the hardship documentation that had been prepared by the legal owner of the building at Mr. Tyler's suggestion. After receiving much negative criticism of that report, the applicant came back with another report to document the hardship of preservation. The Commission's own consultant agreed with that assessment. The applicant claims that it will cost \$300,000 to \$500,000 just to stabilize 107 Walnut after the demolition of 103 Walnut. Besides the tremendous expense involved much of this bracing would have to be removed later to develop the building. In a good faith effort, the applicant is now offering to build a fence around the property based on the December 1992 Planning Commission Zoning guidelines for a parking lot. Mr. Schwartz handed around a drawing of the proposal. He also passed out an engineering report by Kurt Carmen, the engineer who inspected the property and wrote that if 103 Walnut Street was demolished this would in

turn make 107 Walnut Street imminently dangerous. He explained that the steel frame in 107 was installed not to stabilize it but rather to allow higher loads on the floors. It was not meant to give lateral support, and in fact the party wall between the buildings was partly removed at the time the frame was installed.

He explained that Mr. Pacitti's insurance company would not insure this building and that he believes it would be doing a disservice to public safety to leave this building standing.

Mr. Maenner of Licenses and Inspections related that he had visited the property and found the steel frame to be rusted and in need of reinforcement. Mr. Solvile of Licenses and Inspections said that with the additional information from Mr. Carmen's report, if that report were sealed, he would now list the building as imminently dangerous.

Arlene Matzkin made the point that the report had estimated \$200,000 to stabilize the building and that much damage had been done by the owner by removing all the stabilizing floor boards.

Mr. Schwartz explained that the equitable owner has only had the property for a year and that the damage had occurred over many years during which the City should have cited the owners with violations. He also said that the owner took up some floor boards to inspect the joists, found they were not bearing on the wall, and the floor system in the whole building collapsed. He added that the Commission had allowed almost every other building on that block to come down and the real estate market is in a down cycle which requires that everyone must adjust their expectations.

Mr. Grimes asked Mr. Schwartz if his client was willing to commit to building the fence wall shown in the plan as a condition of any demolition of these buildings. Mr. Schwartz said that he was and that the wall would be built immediately after demolition.

Mr. Spilove noted that everyone on the Commission is angry at approving these demolitions piece by piece, where there has been severe neglect, however, the Commission has been forced into these decisions because of the lack of enforcement from Licenses and Inspections, the Law Department and the Courts.

Milton Marx of the Preservation Coalition asked that the Commission make the grounds for its decision on these buildings very clear and to make sure that it does not appear to be rewarding an owner's demolition by neglect.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association said that for the past three and one half years the Commission has overseen the clearing of this quadrant of the Old City historic district. Particularly in this case, where the owner of a building has so blatantly created a dangerous condition with the removal of the floorboards, the Commission is clearly rewarding an owner for neglect and active demolition. He warned other communities that they can not count on the Commission to protect their historic buildings or districts. Mr. Thom explained that in this economic

climate with the reduced tax credits, that it would be virtually impossible to make any shell property work economically. In the fifteen years that the neighborhood has seen demolition of its historic properties, there has not been even one new development on that property. The reason that there is no new development proposed is that new development on the site also would not be economically viable. The Community does not think that this is a good enough reason to demolish these properties, because once they are gone the possibility of reuse and adaptive rehabilitation is gone forever.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion that the Commission approve the demolition of 103-105 Walnut Street based solely on economic hardship without reference to the building's condition or how it got that way and conditioned upon the owner's erecting the fence wall shown in the submitted plan. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wolf and approved by unanimous vote.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the demolition of 107-109 Walnut Street also based on economic hardship. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilds and approved by unanimous vote.

219, 221 SOUTH 9TH STREET

Sallie A. Updyke, Esq.

PROPOSAL: Demolition

Financial Hardship Committee Recommendation: Deferral to work on development proposal

Mr. Tyler explained that the applicant had applied to demolish the buildings at 219-221 S. 9th Street based on economic hardship, in particular the increased cost of stabilizing and sealing the buildings. The applicant stated that over the long term the hospital would like to demolish the entire row in order to build some type of out-patient care facility, although it does not have any developed plans to that end. Wills Eye does, however, already own all but three of the properties in the row.

The Committee did not recommend approval or denial of the application; rather it sought to work with the applicant in developing a proposal.

Ms. Updike noted that the Committee had also said that there were perhaps alternative and less expensive ways to seal and stabilize the building and that it offered to visit the property to make recommendations.

Mrs. Matzkin said that the estimates on the expense of sealing the building were wildly out of line and the applicant should seek new bids to complete the work of stabilizing and sealing the building.

Mr. Wilds expressed confidence that because of the space behind the buildings that it will be possible to create a development somewhat along the lines of the Pennsylvania Hospital building in the 700 block of Spruce Street.

The Commission voted to defer a decision on the matter to allow time to work with the hospital on a development proposal.

**Continuation of the REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28
November 1995, Arlene Matzkin, Chair**

2121 WALNUT STREET

Donna Fecondo, Applicant

**PROPOSAL: Stone-colored graffiti coating of facade, restoration of
copper ornament**

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of stone colored paint conditional upon restoration of copper ornament

This proposal was sent back to the Committee because the Commission had not received a building permit application at the time of the last hearing. The proposal involves the legalization of the painting of an unpainted stone surface of the building as well as the copper ornament at the top parapet of the building. The Committee voted to approve this stone color paint as a graffiti covering, conditional upon the copper ornament at the top of the building being stripped of paint and resecured with the square ornament being placed symmetrically along the front parapet and the swags distributed in their current configuration without altering the spacing.

A motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal was made by Dr. Brownlee and seconded by Dr. Wolf. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

24 SOUTH BANK STREET

William Link, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Legalize door replacement

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial. New doors should be made that achieve the security purpose, but also replicate the height and look of the historic doors.

The applicant explained that vandals had repeatedly broken the doors and threatened the building with the possibility of fire. The current metal doors were installed on an emergency basis. Richard Thom of the Old City community explained that this building had been restored using the tax credits and that the side streets facing this door were being upgraded as part of the administration's attempts to create tourism corridors through this area. Commission members explained that new doors should be made of metal or wood, possibly with interior bars to match the original doors seen in our photographs. The applicant should work with staff on the design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee to deny the application which was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and approved by unanimous vote.

FAIRMOUNT WATERWORKS

Claire Donato, Mark Thompson Associates, Architects

PROPOSAL: Vents for kitchen and air conditioning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of scheme C to install air vents behind louvered shutters on the south or garden facade, as well as in arched reveals on the east and west facades and within rebuilt chimneys that retain their present configuration.

The applicant drew up three possible solutions to the exhaust and intake air needed for a restaurant and display area in the old engine house. The Committee thought that scheme C would be least intrusive to the public.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal. Dr. Brownlee seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

ACADEMY OF MUSIC, 232-246 S. BROAD STREET

Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group Architects

PROPOSAL: Ramp, roof alterations, loading dock alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of Roof and loading dock alterations, restudy of ramp.

The applicant proposed to raise two penthouses set back on the roof of the Academy to install new structure to support the roof. Additionally the applicant described changes to improve accessibility to the service entrance on the Locust Street facade. The application to install a long ramp on the Broad Street facade had been withdrawn in between the Committee and Commission meeting.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee which was seconded by Mr. Wilds and Unanimously approved.

3409 HAMILTON STREET

Russ Friday, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New front stone retaining wall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

The applicant has removed the remains of a collapsed brick retaining wall and rebuilt the wall in a gray stone. The gray stone better typifies the walls of the neighborhood and no one could say whether the brick wall was original.

The motion made by Dr. Brownlee and seconded by Dr. Wolf to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal passed by unanimous vote.

824 SOUTH FRONT STREET

Stella Toczhlowski, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Storefront restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with a reduction

in the width of the store front window mullions.

The proposal called for restoring the front of this storefront to its look at the time of designation with the division of the main storefront window into three parts to protect against a vandalism problem. The doorway will be restored to look like a full height double leaf door.

Dr. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal which was seconded by Dr. Brownlee. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

325 SOUTH 18TH STREET

Teresa Kennedy, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Reconstruction of rear section of the building to replicate existing.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of demolition of rear portions of the building conditional upon rebuilding in kind.

The concept of demolishing the rear portion of this imminently dangerous building and rebuilding it to replicate the historic original has been reviewed and approved before. This review differed in that the applicant explained that the mansard also probably must be rebuilt and details have been provided.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. This was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and passed by unanimous vote.

1811 WALNUT STREET

William Wheeler, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Concept of rear demolition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval conditional upon receiving, reviewing and approving plans for a compatible rear addition for Sansom Street.

George Galis, President of the Center City Residents Association read a letter objecting to any approval in concept without any idea being proposed for the design of the building at the rear. Mr. Vance spoke for a number of Commission members who said that the applicant must provide more of a proposal before the Commission would be willing to give even conceptual approval.

Mr. Tyler explained that it is important for the Commission to give guidance to applicants who are considering investing so that they can make informed decisions. Sometimes the advice of staff is not certain enough in cases of this magnitude. Bill Wheeler, acting on behalf of the developer echoed this sentiment. Dr. Brownlee referred to the fact that the Commission had in the past agreed to the demolition of the rear portion of this building when given a massing study showing a 40 story tower. Commission members asked Mr. Wheeler to define further his proposal and come back with it.

2331-2335 NORTH BROAD STREET

David Dobson, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New shingle roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Defer pending the receipt of additional information regarding the pricing of a more appropriate roof.

Mrs. Matzkin explained that the applicant seeks to install a new shingle roof because the current shingle roof leaks. The original roof at the time of designation was a standing seam copper roof. The current roof was installed without a permit. Committee members thought that a new standing seam roof would be the correct roof for this building and that shingles were the least appropriate roof for the building both owing to the residential look of shingles and the problem of water getting under them on this shallow pitch roof. They asked the applicant to price out a rubber membrane roof both with and without battens to approximate the look of a standing seam roof. Members questioned the bid price of \$96,000 for shingles on this size of roof. The applicant has since received a revised bid which raises the price of the roof \$30,000 to cover it with a rubber membrane. Mrs. Matzkin telephoned the architect for the work on the rest of the complex who explained that three years ago she had approached the Commission about installing a new roof on this building. She designed a roof with exterior gutters and standing seam metal on the visible portions of the roof and had estimated the total cost at \$35,000. When Mrs. Matzkin called Canon Associates, who wrote up a roofing report on this building in May 1995, they also were shocked at the cost of the proposed roof. They thought the shingle roof including reflashing the skylight could be achieved for between \$15,000 to \$20,000. Both Mrs. Matzkin and Mr. Canon thought that a rubber roof would run in the range of about \$1.00 a square foot for materials. Mr. Dobson of Food For Life explained that they had gotten three bids which came in at approximately the same price. He had wished to install a copper roof which was the reason for delaying the work.

The bank explained that they would not loan money for other work on the building if a new roof was not installed first, which is the reason why he is trying to go ahead with this roof now. He explained that they hired a roofing consultant to work with the contractors. He could delay the process until the spring to get new bids, but he was not sure that would make a difference in price.

Mrs. Kaplan recommended that perhaps Mr. Dobson could utilize his own consultant, Mr. Canon to find contractors and refine the bids both to save themselves money and come up with a more sympathetic proposal.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion that the applicant go back and work with staff to obtain some additional bids and a more sympathetic solution to recovering this roof. This motion was seconded by Mr. Wilds and passed unanimously.

2035 SPRUCE STREET

Deborah Gruenstein, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New slate roof

This application had come before the Commission before with an application for asphalt shingles and was turned down. Now the applicant is applying to reroof in kind to match the original scalloped slate.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the proposal which was seconded by Mr. Wilds and passed by unanimous vote.

2402-2404 PINE STREET

PROPOSAL: New windows and door

This proposal involves restoring the front facade with new 6/6 true muntin wood windows and a six panel wood door.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal which was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and approved by unanimous vote.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HALL

William Dupont, Voith and Mactavish Architects

PROPOSAL: Roof alterations

This proposal involves rebuilding the roof that has suffered severe water damage. The applicant has agreed to rebuild the hipped and gabled slate roof back from the front wall to the visible air ventilator. Beyond this point where the roof is not visible, the applicant wishes to build a very low pitch gable roof that will save a considerable amount in construction cost. At the rear wall where the roof is only slightly visible the applicant would construct a hip to meet the rear parapet.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the proposal which was seconded by Mr. Wilds and approved by unanimous vote.

100-102 MARKET STREET

Sabrina Soong, Architect

PROPOSAL: New windows and door

This proposal involves the installation of wood true muntin windows on this long empty and open building. The owner has asked for one alteration consisting of a ground floor wood and glass entry door to be built in the farthest western bay of the ground floor. This door will permit direct access to the upper floors from the outside of the building.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal which was seconded by Dr. Brownlee and approved by unanimous vote .

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES: Certified Local Government
Comment, Richard Tyler

Mr. Tyler explained the role of the Commission, as the representative of a Certified Local Government, in the National Register nomination process.

Reading Railroad North Broad Street Station

Mr. Tyler said that this station was being nominated under criteria A (association with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history) and C (characteristic of a type, period or method of construction; work of a master; high artistic value). According to Mr. Tyler's research this is the only train station by the important Philadelphia architect, Horace Trumbauer. Built in 1929, the station was part of a great effort to increase Reading Railroad passenger traffic. Constructed on the eve of the Depression and in a period of decline for rail passenger traffic however, the building was doomed to failure as a station. The listing of the building on the Register hopefully will help to secure a reuse and the preservation of the building.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to support the building for listing on the National Register which was seconded by Mr. James and approved by unanimous vote.

Multiple Resource Nomination: Pre-1945 Philadelphia Housing Authority Public Housing

Mr. Tyler said that the second nomination also met criteria A and C. The nomination includes P.H.A. projects at Abbottsford Homes, Bartram Village, Hill Creek, Oxford Village, Passyunk Homes, Richard Allen Homes James Weldon Johnson Homes and Tasker Homes. They are significant for their place in architecture, the effort to create decent housing for the poor and the defence industry and race relations. They were nominated in the context of a Memorandum of Agreement worked out among the Advisory Council, the State Historic Preservation Office, H.U.D. and P.H.A. to facilitate the receipt of over \$200,000,000 to demolish and remodel parts of the complexes. Mr. Tyler suggested that the Commission should acknowledge the eligibility of these properties while recommending to the State Preservation Board that they not be listed. He explained that P.H.A. had complied with the Memorandum of Agreement by nominating the eight complexes and by having the rehabilitation and demolition plans reviewed by the S.H.P.O. or the Commission. Indeed, during the early discussions that resulted in the Memorandum, the state, federal and local preservation officials made it clear that they did not seek the preservation of physical and architectural conditions that exacerbated the social conditions. Actual listing would serve no preservation objective and could create a misconception about the role of preservation, the National Register and Section 106.

Mr. Wilds explained that in legal terms there is no difference in the review of work on buildings that are eligible

for listing as opposed to buildings that are actually listed on the National Register. Still he was concerned about even conceding the eligibility of the structures to the State if this would in any way hinder the work that needs to be done to these properties.

Dr. Brownlee said that he thought that judging the buildings from an historical standpoint they are some of the most significant in the City. He thought that at an extreme even a concentration camp has an historical story that needs to be told. He also said that given the significance of these complexes and the seriousness of our society's social problems, that we should not avoid officially recognizing this significance on a technicality.

Mr. James thought that the Commission should recommend these buildings for actual listing because he thought that these residents would appreciate having this history recognized and that they could understand that this is part of a process to improve the buildings. This opinion was supported by Mr. Vance.

Mr. Tyler explained that the director and deputy director of P.H.A. both thought that the complexes should not actually be listed and that just the nomination of them fulfilled the requirements of the Memorandum of Agreement.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to recommend the buildings for listing on the National Register. This was seconded by Mr. James and passed by unanimous vote with the exception of Mr. Wilds who voted against the motion.

**REPORT of the Activities of the Philadelphia Historical
Commission Staff, November 1995, Richard Tyler, Historic
Preservation Officer**

Milton Marks commended Lori Salgonicoff for her work at the Commission, particularly in the area of out-reach to the Community.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the Report of the Staff Activities and to thank Lori Salgonicoff for her years of fine work. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wolf and passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Tyler took a moment to describe recent continued discussions with the National Park Service regarding the monitoring of climate control at Independence National Park. He explained how the Commission's consultant agreed that the proposed monitoring should be scaled back; for example the proposed sampling schedule of every five minutes down to every hour or indeed three times a day. The Commission concurred that this would be an appropriate course to follow.

Mr. Spilove thanked the staff for a good year and wished

everyone a happy New Year.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron