

**THE MINUTES OF THE 418th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
11 June 1997
City Council Caucus, Room 401 City Hall
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Arlene Matzkin
Shelly Merhige, Office of the City Council President
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Maria Walker
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community
Development
Caroline Wischmann

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Preservation Technician
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Specialist
Gina Frese, Intern
Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also, with affiliation and/or project

Robert Pooner, I.G.R., Inc.
Ted Stopkoski, Northeast Brick & Block Company
J. Part, JPA
Robert Powers, Powers & Co., Inc.
Laura Blaw
Bill Isenberg, Stanley Hardware Building
John Hunt, Stuart Rosenberg & Associates
Robert Kurtz, 337 South Camac Street
W. Helm, JPA
Michael Mattioni, Esq., 110-112 South Front Street
Dante Luciani, 226 South 21st Street
Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart Rosenberg & Associates
Fritz Doerstling, Omnipoint
Cynthia Tedeschi
John M. Bacon, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Victoria Rivkin, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Leslie Ledoper, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Sandra Safran, 425 South 20th Street
Brett Webber, 2415 Pine Street

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 418th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia

Historical Commission to order at 10:05 a.m.

MINUTES of the 417th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Ward and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 417th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 14 May 1997, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE REPORT, 27 May 1997,
Arlene Matzkin, Chair

Ms. Matzkin read the Committee's recommendations before discussion of each proposal.

5267-69 Germantown Avenue, Grumblethorpe

Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, Owner
Theodore Nickles, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1744

PROPOSAL: New roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the cement-shingle replacement roof has worn. The contractor proposes to install asphalt/fiberglass shingles that would resemble a weathered wood roof.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1601 Rowan Street

Bob McCleary, Owner

Albert Pooner, Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: New roll-down gate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposed replacement garage door. She noted that over the years the house has suffered many unsympathetic changes.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

231 Chestnut Street

Tina Hu, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; c. 1960 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition of the removal of the present three flags.

Ms. Matzkin described the two proposed signs: one over the door and a hanging sign under the pent eave. The Committee believed that the two signs in addition to the extant three flags would overwhelm the storefront. It recommends approval on the condition that Ms. Hu removes the three flags.

Ms. Walker made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1131 Pine Street

Larry Gricio, Owner

Joseph Serratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1800

PROPOSAL: New addition, windows, extend roofline

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the addition with the rear gable pushed back at least six feet from the original ridge of the roof; approval of the windows on the condition that the frame have a bead; transom above door must have two panels.

Ms. Matzkin described the multi-faceted proposal. First, the owner wishes to remove the rear wall and roof and add an addition. The proposed addition would add several feet to the slope of the roof. The Committee believed that the slope of the roof characterizes the date of construction and should not change. Instead, Committee members asked the architect to push the rear gable back at least six feet away from the ridgeline of the original roof. Mr. Serratore agreed. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* recommend against changing the configuration of the roof by adding new features so that the historic character of the building is diminished.

Second, the Committee and Commission have not approved the proposed Pella windows in the past. These insulated windows have applied muntins on the interior and exterior with a spacer bar between the two panes of glass. The Committee believed that they have the same visual appearance as true-muntin windows. Mr. Baron noted that these window sash come in a box that is inserted into the frame of the original window. This gives the impression that the sash "float" in the frames. This proposal includes building new frames around the box, eliminating that "floating" appearance. The Committee noted that the new frames should have a bead.

Mr. Baron noted he has a concern that the project includes the removal of the rear wall, all floor joists, and the rear

roof, which may cause the front facade to collapse. He has worked with the architect to plan the project in phases to help ensure the safety and preservation of the front wall.

Mr. Wilds asked the staff to have the architect submit photographs of the rear wall for documentation before work begins.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee on the condition that the architect submit photographs documenting the rear facade before construction begins. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed with eleven votes. Mr. James dissented.

937 Lombard Street

John Brown, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820

PROPOSAL: Legalize aluminum covered dormers

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition that when the owner wishes to re-roof the building, he must restore the dormers as well.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal. A previous owner installed aluminum siding on the cheeks of the dormer and then sold the property to Mr. Brown. The Department of Licenses and Inspections has issued a violation for the work. The Committee noted that the siding eliminates the shadowline of the dormer roof. Mr. Brownlee noted that the siding also creates shadowlines along the cheeks of the dormer. He wishes to see the siding painted a dark color to eliminate these shadowlines.

Ms. Walker made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Commission. Mr. Brownlee made a motion to amend the motion with the condition that the cheeks of the dormer be painted a dark color to match the roof. Ms. Walker accepted the amendment to her motion. Mr. Ward seconded the motion with the amendment. The motion and amendment passed with a unanimous vote.

232-34 Market Street, Stanley Hardware Building

William Isenberg, Owner

Stuart Rosenberg, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865; c. 1930 - 1st floor alterations; c. 1955 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Complete rehabilitation, new windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the rehabilitation of the front facade, including the new cornice above the 1st floor; approval of the new windows along Bank Street; approval of painting the 1st floor of Bank Street facade;

approval of cleaning the front facade with staff to approve a cleaning sample.

Ms. Matzkin explained the many parts of the proposal. The 1930s storefront from the Horn & Hardart remained under the 1960s storefront of Stanley Hardware. The owners wish to restore the 1930s storefront. The restoration includes installing a new cornice above the first floor. The proposed cornice does not match the other cornices of the building and will be made from a stock profile. Other work includes repairing the wood four-over-four muntins, and cleaning and patching the stonework on the front facade with staff to approve samples.

The proposal includes repairing and replacing windows in the three buildings on the Bank Street facade. The southernmost building has metal-clad wood windows that the owner wishes to repair. The proposal calls for replacing the rest of the windows in the other two buildings with aluminum replacements. Ms. Matzkin stated that the Committee recommends approval. Mr. Tyler noted that the staff wishes to contest the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Baron explained to the Commission, using visuals, how drastically the proposed windows differ from the actual window profiles. The proposed windows differ in jamb and muntin profiles. He stated that the proper profiles are available in wood windows, which do not need scaffolding to paint because they tilt into the room. Stuart Rosenberg, architect for the project, noted that the owner wishes to have aluminum windows for less maintenance. Mr. Baron said that the jamb liners of aluminum windows may disintegrate as quickly as paint on wood windows. Mr. Rosenberg explained that since the Architectural Committee meeting, the contractor has inspected the subsills and frames and installing wood windows would be twice the cost of aluminum ones. The owner needs to finish construction by mid-September. Mr. Tyler also noted that the glazing pattern of the Bank Street windows does not match the original. Mr. Rosenberg proposes two-over-two windows but they should have a two-over-four configuration.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation on two conditions: the glazing pattern of the windows on Bank Street must match the original glazing patterns and the architect must work with the staff to achieve the best possible panning pattern for the windows on Bank Street. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Baron noted that the proposal also includes the removal of a visible water tower on the roof of the building. The Committee had not discussed this part of the proposal.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to approve the removal of the water tank. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

123 Chestnut Street, Corn Exchange

P&A Associates, Owner

Albert Paris, Restaurant Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1900; 1906 - addition

PROPOSAL: Banner

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of rectangular banner, hung mid-pole.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposed banners for the extant flagpole. Mr. Wilds questioned the Commission's review of the banner, asking if it was regulating aesthetics. Mr. Tyler replied that the banner acts as a sign which is within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

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

123 Chestnut Street AKA 45-55 South 2nd Street

P&A Associates, Owner

Jerome Donovan, Restaurant Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900; 1906 - addition

PROPOSAL: New door; signage for 2nd Street facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of door change; approval of sign, attached in mortar joints; approval of two flagpoles flanking the door, attached in mortar joints.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the Commission had approved a new door and transom for the building. The owner applied for an alteration of the door configuration on the suggestion of the Preservation Alliance which owns a facade easement. Since the Alliance has now approved the same door configuration the Commission approved, Ms. Soong has withdrawn the door proposal.

