

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE MEETING

March 24, 1961

Present were: Mr. George K. Trautwein, Chairman
Mr. R. Norris Williams
Mr. Charles E. Peterson

Mr. John F. Lloyd
Mrs. Charles J. Maurer

Submissions on the Agenda:

- ✓ 277 South Fourth Street. The plans were approved ✓
- ✓ 279 South Fourth Street. Shutters to match original door to be installed. This was approved.
- ✓ 236 Pine Street. It was recommended that the first story windows have 9/9 sash; the upper windows 6/6, and that the shutters be operable. The submission was approved, subject to Mr. Lloyd's supervision.
- ✓ 520, 522 Delancey. The drawing was approved, subject to Mr. Lloyd's inspection of the cornice, now covered with tar paper.
- ✓ 512 Spruce Street. It was recommended that the architect be told that the Committee likes everything except the doorway and the dormer. Evidence seems to prove that the present doorway is original. If the modern addition to it were removed, the outline of the frontispiece will be revealed. A new one to match must be made.

The architect is to be asked to show evidence that the transom he designed for the dormer window is authentic. In any case, there must be two sashes to the window.

Further study is required before the drawing can be approved. The Committee recommended that shutters be omitted, since no evidence exists that the house ever had shutters; the survey does not mention shutters, except on the inside. The Architect is to be informed that the Commission presumes he and his client are as interested in correct details as we are, and that it is hoped the restoration will win a plaque for its excellence.

- ✓ 304 South Philip Street. A drawing of the proposed door is required.
- ✓ 1011 Spruce Street. The contractor is to be advised to ask the same architect who prepared drawings for 520, 520 Delancey, to make a drawing of 1011 Spruce, since he is in charge of the work to be done at both sites.

✓ 411 So 3^d Approved
✓ 528 Delancey -

✓ Cliveden. The Committee approves the drawing submitted, seeing no reason why the frame shed should not be built, as it is obviously of a temporary nature. Mr. Chew is to be thanked for his courtesy in showing it to the Commission.

V. C. 8-8222

242, 244 Delancey Street. A report on correspondence, telephone calls and personal interviews with the owners, was made to the Committee. It required no action.

To Paint or Not to Paint face brick.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the Redevelopment Authority informs its clients that all paint must be removed, understanding that this is a requirement of the Historical Commission. The order is not based on investigation, but on the belief that less maintenance is required, if a building is not painted.

On the basis of a discussion of known cases of painting, staining and oiling brick, Mr. Peterson dictated the following, which is to be sent to him in draft for possible revision:

In general the Commission prefers buildings not be painted. If information points to a building having been painted when new, it is to be painted again. There are other forms of waterproofing, such as silicones and oil. If successfully used, these treatments give satisfaction for many years; they change the color of the brick very little, if at all.

Waterproofing materials were not available until recently. It was therefore necessary, if bricks were porous, to use paint, in waterproofing. It was not uncommon. Independence Hall was painted and pencilled; the Fowel House brick was oiled; the brick of 217 Spruce was stained, because it was impossible to match the old brick, when the house was fully restored.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

George K. Trautwein, Chairman