

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Arlene Matzkin, Chair
Commission Conference Room
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street
24 June 1997

Present

Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson
Penelope Batcheler
Herbert Levy
Suzanne Pentz

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Robert Blood, Intern

Also

Philip Scott, John Milner Associates
George Wolfer, Girard Estates
Martha Coonley, 109 Church Street
Ivor Moore
Marvin J. Gerstein, Temple University
Eric Rahe, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Shawn Marren, George Yu Architects
Raymond Rola, AIA
Ed Lucas, Undine Barge Club
James Garrison, Hillier Group
Bob Levy, Edifice Rex
John Hunter, Venturi Scott Brown Architects
Elmer Atkinson, G.A.R. Museum
Thelma Rachubinski
Bill Wilkenson, University of Pennsylvania
Fritz Doerstling
Marcene Rogovin, Reading Terminal Market
Leslie Gallery
Bill Mc Dowell,
Elizabeth Masters, Cope Linder Associates
Gregory Picovitsky, Comcast
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Vern Lei, T.C. Lei & Associates
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Judith Eden, C.C.R.A.
Laura Blaw
David Schwing
Kenneth Brinkley, Architect, School District of Philadelphia
Diane Perkolup, Esq. council, School District of Philadelphia
Jeff Levine, John Milner Associates
Lisa Armstrong, Armstrong Kaulbach Architects
Fred Kaulbach, A.K.A.
Mary Ossi, Vitetta Group
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group
David Schaaf, City Planning Commission
Claire Oliver
Terry Graboyes, Graboyes Commercial Window

Carl Massara, AIA, Carl Massara and Associates
Tang D. Wong, 274 S. 20th Street

Ms. Matzkin called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

1115-1145 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

Philip Scott, John Milner Associates

DATE: 1891-1893

PROPOSAL: Masonry restoration of Headhouse shell; new windows

This proposal for the restoration of the shell of the Headhouse has been greatly rushed by the need to prepare the masonry base of the building for the Hard Rock Cafe. For this reason the architects have had time to show the scope of the work rather than to draw all of the details. The work includes repair to the badly damaged granite base of the building, cutting back the damaged rusticated granite bands to receive dutchmen panels of new rusticated granite. At the window heads, the plans show removal of the metal beams and patching the bottom of the voussoirs. The south west corner of the first floor, formerly built out in concrete for the twentieth century Sunray Drugstore facade, will receive a new facing of banded granite. The new base will project out approximately eight inches and fit under the rebuilt granite cornice. The architect proposes the replacement of the existing wood windows with aluminum windows to match the design and profiles of the existing. Although not shown on the drawings they intend to repair the existing leaded glass arched panels over the second floor windows and group them in the front corner conference room area. Mr. Baron asked that the drawings be revised to show the architects stated intent to retain those windows as well as the Reading Terminal sign. Mr. Scott explained that he proposes to clean the masonry and replace damaged or missing balusters with replicas in cast stone as well as repair and stabilize the upper floor terra cotta.

The Committee discussed the possibility of making the first floor repair projection mirror the stone portico that once existed on the east end of the facade rather than have it cover an intact stone pier. The architect explained that they prefer the solution as drawn in order to create symmetry around the opening and the Committee agreed to accept that proposal.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval with staff to review details and design of windows and masonry work.

20-30 North Front Street and 103-107 Church Street

Girard Estate, Owner

George Wolfer, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of windows; install painted plywood

The Girard Estate owns nine buildings at the intersection of Front and Church Streets that have sat vacant for many years.

Mr. Wolfer explained that the windows had deteriorated over a long period of time and that the Estate recently removed the windows and sealed the buildings pending the receipt of a development proposal. The Estate has pointed some of the masonry, replaced floor joists and installed new roofs on the buildings. They have installed boards painted to look like windows along Front Street although the Church Street windows remain open. A neighbor who bought 109 Church Street, Ms. Coonley, complained of water pouring into the Church Street buildings damaging her foundation walls. She would like to see the buildings sealed although not boarded up. She said that Girard Estate has let these buildings sit vacant, blighting the neighborhood for years and that they should sell or develop them and not be allowed to merely board them up.

Mr. Baron suggested asking that the Estate seal the rear windows with boards, but that the front windows particularly on Church Street, where they face rented apartments and restored buildings, should have new correct sash installed and not boards. The rest of the windows should come back for review within three months to allow time to explore development opportunities.

The Committee voted to recommend that all the windows be boarded up from the outside and painted to resemble windows, for a period not to exceed three months. At that time, or before, the Estate must return with a window replacement proposal. Ms. Pentz abstained from voting.

925 Chestnut Street

Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, Owner

Ivor Moore, Applicant

DATE: c.1925

PROPOSAL: Signage for building owner and tenant

This proposal calls for four signs under two separate applications, two white aluminum signs for Blue Cross, the tenant, and two bronze signs identifying the building as 925 Chestnut Street. The Committee thought that the signs near the main door appropriate but that the signs on 10th Street confused the public.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Blue Cross sign and the bronze 925 Chestnut Street above and next to the main door, but to deny the signs on the corner on 10th Street.

1834-38 Park Mall, Shusterman Hall

Temple University, Owner

George Yu, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Stone plaque

This proposal calls for installing a carved stone plaque

bearing the name of the man who made possible the rehabilitation of the building.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the plaque.

321-325 South Street

Leonard Lipkin, Owner

Elan Zaken, Applicant

DATE: 1825/1920 refacade

PROPOSAL: Cut new 2nd floor windows

This proposal calls for removing a full width sign board from the face of this building and cutting two large show windows into the second floor brick facade. The facade itself, a nondescript twentieth century brick front, refaced two early 19th century rowhouses. The Committee discussed removing the sign band first to see the facade beneath; however, most agreed that given the lack of architectural distinction of the facade, the applicant should not undertake the effort.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval provided the applicant documents the facade beneath the sign band with a photograph after removal of the sign and before cutting the new windows.

330 South 3rd Street

Mr. and Mrs. Bromley, Owners

Jeffrey Biel, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1775

PROPOSAL: Re-roof

This proposal calls for reroofing this building with flat black shingles to match the neighboring property. Committee members thought that the roofer should use a dimensional shingle in weathered wood color. The two roofs should look separate on the two houses.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of reroofing with weathered wood color asphalt/fiberglass dimensional type shingles.

Boathouse #13, Undine Boathouse

Undine Barge Club, Owner

George Skarmear, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Complete restoration

This proposal calls for restoring the boathouse back to its c. 1895 appearance, removing the asphalt roof and reinstalling a slate roof with cresting. They will remove a later porch roof and a casement window and restore a roll up awning and some

woodwork depicted in an 1895 picture. Work will include rebuilding a chimney and repainting woodwork according to an historic color scheme. The applicant supplied numerous historic photographs to document the historic look of the property as designed by Frank Furness.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval based on the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Restoration.

3401 Spruce Street, Irvine Auditorium

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

John Hunter, Venturi Scott Brown Architects/Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Masonry restoration; cut, widen opening; close skylights

This proposal involves modifying an auditorium famed for its unsuccessful acoustics into a successful up to date theater. The University seeks to repair the masonry shell and roof with slate and copper. In repairing the roof several skylights will receive a roof of copper. Code issues require the creation of several exits to meet modern fire safety egress requirements. The plans show a window cut into an exit, and a door widened to accommodate a greater flow of people. Committee members examined the plans to try to find an alternative to widening the door opening and creating the appearance of unsupported masonry. Mr. Levy favored the idea of installing a piece of stone under the now visually unsupported gothic arch. Behind a different arch, Mr. Hunter explained that the installation of a tracery like grate will hide mechanical equipment.

The Committee voted 2 to 1 to recommend approval with staff to review details. Mr. Levy voted against the proposal owing to the treatment of the opening. Ms. Pentz abstained from voting.

832 South Front Street

Thomas Rachubinski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl replacement windows & storm door

In 1992, the Rachubinskis replaced existing one-over-one wood windows with vinyl one-over-one windows. From pictures of the other identical buildings in the row we can surmise that the original windows contained six-over-six panes. The staff had a violation issued at that time and spoke with the owners about replacement. Recently staff asked to have the violation reissued and the matter goes to court for non-compliance in mid-July. Since the last violation, the Rachubinskis have also installed a vinyl storm door. The owners claim that the Department of Licenses and Inspections told them that they did not need a permit for the windows. Mr. Baron suggested a compromise based on the existence of one-over-one windows at the time of designation. He suggested the replacement of the tall basement

sliders and the first floor windows with historic sash as well as painting the storm door and window frames a color to match the existing main door.

Ms. Batchelor said that the storm door seemed to have the worst impact and set a bad precedent of covering the doorway. She said that doorways constitute the main decorative feature of Philadelphia houses and should remain exposed. She also recommended reinstalling the wood show sills, the lack of which make the windows look flat. Mr. Levy noted other storm doors on the block and said the precedent had been set. Ms. Batchelor said that the Commission had not approved those other storm doors and that the Commission should enforce a policy against them. The Rachubinskis explained that the storm door also helps protect against burglaries. Mr. Tyler suggested that, given the incorrect information from the Department that the owners paint the storm door but leave the existing windows.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the eight new windows because of the misinformation given by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and split 2 to 2 on approval of the storm door. Those in favor of allowing the storm door said that the approval should be conditioned on the owner's painting it to match the main door.

4278-80 Griscom Street

Elmer Atkinson/Applicant

DATE: c. 1795

PROPOSAL: Repoint, stucco base, close two basement windows, install security doors in two other basement windows.

This proposal calls for stuccoing the base of this Federal style house in Frankford. This portion of the facade originally sat below grade. The applicant will clean and repoint the upper walls. Because of security problems in the area, the caretakers of this Civil War Museum would like to close up two of the former basement level, now the first floor, windows and install flush metal security doors in the other two.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the masonry work with a mix and pointing sample to be approved by staff; closing up the two basement windows leaving a stuccoed reveal, and installing the security doors, disguising them to look like closed shutters with a design to be worked out with the staff.

1115-1145 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

Elizabeth Masters, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1891-1893

PROPOSAL: Loading deck on Filbert Street; louvers in windows on Market Street; mechanicals on roof

This proposal calls for creating a loading dock on Filbert

Street and putting louvers into the upper portions of two windows within the Market Street arcade area. Plans show a large air chilling tower installed on the roof of the Headhouse but placed in a minimally conspicuous spot on the east side of the roof.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval.

1115-1145 Market Street, Reading Terminal Market

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

George Broudy, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1891-1893

PROPOSAL: Signage, awnings, lighting, film on windows

The Commission previously approved this proposal in concept and it returned with greater detail. Mr. Broudy suggests attaching the large corner signs in three places with a band of metal covering the flat band of the masonry behind the face of the sign. He showed the awnings with a two tone orange and red canvas, alternating to pick out the windows from the entrances. and a choice of a red or beige color for the six foot high sign boxes along 12th Street. Mr. Tyler said that during the drawing development meetings, he understood that the present package formed a menu from which some, but not all, elements would be selected. Taken altogether, he found the combination excessive and more appropriate for a shopping mall than an historic market. He also mentioned a letter from the Preservation Alliance to the Market Board which expressed similar reservations about the proposal. Committee members thought that the building could stand this amount of signage.

In order to provide a sun block, the market management began installing a copper colored mirror film on the 12th Street windows. Staff found it quite modern in appearance, like the glass in a mirror wall office building, and asked that work stop until it could be reviewed by the Historical Commission. Committee members did not find it objectionable.

The Committee voted to recommend approval, but with only the red canvas awnings, no metal band hiding the fasteners behind the round corner sign and with the beige color for the sign box frames.

7500 Germantown Avenue

New Covenant Church, Owner

Vern Lei for Comcast, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Alter existing antennae on smokestack

This proposal calls for removing the existing antennae and reinstalling smaller ones to match the originally approved application. The antennae would now fit within the niches and not angle downward as they did before. The wires would be covered with a painted metal housing. When asked what made this

design possible, Mr. Lei said that new technology allowed for reduced size.

The Committee voted to recommend approval but with the metal ladder painted a brick color rather than installing a housing.

7500 Germantown Avenue

New Covenant Church, Owner

Fritz Doerstling for Omnipoint, Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Antennae on smokestack

This proposal calls for installing a third set of antennae on this smokestack, building a fenced in equipment cabinet area facing the main drive of the campus and running the wires up the side of the stack in a wire housing ladder. This proposal differs from the first two installations in that the equipment cabinets cannot be placed inside the existing building since the space has already been taken by other providers. This necessitates the fenced in equipment yard and erection of the cable wire tray on the highly visible Germantown Avenue side of the stack. In addition, Committee members thought that adding another set of antennae would do substantially more damage to the historic look of smokestack through the sheer cumulative amount. Mr. Tyler expressed the opinion that although the antennae severely alter the look of the chimney, he finds it preferable to building a separate structure in this wooded area to hold them. Ms. Matzkin disagreed saying that she has seen the structures in her neighborhood and does not find them so objectionable and places exist closer to the railroad tracks in this area where the antennae structure would blend in better.

Mr. Doerstling offered to look into the possibility of using a smaller antenna technology and perhaps piggy backing his wiring along one of the existing cable trays.

Committee members asked to see pictures of the structure against which the new equipment cabinet would be built. They made comment on the architectural quality of the power house and recognized that the application would affect more than the chimney. This further convinced them that more damage to the historic character of the building either in terms of antennae or a fenced-in exterior equipment area should be avoided.

The Committee voted to recommend 3 to 1 against any additional antennae installation on this building. Mr. Levy expressed the opinion that one last set of antennae could be applied to the building, if the wires could be run in an existing wire tray, but no others in the future.

1925-27 Walnut Street

Michael Singer, Owner

Fritz Doerstling of Omnipoint, Applicant

DATE: c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Antennae on penthouse

The applicant submitted a revised application to install antennae on the top of this apartment building. The Commission turned down Omnipoint's application to install antennae mounted at the edge of the roof at a previous meeting. This time the antennae will be set back against and no higher than the penthouse. They will be painted to match the color of the wall behind them and will be removed at such time as they become obsolete.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of this proposal in its revised form.

1722 Pine Street

Laura Blaw, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Roof-top rear deck

This proposal involves the legalization of a deck begun without a permit. The Committee postponed the review from last meeting to allow the community ample notice to comment on the deck. Ms. Blaw brought in a petition of non-objection to her deck signed by surrounding neighbors. Mr. Baron asked that the Committee members first look at the deck in terms of its design. Ms. Blaw showed developed design details of the deck with its open roof-like pergola structure. A neighbor expressed a concern regarding the height of the building on the parapet; however, the Committee did not find this objectionable.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.

1625-45 Spring Garden Street, Masterman School

School District of Philadelphia, Owner

Kenneth Brinkley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1925

PROPOSAL: New aluminum auditorium windows within existing frames

This proposal involves the replacement of the large arched windows of the school auditorium. Ms. Perkolup, counsel for the School District, explained that they would address the windows replaced without a permit in the rest of the building in a subsequent application. The proposal for the auditorium windows calls for retaining and leaving exposed the wood framework including the pilasters, capitals and entablature. Within that framework, the School District proposes to install new cream colored aluminum windows with muntins on the inside and outside of the glass and a spacer bar between. Mr. Brinkley, the architect, and Mr. Baron have worked to have the muntin and sash dimensions and sight lines match those of the existing windows.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the

proposal with staff to review any further details that may need to be worked out.

1900 Rittenhouse Square Street

1900 Rittenhouse Square Condo Assoc., Owner

Jeff Levine, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1924

PROPOSAL: Masonry repair, replacement; balcony repair

This building suffers from conditions including vertical cracking of the masonry along the corners and horizontal cracks along shelf angles and lintels, and severe deterioration of the metal and concrete of the porches. The repair necessitates replacing internal metal elements and approximately 25,000 bricks. After cleaning a portion of the wall, Mr. Levine, the consultant, identified bricks from two companies that come closest to matching the existing, one from Belden and the other from Glen Gerry. The Glen Gerry brick, the closer of the two in color normally comes in a modern modular brick size, smaller than the original resulting in overly large mortar joints. In order to get that brick made up in the size of the existing brick, the building owners would need to order at least 75,000 and absorb the cost of the redundant brick, approximately \$35,000 to \$45,000. In order to save the owners this cost, Mr. Levine proposes to utilize the Belden brick that comes standard in the size of the existing bricks and paint them with a coating called Keim. This coating, far from being a paint, actually chemically bonds with the brick and probably will last 40 to 50 years. The contractor would paint the bricks before laying them to preserve the color of the mortar joint. This treatment would cost approximately six thousand dollars. Randy Cotton representing the Preservation Alliance which holds an easement on the property, asked the total cost of the project. Mr. Levine explained that it will cost \$1,600,000 but that the project will run \$400,000 over budget even using the less expensive brick option.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the submission as proposed with staff to review masonry samples and the color of the coating. Ms. Batchelor asked that the name of the color be submitted for the files so that it could be replicated in the future.

2425 Pine Street

Fred Kaulbach, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1835

PROPOSAL: Replace transom, door

This proposal comes back to the Committee and Commission to resolve two issues in the review of the door restoration project

delegated to Commission staff. The first issue concerned the depth of the placement of the front door within its new opening. At the time of the application, the owners wished to set the door back in to the house approximately six inches to allow space to fur out the inside of the front wall for insulation. In fact the owners have built the door set back about two inches to accommodate the unequal position of the brick at the top and bottom of the door caused by the bowing out of the wall. The second issue had to do with muntins for the round transom. The Committee asked the applicant at a prior Committee meeting to use 2409 Pine Street as the model for the door restoration, because, of all the buildings in the row, it appeared to have the most original doorway. That building has a transom divided into three panes by two vertical muntins. Unfortunately, the applicant has already purchased a half round transom with a single pane of glass.

The Committee members thought that the door now setback a minimal dimension and the half arch transom still represented a substantial step in the restoration of the doorway.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted now at the meeting.

245 South 17th Street

Ithaca Partnership, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door and new 2nd floor window

The Committee has previously recommended denial of a proposal to remove historic fabric from the facade of this Frank Miles Day designed double house to create a garage door and an enlarged window. Mr. Myers returned with an application for a somewhat reduced garage door opening and a plan showing the parking of only three cars. He read a letter from the Streets Department approving a curb cut if the Historical Commission will allow the applicant to introduce a garage door. Mr. Myers claimed that the Committee had implied that they might look favorably on the application if he secured this approval. Mr. Baron read from the minutes of the Committee that showed that they recommended the rejection of the application at that time based on the removal of historic fabric.

Mr. Myers explained that the building has sat vacant for a long time. He said that it gets light mostly just through its front windows and therefor can seem rather dark inside. He said that people vandalize cars in the open lot across the street and that this owner seeks closed parking for safety reasons. He suggested that the restoration of elements on the facade should justify the loss of some fabric.

Mr. Baron noted that this storefront sits within a block of Rittenhouse Row, in the most exclusive shopping area in the City

and also in one of the most desirable residential areas of the City. The question of whether a less damaging use can be found awaits openly marketing the space. It seemed to Committee members that an owner could find tenants for a store below and apartments or office above.

Lenore Millhollen of the Center City Residents Association voiced strong opposition from within the community to cutting a curb and creating a garage at this location. She explained that commercial parking, both open and sheltered exists in close proximity to this building.

Mr. Schaff from the City Planning Commission read a passage from the current Plan for Center City of 1988 that "restrictions should be imposed to limit the intrusion of automobiles onto the sidewalk. Driveways should be located on service streets... no driveways should be permitted on main heavily trafficked streets". He explained that on 17th Street, a very busy pedestrian and vehicular street, the Planning Commission does not support this building modification or curb cut which will create such confusion and inconvenience.

Committee members again expressed their concerns that, although the facade has had a storefront installed in place of the former residential window this application seeks to remove substantial historic fabric and change a design on the front facade of a building by an extremely important architect, Frank Miles Day. Mr. Myers said that he thought the short window on the second floor existed because from the inside it served as the only place to put a bed in that room when this building was a house. The drawing published in American Architect and Building News in 1890 showed that Mr. Day expressly designed the shorter central window as integral to his design purpose. Mr. Tyler calculated that just at the storefront level this proposal would remove close to 90 square feet of historic facade.

Arlene Matzkin also said that cutting a garage into the facade would disrupt the historic district with its non-historic use. Although the Commission does not regulate use directly, The Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation # 1 states "A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use which requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spacial relationships." Particularly considering that the building sits within an historic district, the parking garage both in function and alteration to materials will disrupt the historic streetscape.

Mr. Myers asked if the Committee would look more favorably on an application where his client kept the width of the existing storefront and cut only the area below the storefront. Mr. Myers explained that the Commission had allowed the cutting down of existing openings to create a door in the past on other buildings. Mr. Baron drew a distinction between cutting down an opening where that opening represented a small percentage of a much larger facade and this case where cutting down for the

garage door would extend across the majority of the facade and dominate the look of the whole ground floor. Committee members also thought that very little good would come from this proposal to mitigate against the loss of fabric, that a terrible precedent would be set in cutting a garage in the front of a house and that serious damage would be done to the historic district environment.

Committee members agreed that the issues remained the same whether the application involved the widening of the opening or more simply cutting down the existing. The application would still violate Secretary of the Interior Standards 1, 2, 5, and 9 and should be denied.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend the denial of this application.

237-47 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel

Jerry Pantelidis, Owner

Terry Graboyes, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: New aluminum windows; panning frames

This proposal calls for leaving the first floor windows in wood and replacing windows and panning the frames of all upper floor windows. The applicant has agreed to a custom panning profile to match the existing frames. The main difference between the existing sash and the proposed regards the plane of the glass. In the existing the glass sets back approximately 3/4 of an inch behind the frame whereas in the proposed it appears flush. Ms. Graboyes explained that creating the setback would add about \$60,000 to the cost of the 1,478 windows. The building permit shows the present application costing \$578,000. She also said that having the setback would reduce the energy efficiency of the window. Committee members thought that the setback of the windows in the opening would create a shadow line that might help alleviate the flat appearance. They asked that any letter of approval make it clear that we believe this proposal will not meet the requirements to receive historic tax credits. Committee members asked that the contractor base the color of the windows on an historic paint study.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.

118 South 21st Street,

2101 Cooperative Inc., Owner

Terry Graboyes, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1953-4

PROPOSAL: New aluminum windows

The staff referred this application to the Committee in spite of the non-contributing status of the building because the staff and the applicant could not come to agreement on the wind

application. The typical existing windows with a silver finish divide into three vertical and horizontal units for a total of nine parts. The proposed windows would have a bronze finish and divide in half vertically and horizontally making four parts. When Mr. Tyler advised Ms. Graboyes on this project earlier, he thought that she intended to present a window that differed in operation but retained the major sight lines of the existing. Ms. Graboyes said that she had already ordered the windows.

The Committee voted to approve pursuant to Section 6.5 of the Rules and Regulations.

274 South 20th Street

Tang De Wong, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Legalize paint, signage

Mr. Zheng assisted Mr. De Wong in his application by translating English and Chinese for him. The application sought to legalize the painting of the facade in green and cream colored stripes as well as installing a projecting plastic face box sign. Mr. Baron showed the designation photo which indicated a single tone facade and brackets for hanging a sign, but no sign. Ms. Eden explained that in zoning negotiations, an agreement had been struck that approved the installation of this sign because of the existence of a previous sign so long as it was not illuminated and the applicant removed the second sign bracket. Mr. Zheng showed that Mr. De Wong utilized the second sign bracket to support the sign as well.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of retaining the sign so long as the facade was repainted in the existing cream color to cover the green stripes and the sign remained non-illuminated. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee and Commission approval of the retention of the second bracket would not override the Zoning Board's condition that he remove it.

1912 Rittenhouse Square Street

Claire Oliver, Owner

Carl Massara, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: New door, steps, rear garage, addition

This proposal involves one of the houses formerly owned by Mr. McIlhenny on Rittenhouse Square. Ms. Oliver seeks to buy the property and use it as a residence and art gallery. The entrance which had been closed off in the 1970s would be reopened and partially restored to its original appearance. A grand stair would be rebuilt but with a few less steps. The additional steps would be inside the front door. On the rear facing Manning Street, which has mostly rear ends of houses in this block, the applicant would cut a window into a garage. An addition would be attached to the rear ell and a bank of air handlers

would be placed on the roof.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the front door modified to large glass panels in place of the six panels of wood, a screen placed to the west of the air handlers, a paneled garage door and a simplified rear gate.

1700 Spruce Street and 1701 Delancey Street

Tenth Presbyterian Church, Owner

Matthew White, Applicant

DATE: c.1860/c.1900

PROPOSAL: Lighting rods

This proposal involves the placement of a large number of lightning rods on the three building complex of the church. In the wake of lightning having struck the church down the street and causing a fire, everyone agreed to this prudent course.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review placement, method of attachment and screening.

1900 Pine Street

Allan Baumholtz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Cut new 1st floor window in non-historic fabric

This proposal involves cutting a new window in a modern stucco wall of this pizza parlor.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval so long as Mr. Baumholtz matched the size of the adjacent window.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron

Randal Baron

Assistant Historic Preservation Officer