The proposal also includes a new sign and four flagpoles with banners. The Committee recommends approval of the sign and two flagpoles flanking the door.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee for the signage and banners. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

4313-17 Main Street, Masonic Lodge

Banana Republic, Owner

Park Ow, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1860

PROPOSAL: New 1st floor windows, door; signage; ADA ramp
Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of changing the first-floor windows on the front and rear facade, but with more horizontal panes, with staff to review window details; approval of signage in the side windows, not over the door; approval of the ADA ramp with the railing to match the original; approval of banners in either location, attached in the mortar joints.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for the new windows and doors on the first floor of the front and rear facades. The original proposal included signage in the middle transom above the front doors. The Committee believed that the transom should have multi-paned glazing and asked the applicant to put the signage in the side windows. Mr. Ow has made the changes asked by the Committee but asks to have the signage above the transom of the middle bay instead of the side windows.

Ms. Matzkin also explained that the applicant wishes to have banners at the third-floor level which are not allowed under the Manayunk ordinance. He has applied for approval of banners also at the first floor in case the Zoning Board of Adjustment does not approve their variance for the higher banners.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation but to allow signage also over the door and transom instead of the side windows. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

735 Walnut Street

Edward Weintraut, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1799

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows, aluminum cladding on dormer
Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the third floor windows subject to the restoration of the dormer, including installing a multi-paned, true-muntin, wood window, with staff to approve details.

Ms. Matzkin described the compromise reached by the Architectural Committee and the applicant. The Committee recommends approval of the third floor windows on the condition that the owner restores the dormer with a wood, multi-paned window and wood details.

Upon a motion and duly seconded the Commission voted unanimously to accept the Committee's recommendation.

To honor a request made by Robert Kurtz, the Commission then heard the proposal for 337 South Camac Street.

337 South Camac Street

Richard Schiro, Owner

Robert Kurtz, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865; c. 1920 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of cornice brackets; cover cornice and bays in aluminum

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Ms. Matzkin explained to the Commission the background of the property. Several years ago the owner, without a permit or Commission approval, removed the cornice brackets and covered the cornice and three bays with aluminum during the weekend. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the work and reissued another violation some months ago. Mr. Kurtz, manager of the property, now asks the Commission to legalize the work.

Cynthia Tedeschi, counsel for Mr. Kurtz, testified that the contractor performed the work in the fall of 1993 and spring of 1994. The owner claims he did not receive a violation notice until 1997. Mr. Kurtz did not know the historic nature of the property or that the work required a permit. Mr. Tyler noted that the Department of Licenses and Inspections requires a permit for the proposed work for all buildings, not just those designated by the Historical Commission. Mr. Baron stated that he took an inspector from the Department to the site several days after the work was completed and asked him to issue a violation.

Owing to a fire in City Hall, the meeting adjourned and moved to the offices of the Historical Commission at 1401 Arch Street, Suite 1301.

Ms. Tedeschi, showed pictures of other houses along South Camac that also have aluminum. Ms. Spina stated that these houses may not appear on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places or the work may have occurred before designation. Mr. Baron emphasized that the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* recommend against covering historic fabric with other materials such as aluminum and the removal of character defining elements such as the modillions of the cornice.

Mr. Wilds stated that the proposed work represents the sort of change that the Historical Commission was established to prevent. If Mr. Kurtz had followed proper channels and applied for a building permit before the work began he could have pursued alternative solutions. Ms. Walker asked that an inspector view other properties along the street for any additional violations.

Mr. Wilds noted that the pictures submitted to the Commission by Ms. Tedeschi have different windows. Ms. Tedeschi stated that Mr. Kurtz may have building permits for those windows. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Kurtz to show the permits to the staff of the

Commission.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee and disapprove the legalization of the work. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Kurtz is to provide permits for the changed windows.

326 South Juniper Street

Carl and Elizabeth Spitko, Owners

Andrew Callaghan, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: New windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new wood, true-muntin sash installed in existing frames.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for new wood, true-muntin sash installed in existing frames. The windows, made by Marvin, have a rabbet to attach exterior energy panels. The owners do not wish to have the panels, but the windows would still have the rabbet.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Wischmann seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

210 West Washington Square

210 West Washington Square Associates, Owner

Fritz Doerstling, Applicant

DATE: 1930

PROPOSAL: Antennae

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of antennae on the penthouse, no higher than the penthouse roof, painted to match the building and removed when they become obsolete.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the proposal for the antennae on the building included antennae on the parapet wall as well as the penthouse. The Committee recommends approval of antennae only on the penthouse, painted out to match the building and removed when they become obsolete. Fritz Doerstling, the applicant, has returned with drawings reflecting the Committee's request. The new application includes antennae smaller than the original application. The Ad-Hoc Committee on Telecommunication Systems reviewed the proposal and concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's

recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

806 South Front Street

Taylor Frome, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1754

PROPOSAL: New roof, windows, bulkhead doors; legalize french doors on rear

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the extant rear french doors and balconette; approval of new wood, true-muntin windows on the front; approval of replacing in-kind the wood bulkhead doors; approval of restoring the dormer cheeks with ship-lap siding; approval of a new asphalt-fiberglass shingle roof, with staff to review all details.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the former owner replaced the front windows with inappropriate vinyl windows and more recently, Ms. Frome, the new owner, installed french doors on the rear of the building without a permit and Commission approval. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation. The proposal includes legalizing the rear french doors and balconette, installing wood, true-muntin windows on the front facade, replacing the asphalt roof with an asphalt/fiberglass shingle resembling wood shingles, and replacing in-kind the wood bulkhead doors.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

425 South 20th Street

Sandra Safran, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Replace flashing, some slate; re-paint facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the flashing replacement; approval of re-painting the facade a green color; if slate needs painting, paint a slate-grey color.

The owner, Sandra Safran, proposes to replace the flashing above the cornice and retain the slate shingles. If any slates break during the construction, the contractor will replace them with slates that have the same shape. The proposal also includes re-painting the facade a green color. In the past the owner had the slates painted as well. The Committee recommends a grey color for the roof instead of green.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2035 Delancey Street

Frank Lundy, Owner

Rachel Simmons Schade, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Rear facade alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the alterations proposed for the rear of the property. Cypress Street, on this block, only has the rears of buildings. The changes include the construction of a first story garage with a deck at the second floor level, stuccoing the two-story ell and installing a parapet wall on the ell for a second deck. The owner is applying for a zoning variance because the new construction would occupy 100% of the property.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

2415 Pine Street

Brett Webber, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: New windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for wood, true-muntin windows. She explained that the proposed windows have 1-1/8 inch muntins while the original windows have 7/8 inch muntins. Several Commission members stated that the difference is minimal, but Mr. Tyler noted that the proposed muntins are 30% larger than the original, a great difference.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

237-47 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel

Claybar Associates, Owner

Bill Gillin, Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Legalizing removal of masonry clad water tank

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial. The applicant should return with a proposal to re-build the masonry structure.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the owner of the Barclay Hotel removed the masonry cladding of the water tank without a permit or Commission approval. The Department of Licenses and

Inspections issued a stop-work order. Jerry Pantelidas, owner of the building, stated that the masonry was falling onto the roof and the courtyard. He had an engineer inspect the structure and decided to remove the watertank. He expected the contractor to secure any and all necessary permits. The contractor removed and disposed of all of the decorative masonry, including the balustrades and cartouches.

Ms. Spina emphasized that the Committee agreed that the water tank posed a danger and should be removed; however, it believed that the ornate decoration of the masonry cladding proved that the tank's enclosure was not just a utilitarian structure. The Committee wishes to see the structure rebuilt, and the application to remove the water tank should include a replacement proposal. Mr. Bumb stated that the masonry, while decorative, enclosed an unsightly element that will no longer exist. The masonry ceases to prove necessary. Mr. Brownlee noted that the Commission enforces the retention and replacement of other elements that no longer prove necessary. He compared the masonry cladding of the water tank to a chimney. The heating system of the house may not use the extant chimney, yet the Commission recognizes the chimney as an important element. The architect clearly believed that the water tank was an important element if he designed such a decorative surround for it.

Mr. Pantelidas stated that the masonry cladding appeared to have been temporary. He argued that if the architect wanted the enclosure to be permanent he would have design a better cladding system. Mr. Brownlee observed that many architects use materials that have a limited life expectancy, including wood.

Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* recommend against removing a feature of the roof that is unrepairable and not replacing it. He stated that the owner does not have to replace the structure with masonry. Fiberglass or other appropriate materials may be used. Mr. Brownlee also stated that he resented that the Commission constantly faces proposals for legalizing major work performed without a permit.

Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the demolition of the water tank on the condition that the owner rebuilds the decorative structure in masonry or an appropriate substitute material. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which passed with eleven votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

2433 Pine Street

Robin Kohles, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875; c. 1960 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Alter 1st floor; new windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to

approve details.

Ms. Matkzin described the proposal to alter the first floor to resemble the Victorian storefront that once existed on the building. The proposal also includes replacing the front windows. The Committee asked for some revisions of the drawings to include pilaster capitals and a wood entablature below the storefront cornice which Ms. Kohles has provided.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

110-112 South Front Street

Michael Mattioni, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Deferral of obligation to re-erect columns and entablature

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition that the owner erect a small building to house and protect the stone. Committee and Commission will review and approve the design of the new structure.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the proposal entails the deferral of the owner's obligation to re-erect the stone columns and entablature. Mr. Tyler stated that the Commission allowed the demolition of the building except the entablature and columns. The property is land-locked and the owner requested that the Commission approve the dismantling of the stones so that the land could be cleared of debris. When the property is redeveloped the stones would have to be dismantled again for the construction, putting a great amount of stress on the stone.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the Committee had two main concerns: that the new owner be held legally bound to re-erect the stone columns and entablature and the stones be stored and protected properly until re-erection. Ms. Kaplan asked if the condition could be recorded in the deed for the property. Mr. Brownlee suggested an amendment to the title. Mr. Zecca stated that he will review whatever mechanism Mr. Mattioni, counsel for the owner, develops that would be legally binding.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee on the condition that the counsel for the owner provides evidence that the new owner will be legally bound to re-erect the stone columns and entablature when he/she redevelops the land. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2031 Delancey Street

Anthony Cutruffello, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870; 1924 - 1st & 2nd floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Repair chimney, cornice; re-paint facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to approve cornice details.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposed work, including repairing the cornice, chimney and re-painting the facade.

Mr. McLaughlin made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

1722 Pine Street

Laura Blaw, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Rear roof-top deck; planters and window boxes on front facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Defer the deck proposal until next month; approval of window boxes and planters.

Ms. Matzkin explained that this proposal came to the Committee at the last minute. Several neighbors did not have notice that this property appeared on the agenda, and they asked the Committee to defer discussion of the roof-deck until next month. The Committee did discuss the window boxes and planters for the front facade. The planters would measure 30"x 30"x 30".

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the window boxes and planters. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

226 South 21st Street

Dante Luciani, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: New rear windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of wood windows to match existing, with staff to approve details.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for wood, true-muntin windows for the rear facade.

Mr. McLaughlin made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2200-2216 Green Street, Convent of Divine Love

Ted Stopkoski, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1930

PROPOSAL: Replace stringcourse

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the limestone stringcourse had deteriorated because of a roof leak. The contractor repaired the roof and now proposes to replace the stringcourse with new limestone. The new stringcourse will protrude about one inch and will have drip line on the bottom.

Ms. Walker made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

35 South 3rd Street

Yu Xiang Peng, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of wood, true-muntin six-over-six sash in existing frames with staff to approve details.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for wood, true-muntin windows.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Unfinished Business

4414 Ridge Avenue, Undine Barge Club

Lyons Bradley, Applicant

DATE: 1875 - Boathouse; c. 1840 - stone house

PROPOSAL: Demolition of stone house

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with photographic documentation.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Barge Club needs more time to gather the requested information. The last vote taken by the Commission only delayed discussion for one month. He asked the Commission to vote to defer discussion and a vote for another month.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to defer discussion and vote until next month. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Report of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Telecommunication Systems,
30 May 1997, Joseph James, Chair.

315 North Broad Street, Packard Building

Packard Historic Association, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1910-1911

PROPOSAL: Antennae

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the antennae mounted on the penthouse below the cornice on the condition that the company paint out the equipment to match the building and remove all equipment when it becomes obsolete.

Mr. Tyler gave the report of the Ad-Hoc Committee for Mr. James. He stated that the Ad-Hoc Committee agreed with the Architectural Committee. The recommendation for the proposal is approval with several conditions: the company must mount the antennae below the cornice of the penthouse, paint out the equipment to match the building and remove all equipment when it becomes obsolete.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Report of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff,
May 1997, Richard Tyler. Mr. Spilove introduced a new intern for the Commission, Gina Frese.

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina