

THE MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE MEETING

OF THE

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

David Hollenberg, Chairman

29 March 1990

Present: David Hollenberg, Architect, Chairman of the Committee
Penelope H. Batcheler, Historical Architect for
Independence National Historical Park
Herbert W. Levy, American Institute of Architects
Donald Stevenson, Architect

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Patricia A. Siemiontkowski,
Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner
Daniel W. Simcox, Executive Secretary

Also: Roger T. Prichard, Old City Civic Association
Thomas Hine, The Philadelphia Inquirer
Mary Burr, Fairmount Waterworks Restoration
Susan Myers, Fairmount Waterworks Restoration
Edward Grusheski, Fairmount Waterworks Interpretive Center
Pat Goddard, Chart House Enterprises, Inc.
Alan Campbell, Joseph H. Lancor Architects
Matthew Smith, Philadelphia Water Department
Katherine Huseman, Law Department
Peter Odell, Fairmount Park Commission
Hyman Myers, Vitteta Group/Studio Four
Bill Quinn, Franklin Institute
Karen Pelino, 2002 Spruce Street
Michael Lynn, Michael Lynn Architects
Robert Cassway, Cassway Albert & Associates
Saul Spano, 1610 Chestnut Street, Hartmax
William Stancill, 1610 Chestnut Street, Hartmax
Alvin Holm, 2018-2026 Sansom Street
Tami Siegal, 2018-2026 Sansom Street
Tom Sherwood, 2018-2026 Sansom Street
Chris McLaughlin, Ralston House
Andrew Blanda, Otto Sperr Architects
Bertie Bonner, R.A., Office of John M. Dickey, Architect

A Summary of Architectural Committee Recommendations: 29 March 1990

Comment

1712 Walnut Street: The Committee commended the applicant for his plans to replace a building destroyed by fire with a new building compatible with the historical and architectural character of the proposed Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.

Tabled

3635 Chestnut Street: The Committee tabled this application for demolition because of some uncertainty concerning the actual designation of the Ralston House as an historic building.

Approval in Concept

Fairmount Waterworks: The Committee voted an approval in concept for the proposed masonry link between the Graff House and the Caretaker's House, the proposed enclosure of the Graff House porch, and the general plan for the adaptive conversion of the facility as a restaurant. The Committee asked the architects to re-study the design in preparation for an on-site meeting scheduled for 23 April 1990.

Approval

The Franklin Institute: Approval of this nearly invisible installation of netting for bird control on the main facade.

Approval, Contingent upon Conditions

240-242 Cherry Street: Approval of alterations contingent upon the replacement of a window with doors on the third floor.

211-213 N. Third St.: Approval of an awning, flat wall sign, and projecting sign, contingent upon redesign of the awning.

14 N. Front Street: Approval of proposed roof and projecting signs, contingent upon the redesign of the projecting sign.

701 Walnut Street: Approval of proposed alterations to this building, contingent upon the retention of the original roof line.

Disapproval

2002 Spruce Street: Disapproval of a plan for a decorative gate installed illegally at the base of the steps to this restored brownstone in the proposed Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.

2018-2026 Sansom Street: Disapproval of a plan for alterations to this row of buildings in the proposed Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The Committee considered the proposed treatment too decorative and over-scaled, but recommended approval of the removal of existing ceramic tile facades and their replacement with scored stucco.

1610 Chestnut Street: Disapproval of plans to install security grates on this facade. The Committee requested more information to evaluate the viability of an interior installation.

2023 Spruce Street: Disapproval of plans to cut a basement areaway of this building in the proposed Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.

COMMENT

1712 Walnut Street, Robert Cassway, Cassway Albert & Associates. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code, the Committee reviewed this proposal for new construction on this site. Last year a fire destroyed the building occupied by Encore Books. The Committee commended the applicant for a design appropriate to the scale and character of this commercial corridor in the proposed Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.

TABLED

3635 Chestnut Street, Chris McLaughlin, Ralston House. The Committee tabled this application because of uncertainty concerning the actual designation of the Ralston House as an historic building. The Minutes of the 154th Stated Meeting of the Historical Commission does not provide a detailed description of the property. The record simply lists the Indigent Widows' and Single Womens' Home at 3615 Chestnut Street as the designated property.

Chris McLaughlin noted that this building had been vacant for twelve to fifteen years, and that presently the Ralston House wanted to demolish it and use the site for parking.

Mr. Hollenberg indicated that if the Commission determined that the building was included in the designation that the Committee would investigate the possibility of demolition by neglect. He asked if the applicant would object to having this matter tabled until a determination could be made on the designation. Mr. McLaughlin did not object.

The Committee tabled this application for demolition and requested a determination of the scope of the 1971 designation.

APPROVAL IN CONCEPT

Fairmount Waterworks, Alan Campbell, Joseph Lancor Architects, and Pat Goddard, Chart House Enterprises, Inc. In response to a Request for Proposals (RFP) issued by the City of Philadelphia, Chart House Enterprises, Inc. submitted a plan for the adaptive reuse of the Fairmount Waterworks a restaurant. Over the past six years the City has restored the property in preparation for leasing it to a private tenant to occupy and use the Graff House, the old mill house and the new mill house. Chart House Enterprises, Inc. would operate its restaurant under the terms of a twenty-year lease with the City of Philadelphia.

The conceptual plans presented to the Architectural Committee were granted an approval in concept by the Fairmount Park Commission on 14

March 1990. These plans include the following: restoration and adaptive reuse of the Graff House and old mill house; installation of a glass enclosure of the portico on the river side of the Graff House; installation of a glass enclosure within the columns of the pavilion; creation of openings in the floors of the gatekeeper's house and the pavilion; restoration of the two small structures as natural lanterns; and landscaping and parking in the forebay area. Ms. Siemiontkowski noted that the treatment suggested for the forebay area exceeded the scope of the RFP and that the architects offered it only as a suggested treatment.

Mr. Hollenberg reminded the Committee of his involvement in the preparation of the RFP and in phases of the restoration. Given his considerable association with this project, he announced that he would abstain from much of the discussion and from the vote.

Mr. Campbell indicated that Joseph Lancor Architects had been involved with numerous historic restorations and adaptations for Chart House Enterprises, Inc. The design proposed for the Waterworks would alter the existing buildings above ground at three places. First, the architects proposed the construction of a stucco link between the Graff House and the Gatekeeper's House. Second, the plan entails the construction of a glass enclosure inside the columns of the Greek Temple pavilion. Third, the architects propose the partial glazing of the porch of the Graff House. Other alterations include the restoration of the lanterns adorned by Benjamin Rush' sculpture atop the old mill house; this restoration requires the removal of temporary wooden floors inside them. Finally, the Watering Committee building may be used as office space for either the restaurant or the interpretive center. The applicants also proposed a service ramp into the forebay area, and parking with valet service along a narrow cartway.

Messrs. Campbell and Goddard stressed the importance of the glass enclosure on the pavilion. Although the number of tables may seem too modest to warrant this construction, establishing a visible presence is critical to the proposal. The architects conceived this pavilion as the essential aspect of the design to present an image of an inviting space for the public to explore. Given the limited public use of the property at present, the architects stressed the import of this clear visible presence of people filling the space. The architects expressed concern with the concept of excavating and flooding the forebay. This element would require a substantial alteration of plans for building services, deliveries, and fire exits.

The Committee focused on the following issues: the proposed glass enclosures, public access to the site, and alterations proposed for exhaust fans, plumbing and other mechanical systems. Mr. Levy posed the question whether the site would offer wheelchair accessibility. Mr. Campbell indicated that the radical elevation changes precluded the possibility of making the entire restaurant wheelchair accessible;

compliance with wheelchair accessibility regulations would entail the constructions of ramps which would fill the space.

The Committee commended the architects for proposing all glass elements for the proposed enclosures. However, Mr. Levy objected to the restriction of public access to the river's edge. Mr. Goddard stressed the importance of the pavilion as proposed, which would establish a public presence on the deck and invite people to the space. A continuous presence on the pavilion would invite people to the interpretive center as well as the restaurant. Further, the opening in the pavilion floor offered an interpretive perspective of the Waterworks by linking the two levels of the facility. The architects conceived this opening as a key component for integrating the restaurant and the interpretive center.

Mr. Stevenson asked whether alterations were proposed for any historic floors. Mr. Goddard noted that the plan entailed penetrating only the floors of the pavilion and the Caretaker's House. Mr. Hollenberg indicated that the floor of the Caretaker's House was not original, having been altered in 1983. He also noted that the wooden covers presently in the lanterns were installed as temporary safety measures and would not bear significant weight.

Mr. Levy asked if the public would retain access to the interpretive center when the restaurant was closed. Mr. Goddard responded that there would be access. Ms. Batcheler asked if there were previous plans for this site. Mr. Hollenberg responded that there was a proposal to use the new mill house for low-grade power generation. Those plans, however, were abandoned for economic reasons. The only other plan was for an interpretive center, which remains in the design phase; the Chart House proposal incorporated space for an interpretive center. Mr. Tyler noted that the proposal from Chart House Enterprises was the only remaining one.

Peter Odell introduced himself as the Fairmount Park Commission staff coordinator for this project. He indicated that the plans submitted for the forebay were beyond the scope of the RFP. In general, though, the Park Commission viewed the Chart House proposal as the best adaptation to the uncertain plans for the forebay. Though a study of the forebay had not been completed, clearly the return of water to this race would present problems for delivery, disposal, and egress. At present, Aquarium Drive, an asphalt path over the forebay, is three feet above the deck of the pavilion. Historically, the water was thirteen feet below the deck. Excavating and returning water to this area would strengthen the interpretive value of the site. Excavation, without introducing water, also would offer a clearer vision of the historic use of the facility.

Mr. Stevenson noted that the proposal addresses egress and other building systems which are necessary prerequisites to design development. It is unclear if information is sufficient. Mr. Odell

asked the Commission for a decision regarding the proposed use of the site; he separated the issue of the forebay, indicating that it would be developed by the City, not Chart House Enterprises.

Mr. Tyler expressed grave concern for the glazing of the pavilion, indicating that he expected a commercial conversion, given the City's Budget predicament. The Committee expressed satisfaction that the architects proposed all glass elements. Ms. Batcheler indicated that her initial concern for the glazing of the pavilion had dissipated into a belief that the proposal could work well. She asked if tinting the glazing would allow the structure to disappear.

Mr. Goddard responded that the transparency of the glass, and the design of the pavilion, inside the columns rather than piercing them, would allow the structure to disappear. He stressed that the design would establish an aesthetic essential to the site, by providing a highly visible presence of activity, and by offering an integrating design which adapted historic structures for contemporary use.

Mr. Levy expressed reservations regarding the ductwork proposed to pierce the roof of the pavilion. Mr. Campbell indicated similar systems were used in other projects. Mr. Stevenson expressed reluctance to recommend approval in concept, as it would convey the message that many smaller assumptions in the design were acceptable. He did not object to the use of the facility as a restaurant, but wanted to register his reservations regarding any approval which may convey unintended acceptance of numerous design features.

Mr. Hollenberg requested that Mr. Odell clearly state the bounds of the approval he sought. Mr. Odell responded that he sought an approval in concept of the restaurant, and that the Fairmount Park Commission would return with a proposal for the forebay, including the possibility of excavating the bridge connecting the pier and the mainland. Mr. Levy noted that excavation would interfere with the plans presented for parking. He further pointed out that the Chart House proposal appeared to require the use of the forebay as a service drive. Mr. Odell noted that the Fairmount Park Commission considered other access alternatives including a bridge buried below the asphalt cartway or a shallow depression without a ramp. Mr. Levy expressed reservations with the apparent location of this service alley, and referred to the problems of those in Center City. Mr. Odell stated that the trash and pedestrian levels in these areas were quite different. Mr. Stevenson stressed that the placement of these services below the primary public space afforded the least desirable view of the trash.

Mr. Tyler noted that the City had invested a considerable sum in the restoration of the Waterworks and asked the architects to consider pulling back the glass one column along the river. Mr. Goddard responded that providing an areas sufficient for circulation would require pulling the glass two columns back from the river. He also

objected to this suggestion based on safety concerns given the relatively low height of the balustrade. Further, the Chart House did not want to encourage lateral circulation along the balustrade. This alteration of the design would not only reduce the number of tables, but also would reduce the enclosure to a foyer rather than a public space. He implied that this would defeat the purpose of the pavilion, which was to establish a visible presence in public view.

Mr. William Bolger of the National Park Service asked several questions to clarify the architects proposal. He focused on the importance of the possibilities of re-introducing water to the forebay. Though acknowledging that use of the site as a restaurant possessed historic precedent, he expressed concern with the extent of the proposal. He suggested that the Committee evaluate the proposal based on its status as a National Historic Landmark, and urged that the pavilion remain open to the public as a well preserved Victorian public space. Although the enclosed pavilion may be considered important to the restaurant, retaining the open character seems more significant. Mr. Bolger pointed to the Valley Green Inn in the Wissahickon Valley as an example of a successful historic restoration. He concluded by urging the Committee to establish the character of the building and to review the proposal in relation to that character.

Howard Kittell, Executive Director, Preservation Coalition of Greater Philadelphia. Mr. Kittell supported the comments made by Mr. Bolger, and indicated that the Board and membership of the Coalition were concerned with the glazing of the pavilion. He stressed the importance of this image to the City of Philadelphia. He applauded the design of the interior of the facility and urged the continued study to keep the pavilion open to the public.

Mr. Stevenson reaffirmed his reluctance to vote for conceptual approval because of the uncertainties surrounding the plans for the forebay. He stressed that the plans for that area would be linked directly to the design of the entire facility. Finally, he stressed the importance of maintaining the pavilion open for public access.

Ms. Batcheler inquired into incorporating more seats into the Graff House. Mr. Tyler indicated that this suggestion was more problematic than the proposal to glaze the pavilion. Mr. Odell said that the Fairmount Park Commission discouraged similar suggestions.

Mr. Levy stressed the importance of public circulation along the river side, and therefore recommended pulling back the glazing and reducing the size of the opening proposed in the pavilion. As well he stressed the importance of resolving the issue of the forebay. Otherwise, he did not object to the conversion of the facility for use as a restaurant.

Mr. Goddard said that pulling back the glazing as suggested would leave a void between the river and seating during inclement weather.

He stressed that the pavilion was essential to the design given the requirements of the RFP. The size of the opening successfully integrates the pavilion and the old mill house work by offering visual continuity between the two levels of the facility.

Mr. Hollenberg asked the Committee for its recommendation. Discussion ensued on a point by point basis:

- The Committee did not object to the proposed masonry link between the link of the Graff House and the Caretaker's House.
- The Committee did not object to the proposed enclosure of the Graff House porch, although it did insist on a mock-up of the enclosure as well as a detail of the proposed attachment to the historic fabric.

The Committee did not vote on the proposal for the pavilion, as there were significant reservations regarding the question of glazing itself, the size of the proposed enclosure, and the penetration by mechanical systems. Finally, although not formally a part of this proposal, the eventual plans for the forebay concerned the Committee as they effected the plans for mechanical systems and egress.

In summary, the Committee voted an approval in concept for the proposed masonry link between the Graff House and the Caretaker's House, the proposed enclosure of the Graff House porch, and the general plan for the adaptive conversion of the facility as a restaurant. The Committee asked the architects to re-study the design in preparation for an on-site meeting scheduled for 23 April 1990.

APPROVAL

The Franklin Institute, 20th and the Parkway. Hyman Myers, of the Vitetta Group/Studio Four, presented a proposal for the installation of bird screen netting on the main portico entrance of the Franklin Institute. The purpose of the netting is to protect the historic fabric of the structure without compromising its aesthetics. Mr. Myers presented an illustrative slide show that depicted the near transparent nature of this treatment. The netting is secured to the building by stainless steel attachments inserted into the masonry joints.

The Committee commended Mr. Myers for a thorough presentation and voted to recommend the approval of this project.

CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

240-242 Cherry Street, Michael Hauptman, Brewer and Hauptman Architects. Mr. Hauptman presented plans for a substantial rehabilitation of this building as an expansion of the adjacent office

building. The architects requested approval of the following facade alterations: removal of masonry infill and replacement with new double-hung, wood, two-over-two windows based on the design of the existing original window on the ground floor and proposed new doors based on existing fabric.

Mr. Levy suggested the replacement of the window proposed for the third floor with doors, similar in design to those at the first two stories. The Committee voted to recommend approval of these alterations, contingent upon the restoration of the door opening within the central bay of the third floor. The recommendation also was made contingent upon staff approval of the proposed masonry cleaning and re-pointing.

Mr. Hauptman requested approval in concept for a stair tower with skylight proposed for the building. The Committee voted to recommend approval in concept for this tower.

14 N. Front Street, Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates: Ms. Soong presented plans for the installation of two signs: a roof sign of individual, back-channel-lit letters, and a projecting sign.

The Committee recommended approval of the roof sign and suggested the use of white letters. The Committee recommended an approval in concept for a projecting sign. However, they directed the applicant to design a sign suited to the style of the building, and to avoid a Colonial motif. The Committee also noted that the projecting sign required approval by the Philadelphia Art Commission.

211-213 N. Third Street, Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates. Ms. Soong presented plans for removal of the infill in the storefront and the installation of a new storefront with aluminum windows. The plans also entail the installation of two signs -- a flat wall sign and a projecting sign. Finally, the applicant proposed the installation of an awning across the historic columns of this facade.

The Committee expressed its disapproval of the plan to cut into the marble columns for the awning and recommended against the proposed design. Roger Prichard of the Old City Civic Association noted that the building would not receive much sun because of its location in the shadow of the Wireworks Building across the street. Appreciative of Mr. Prichard's comments, the Committee acknowledged the restaurateur's interest in offering customers protection from inclement weather. Accordingly, the Committee indicated that a smaller awning fitted within the single bay above the entrance would be acceptable. Further the Committee suggested that the applicant refine the distinctive graphics for enhanced legibility. With these comments, the Committee recommended approval of this application.

The Committee also reminded the applicant that Art Commission approval

was required for the proposed projecting sign and awning.

701 Walnut Street, Ms. Bertie Bonner, Office of John Dickey Architects. Ms. Bonner presented plans for alterations to the Pennsylvania Bible Society. The plans indicate the replacement of all existing windows with new wood sash having insulated glass. The Committee questioned whether the proposed glass would be possible given the existing muntin size. The members suggested the use of an internal storm window. However, they informed the applicant that insulated glass would be acceptable if it did not change the muntin thickness by more than one-eighth inch.

On the first floor, the applicant proposed restoration of the original masonry openings. Ms. Siemiontkowski offered an early insurance survey and photograph which indicated the original door design and window treatment. After review of these historic documents, the Committee recommended the building's restoration in accordance with the new information.

The Committee supported the idea of using gold lettering on the windows for signs. The applicant also proposed an alteration to the cornice to provide a level surface on the roof for a scuttle above an existing stair. The Committee discouraged this proposal and recommended that the applicant retain the original roof line.

DISAPPROVAL

2002 Spruce Street, K. Pelino, Michael Lynn. In 1988, the owner of this property undertook a complete restoration of the entire brownstone facade of this building, which stands within the proposed Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The Historical Commission approved the plans for the restoration and the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a building permit for it. However, neither the approval nor the permit included the installation of a wrought iron gate which was installed at the bottom of the stairs in 1989. The staff requested the Department of Licenses and Inspections to issue a violation for the illegal gate. The present application represents an attempt to remedy this problem.

Ms. Pelino circulated photographic studies of both the problems of the neighborhood and the gate itself. Though Ms. Pelino offered to present a videotape as further documentation of the problems, the Committee declined, having accepted her point regarding the problems of the block. Ms. Pelino indicated that persons who loitered on the stairs gouged the stone, causing significant damage. She added that this physical damage was only one aspect of the generally severe problem of harassment which she experienced from this group of loiterers. Although she had requested assistance from other City agencies, she was not relieved of the problem. The installation of the gate appears to have resolved her problem.

Michael Lynn informed the Commission that he had designed the gate from several Victorian castings, and believed that it was compatible with both the house and the rest of the block.

Ms. Batcheler inquired into the means of attachment of the gate. Mr. Lynn responded that four bolts secured the metal to the masonry. Mr. Hollenberg asked Ms. Pelino how her neighbors addressed the problem. She responded that her stoop offered a particularly desirable vantage point to the corner. Mr. Stevenson asked if the group of loiterers sat on any other stairs since the gate was installed. Ms. Pelino responded that they sat on the next stoop, and sometimes on the corner.

Ms. Pelino stated that the gate seemed a rather minor intrusion on the proposed district compared to other elements of the block. She pointed out that the property across the street did not maintain the historic character of the block or the district. Mr. Hollenberg informed her that the Commission did not have jurisdiction over that building at the time of its alteration.

The Committee expressed concern for the precedent which approval of this gate would establish. Ms. Pelino compared the impact of the precedent of allowing her gate to that of allowing solid metal grates on the commercial property across the street. She inquired into the reasoning of allowing an opaque, roll-down security grate on a commercial enterprise, while refusing to allow her to protect her property with a decorative gate. Ms. Pelino stated that if she removed the gate, her stairs would be ruined, and the value of the building diminished. Having spent \$60,000 on the restoration, she did not intend to spend \$5,000 more on any future restoration of the stairs.

Mr. Lynn reaffirmed the problems of the corner: of a record of vandalism, loitering, prostitution and a general reputation as a "merry-go-round." He asserted that it was the worst corner in a bad area. Ms. Pelino indicated that she intended to enclose the rear of the property, to prevent its further use as a public restroom. She expressed concern that she could not enter her building without being confronted by a group of menacing individuals. She concluded that if the public sector could not resolve her problem that it seemed unfair to deny an inoffensive solution that worked.

The Committee discussed the problems and weighed the varied interests. It admitted that the detail for the gate was fine, but that the appearance lacked any historic precedent. Though Mr. Levy suggested the possibility of moving the gate onto a the first tread, Ms. Pelino indicated that the stairs were not solid, and would not offer a desirable anchor.

Mr. Hollenberg expressed grave concern that every property owner in the Rittenhouse Fitler District may want such a gate. He added that

the Committee was required to disapprove this application based on its complete absence of historic documentation and peculiar appearance. He commended the applicant for the restoration of her brownstone, lauding it as one of the best in the Rittenhouse Fittler District. He also acknowledged the applicant's legitimate security concerns. However, he noted that such problems were not limited to this block, that the Committee lacked the power to address public safety problems, and that this gate altered the historic appearance of the facade. Accordingly, the Committee voted to recommend disapproval of the application. Mr. Hollenberg reminded Ms. Pelino that the Committee served only in an advisory capacity to the Commission, and encouraged her to testify at the next Commission meeting.

2018-2026 Sansom Street, Alvin Holm, Tami Siegal, Alvin Holm, Architect; and Tom Sherwood, representative for the owner. Mr. Holm presented plans to alter these buildings to present a unified facade with distinctive entrances for a health club, weight program and tanning salon. The original brick facades have been covered with a two inch concrete base and small tiles. Two of the tiled facades have been painted brown.

Mr. Hollenberg noted that these buildings were listed on the inventory of the proposed Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District as contributing buildings for their fenestration and cornice line.

Ms. Batcheler approved of the proposal to use scored stucco for the facade, but objected to the extensive large-scale decorative detail proposed on the ground floor and along the cornice line. The proposal entailed more than the rather humble dwellings were intended to bear.

Mr. Holm stated that he did not plan to restore the buildings but rather to project a different image. Mr. Stevenson asserted that the proposed details were of gargantuan scale. Ms. Batcheler declared that the bay windows proposed were foreign to the vocabulary of the street. Mr. Levy expressed disfavor for the pediments.

Mr. Sherwood, representing the owner, asked if the western entrance could be maintained. Mr. Stevenson encouraged consideration of a different form, and expressed concern for precedent within the district. He indicated that the plan appeared dichotomous, in that its upper two-thirds retained the historic character while the lower third and the cornice details were composed of a vocabulary foreign to the street and District.

Mr. Hollenberg agreed with the comments made, and suggested a recommendation of approval for the stucco and upper floor windows. However, he also maintained reservations concerning the bay windows and pediments proposed for the ground floor, as well as the over-scaled cornice elements.

The Committee recommended approval of the proposed upper-floor window alterations and masonry treatment with scored stucco. The Committee asked Mr. Holm to revise the design along the cornice and the ground floor.

Mr. Holm registered his disagreement with the comments of the Committee and suggested that he would like to appear before the Commission.

1610 Chestnut Street, Saul Spano, Hartmax. Mr. Spano presented plans for a mesh security grille for the facade of Wallach's Clothing Store. His proposal would hide the housing of the grille underneath an awning.

Mr. Levy asked if these grilles were a necessity. Mr. Hollenberg referred to a discussion with Warren Huff of the City Planning Commission at the March Committee meeting. Though acknowledging that many other businesses had installed these grates, the Committee did not consider this proposal favorably.

The Committee asked the applicant if he had studied the possibility of an interior installation. Though Mr. Spano expressed his aesthetic preference for the plan presented, the Committee requested that he prepare a sectional drawing to show whether an interior installation was feasible. Though aware of the difficulty of the crime problem, the Committee asked the applicant to present a plan for an interior installation, enumerating the tasks required. Ms. Siemiontkowski alluded to an interior installation at 1500 Chestnut Street and Mr. Levy directed the applicant to another preferred installation at the Founder's Pavilion of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Committee recommended disapproval of this proposal to install security grates on the facade of Wallach's men store. Mr. Spano requested a written list of the Committee requirements.

2023 Spruce Street, Andrew Blanda, Otto Sperr Architects. Mr. Blanda presented plans for an areaway to provide direct access to the cellar. The applicant wants this access for trash removal and bicycle access. The architect noted that the alley at the rear of the property was not safe. The Committee indicated that it did not want to approve the creation of a space which seemed to invite danger. Further, there was no historic precedent for the creation of this areaway. The Committee commended the architect for his fine proposal, but recommended disapproval of the application. They also suggested lighting the alley and exploring the installation of locked gates at its end.

There being no further business, the Committee adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Daniel W. Simcox, Executive Secretary