

**THE MINUTES OF THE 417th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
14 May 1997**

**City Council Caucus, Room 401 City Hall
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Baldinger, Deputy Executive Director, City Planning
Commission
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Arlene Matzkin
Ed McLaughlin, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and
Inspections
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Maria Walker
Dennis Ward
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community
Development
Stephanie Wolf, Ph.D.

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

Also, with affiliation and/or project

Steve Mullin, Director, Department of Commerce
Daniel W. Simcox, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Phil Jordan, Phillip Jordan Architect
Charles Krudener, Comcast
Richard Goldberg, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Steve Klein, 217 Delancey Street
Mark Thompson, Mark Thompson Associates
Roderick Wolfson, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Robert Shusterman, Esq.
Catherine Apothaker, 315 South Philip Street
Suzanne H. Binswanger, 316 Willings Alley
Molly Espey, Philadelphia Hospitality
E. Mickles, 312 South Philip Street
Judith Block, 219 Delancey Street
Arthur Huslett, 201 Delancey Street
Benjamin Lifsey, 272 South 23rd Street
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Siraik Zakarian, 2201-05 Green Street
Philip Rakita, 222 Delancey Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association

Debora Russo, Department of Public Property
Robin Schatz, Chief of Staff, Councilman DiCicco's Office
Michael Greenblatt, CMH Development LT
Sandra Williams, Philip Street neighbor
Cynthia Eisman, Philip Street neighbor

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 417th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:05 A.M. He announced that the National Trust for Historic Preservation declared the week of 11-17 May National Preservation Week and suggested that everyone contact the Preservation Alliance for the many events planned.

MINUTES of the 416th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. James and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 416th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 9 April 1997, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

MINUTES of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. James and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 30 April 1997, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

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

Mr. James summarized the discussion of the Ad-Hoc Committee. The discussion broke into two parts, the cellular phone antennae and personal cable satellite dishes. The Federal regulations distinguish between the two. Mr. James noted that the Architectural Committee, in making recommendations for antenna proposals, may request any information it needs to make a decision. He offered the technical expertise of the Engineering Division of the Department of Public Property to the Committee. The City is drafting an ordinance to establish procedures for the application and installation of these antennae.

When dealing with cable satellite dishes, Mr. James stated that the owner needs to follow procedures set by the Commission when the satellite dish may affect the appearance of the historical building. The Federal regulations waive the jurisdiction of local land use laws regulating these satellite dishes, except in historical districts. This exception allows the Historical Commission to review them.

Mr. Tyler also noted that the Federal regulations require the Federal Communications Commission and the cellular phone companies to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, when an antenna proposal involves an historic district. The Advisory Council is in the process of changing the regulations to include any historic property. Mr. Tyler contacted the State Historic Preservation Office and discovered that it has seen only one antenna proposal, for a building in Pittsburgh. He continued by saying that the Advisory Council may be willing to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Historical Commission to provide these mandated federal reviews.

Mr. James emphasized that much of the procedures followed by the individual municipalities as well as the federal government are still being developed. This involves on-going discussions and education.

Mr. Spilove and Mr. Tyler thanked Mr. James and the Committee for their efforts. They also thanked Ms. Matzkin for her participation in the many meetings which have taken place throughout the month.

The Report of the Architectural Committee, 29 April 1997,
Arlene Matzkin, Chair

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

7500 Germantown Avenue

New Covenant Church, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Legalize present installation of antennae

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Tyler stated that the attorney for Comcast, Daniel Simcox, Esquire, submitted a letter to the Commission requesting the tabling of the proposal to discuss an architectural solution.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

321 Chestnut Street

Liberty Museum, Owner

Sandra Kelly, Applicant

DATE: c. 1900; c. 1915 - floor added

PROPOSAL: New steps, windows, signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of aspects of the proposal, except the lighting, with the condition that the new windows be set in the plane of the existing and that the corner banner be relocated to Orianna Street facade.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for the steps, windows, and signage for the property. Mr. Baron noted that the Committee questioned the placement of the corner banner in the marble facade. The Committee asked that the banner be moved to the Orianna Street facade so that its attachment occurs in the brick infill and not the marble.

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

810 South Front Street

Don Flynn, Owner

Sean O'Rourke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1795

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation, rear addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review specifications for window and masonry treatments and the resubmitted cornice detail.

Ms. Matzkin briefly described the facade alterations and addition for this building which has been empty for a number of years, including a new cornice, new windows, cleaning and pointing.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with a unanimous vote.

2325 Spruce Street

Sal Dell'Orefice, Owner

David Ujfalusi, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Stone facade restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review a sample.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Serpentine stone has suffered some damage. Serpentine is no longer quarried, so if the contractor cannot find serpentine stone to replace the damaged stones, he will use a stucco or cast stone patch. This type of

patching can be found on College Hall on the campus of University of Pennsylvania.

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

500 West Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Mark Thompson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1882-84

PROPOSAL: Porch rehabilitation

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained the two-step process for the replacement of the non-historic concrete porch. In phase one, the school will remove the metal railing, except for several stabilizing metal spindles which will remain in-between the new wood balusters. Phase two will include removing the concrete porch flooring and the remaining metal spindles. The submission given to the Commission members shows the look of the porch after phase one.

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

2015 Spruce Street

Ken Balin, Owner

Ernest Copson, Jr., Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Re-roof mansard

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the extant metal roof replaced the original slate roof. The owner wishes to install asphalt/fiberglass shingles which will better mimic the look of the original slate shingles.

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

Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed with a unanimous vote.

2214 St. James Street

Lori Clark, Owner

John Carr, Conservator/Applicant

DATE: 1860

PROPOSAL: Cleaning, pointing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to approve cleaning, masonry repair and pointing samples.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the proposal includes cleaning the very soiled masonry and repointing.

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

4414 Ridge Avenue, Undine Barge Club

T. Lyons Bradley, Applicant

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

PROPOSAL: Demolition of stone house

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with photographic documentation.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Barge Club wishes to demolish the stone building at the rear of the property along Ridge Avenue. Mr. Tyler stated that he researched the property using old atlases. An 1849 map identified the property as the Evans Hotel. In 1875 the hotel's name had changed to Leeds Hotel.

Mr. Tyler explained that the nomination form for the Philadelphia Register does not mention the stone building in its description or statement of significance. In 1981, the time when the Commission designated the property, the Commission focused on late 19th century buildings, especially those of Frank Furness. The building described in the nomination is the Furness and Hewitt boathouse situated on Kelly Drive.

Mr. Sklaroff asked how the staff determined the date of c. 1840. Mr. Tyler stated that he inspected the building and the shallow slope of the roof indicates the early 19th century date.

If the building dated to an earlier period the slope would be much steeper. Mr. Sklaroff then asked if the building could prove historically significant as an old inn or hotel. Ms. Wolf replied that East Falls and Chestnut Hill have several inns that predate this structure.

Mr. Wilds noted that if the Barge Club cites economic hardship for the demolition then the proposal should go to the Financial Hardship Committee.

After more discussion, several Commission members expressed the need for more information before a vote.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to table the vote for a period of one month. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed with a unanimous vote.

2201-2205 Green Street

Siraik Zakarian, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Stone fence replacement

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review a stucco sample.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the brownstone wall proved very deteriorated. The original plan called for reusing the brownstone on the new wall, but this may prove infeasible. If the contractor cannot salvage enough brownstone, Ms. Zakarian proposes to build the wall with concrete block and then stucco the block. The stucco will have the same color and scoring as the original brownstone.

Ms. Zakarian also proposes to build a new wall along the northern property line of the property. This wall will also be of concrete block and stucco facing. Ms. Zakarian testified to the need for this approval since the contractor probably will not have enough brownstone for the project. Mr. Sklaroff asked that staff check the feasibility of reusing the brownstone.

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

35 South 3rd Street

Yu Xiang Peng, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Repaint facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, but recommended darker shades of the same colors.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the Committee recommends approval; however, Committee members believed that the white color would wash out in the sunlight. The recommendation to use darker shades was just advisory.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

1835 Spruce Street

Don Friday, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1860

PROPOSAL: Brownstone restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review samples.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the owner wishes to restore the brownstone steps and watertable. The contractor will use "Mimic"

on the watertable and ThoroCoat and ThoroSeal on the steps. Since the steps will suffer from heavy foot traffic, the ThoroCoat system provides a tougher surface.

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

1315 Lombard Street

Joshua Barol, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize screen door, transom storm window, basement windows and removal of basement grate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial. The Committee recommended that the owner reinstall the three pane, true-muntin basement windows and bars and remove the storm door and transom storm.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the previous owner, without a permit, installed a storm door and a storm window over the transom. Mr. Barol, also without a permit, removed the historic basement windows and installed vinyl ones. In the process, he also removed the basement grates. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the basement grates were original. Mr. Baron replied that he was not sure.

After much discussion the Committee decided that the basement windows did not have the same visual appearance as the original windows. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the owner wanted to change the storm door. Mr. Tyler noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards do not specifically address storm doors.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion. Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to amend Ms. Wolf's motion to approve the storm door proposed by Mr. Barol with the door painted to match the front door, with staff to approve details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion for the amendment. The motion with the amendment passed with a unanimous vote.

1401 East Bristol Street, Carl Mackley Apartments

Canus Corporation, Owner

Roderick Wolfson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1933-34

PROPOSAL: Complete rehabilitation; new windows, enclose balconies, proposal in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal in concept. The Carl Mackley Apartments are to be rehabilitated for low-income housing with ten percent of the units handicap accessible. In order for the project to prove feasible, the owner needs to enclose the balconies with glass. The proposed glazing will copy the three part railing configuration. The proposed sliding windows will reflect the vertical divisions of the original casement windows.

Mr. Wilds noted the importance of this project, especially in this area of the city.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve proposal in concept. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. The motion passed with twelve votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

115 Elfreth's Alley

Phillip Beltz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1792

PROPOSAL: Replace pent over rear door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to replace in-kind the pent over the rear door.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

330 South 12th Street

Carmen Pirollo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1828

PROPOSAL: Repair chimney, rebuild wood bulkhead doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to approve details.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the owner wishes to repair the damaged chimneys and replace in-kind the wood bulkhead doors.

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

1801 Vine Street, Family Court Building

Ervin Davis, Applicant

DATE: 1939

PROPOSAL: Tree removal

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the proposal calls for the removal

of the trees around the building. The Fairmount Park Commission is in favor of the tree removal.

Mr. McLaughlin made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

122 South 18th Street

Maribel Leroux, Restaurant Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1898

PROPOSAL: Awning, canopy

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the window awning, adjusted to meet zoning code requirements, and denial of the door canopy.

Ms. Matzkin described the two parts of the proposal. First, the applicant, Maribel Leroux, wishes to have an awning over the front window of the storefront to protect her merchandise. The Committee voted to recommend approval. Second, Ms. Leroux wishes to have a canopy over the front door. She keeps the door open in all types of weather as a way to advertise that the store is open. The door has suffered from being exposed to the elements.

The proposal includes a barrel vault canopy which would extend to the curb with two legs supporting it. The Committee decided that the canopy would hide too much of the decorative stonework around the entrance. Mr. Burke of the Art Commission noted that the Art Commission would not approve the proposal either. The Committee advised Ms. Leroux on ways to protect the door from further deterioration using flashing and a coating.

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

272 South 23rd Street

Benjamin Lifsey, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial. The original sash should be repaired and reinstalled or new windows made to match the originals.

Ms. Matzkin explained that, without a permit, Mr. Lifsey, the owner, replaced the third floor windows in the corner turret. The original windows are unique for two reasons, they have

curved glass and sash and the top sash is one-third the size of the overall window. The replacement windows are flat and the two sash are of equal size. Mr. Lifsey testified that the original sash proved irreparable and he could not afford to have custom windows made. He showed the Committee several bids he received from window manufacturers. The Committee and Commission members acknowledged that the windows may prove more expensive than the current replacements; however, the issue should have been brought to the Commission's attention before the owner began work. Ms. Matzkin noted that the Committee explained to Mr. Lifsey the option of applying to the Financial Hardship Committee. Mr. Tyler stated that the windows are expensive if the replacement windows have real, curved glass. The Commission would probably approve windows that have curved plexiglass, which reduces the cost of the windows considerably yet replicates the visual appearance of the original windows.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

315 North Broad Street, Packard Building

Packard Historic Association, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1910-11

PROPOSAL: Antennae

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of equipment mounted on the penthouse below the cornice on the conditions that the company paints out the equipment to match the building and removes all equipment when it becomes obsolete.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for antennae on the roof of the penthouse of the building. Mr. James noted that the building already has some antennae. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the condition to remove the equipment if it becomes obsolete. He stated that the Commission does not set that restriction on other systems, such as air-conditioning units or kitchen vents. Mr. Baldinger replied that all other systems pertain to the actual use of the building. These antennae are extraneous and could easily be abandoned by the companies when they become obsolete. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the removal of the antennae usually forms part of the lease agreement with the building's owner.

After some discussion, the Commission decided to ask the Ad-Hoc Committee on Telecommunication Systems to review the proposal before it made a decision.

Ms. Walker made a motion to refer the proposal to the Commission's Ad-Hoc Committee on Telecommunication Systems for further review. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with

twelve votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1925-27 Walnut Street AKA 135 South 20th Street, The Chatham

Michael Singer Real Estate, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1927

PROPOSAL: Antennae

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Six Committee members voted to recommend denial. Mr. Cornell dissented.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for antennae on the roof of the building. The antennae would stand thirteen feet high near three corners of the building, making them highly visible. Since the owner removed the ornate finials at the roofline before the designation of the building, the Committee asked if the company could mask the antennae and have them read as the missing finials. The engineer for the company stated that they could not.

Ms. Walker made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed with twelve votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

510 Walnut Street, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co. Building

The Bagel Factory Management Company, Tenant

Phillip Jordan, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1839 - Egyptian Revival facade; c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Awning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the proposal calls for an awning over the doors on the side facade and a sign over the gate. Since the fence stands on a lot that does not appear on the Philadelphia Register, the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the sign. However, the Committee offered some friendly advice to place the sign to the side of the gate instead of above it. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the awning.

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

Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with twelve votes.

Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1813 Delancey Street

Keith Barket, Owner

Kathryn Walker, Applicant

DATE: c. 1856

PROPOSAL: Partial rear demolition, rear decks, new garage entrance

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition that the proposed alterations are changed to a stucco wall on the rear fifth-floor and wooden picket railings on the decks with staff to approve details.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for the removal of the rear fifth-floor, metal and glass greenhouse; installation of a deck on the fifth floor and a deck on the second floor over the garage, and the alteration of the garage entrance. The original proposal called for cedar plywood on the new exterior, fifth-floor wall and the deck railings, which the Committee believed inappropriate. The owner agreed that he did not want the cedar plywood as well, but did not want to halt the decision process and the commencement of work. As a compromise, the Committee voted to recommend approval of the work if the exterior wall had a stucco finish and the decks had wooden picket railings. The owner has resubmitted drawings showing these changes.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

126 Market Street

Timothy McDonald, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1840

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation, new windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the facade rehabilitation for the building which will house an architectural gallery on the first floor and lofts above. The proposal includes cleaning, painting of trim, new windows, and exploration for the original storefront.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Walker seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1928 Pine Street

Mark Ansley, Owner

Peter Miller, Applicant

DATE: 1888-89

PROPOSAL: Alter garage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to widen the garage and the installation of a gable roof with asphalt/fiberglass shingles. The building will have a stucco finish.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the recommendation of the

Committee. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which passed with a unanimous vote.

2127 St. James Street

Marion Rogel, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1923

PROPOSAL: Awning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee's vote split with four against the proposal and three in favor. Mr. Atkin, Ms. Batcheler, Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz voted against the awning.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the owner wishes to have an awning on the first-floor window which faces into English Village. Mr. Tyler described the small hardware item attached to a wood "plug" which the owner, Ms. Rogel, described as evidence of a former awning. Neither Mr. Tyler nor Ms. Spina, after a cursory look, found any evidence of an awning on this or any property in English Village.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee and to disapprove the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed with nine votes. Mr. Bumb, Mr. Baldinger, Ms. Merhige and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

217 Delancey Street

Stephen Klein, Owner

Hugh Newell Jacobsen, Architect

Mark Thompson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1758

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, new addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with the brick color, pointing sample and final garage door design to be reviewed for approval by Committee and staff.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the discussion and vote.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the proposal for the partial demolition and additions to 217 Delancey has returned for a review of the construction documents for permit issuance. The architect incorporated into the new design suggestions made by the Committee at its meeting in December.

Stephen Klein, owner, Mark Thompson, architect, and Richard Goldberg, Esq. of Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, presented themselves to answer any questions the Commission members may have. Mr. Thompson explained that Hugh Newell Jacobsen, the architect for the project, regretfully could not attend the meeting. However, he is working on the new garage door design

requested by the Committee several weeks ago. He should have a new design soon for the Committee to review. Mr. Jacobsen also is searching for a brick color. He will erect several brick samples for the Committee and neighbors to view in the next several weeks. Mr. Wilds noted the introduction of skylights on the gambrel roof that were not part of the original proposal. Mr. Thompson stated that the skylights sit on the upper portion of the gambrel roof and will not be visible from the street. They are needed to provide light into the stairway and a windowless room on the third floor. The curb of the skylights will be only eight or nine inches.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. James seconded the motion.

Mr. Spilove opened the floor to the neighbors for comments.

Robert Shusterman, Esq., representing some of the neighbors, formally objected to the proposal for partial demolition of the building and the partial infill of the extant garden. He stated that the new construction [new kitchen wing and garage] would be oppressive on Philip Street. The elements of the construction, specifically the garage, do not conform to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*. He passed around an article by Randall Cotton of the Preservation Alliance which discussed garage design.

Mr. Shusterman also objected to the failure of the Commission to provide notice to the neighbors about the proposal.

Mr. Tyler noted that the neighborhood association received notice for all of the meetings including those that discussed this proposal. The Commission wrote to several of the neighbors announcing both the Architectural Committee and Commission meetings and he personally called several neighbors to announce the meetings. Mr. Goldberg stated that the fact that so many neighbors attended the Architectural Committee and Commission meetings proves that the Commission provided sufficient notice. Also, he noted that the newsletter of the Society Hill Civic Association discussed the proposal, alerting all of its members.

Mr. Wilds asked the neighbors if they disapproved of the design of the garage or the fact that it held two cars. Catherine Apothaker stated that she opposed the size of the garage. She stated that the design of the garage does not consider the scale of the surrounding buildings. She went on to cite several guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior which she believed the design does not follow. Mr. Thompson noted that the proposed garage is smaller in height than the present one and will allow more light into the neighboring houses and the street.

Robin Schatz, Chief of Staff for Councilman DiCicco, read a

letter from Councilman DiCicco stating that the proposed changes are inappropriate for the neighborhood. He asked the Commission to delay its decision so that Mr. Klein and the neighbors may discuss a compromise.

Bernice Hamel, Vice-President of the Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, thanked the Committee and Commission for their concern in reviewing proposals. She asked the Commission to take special care in discussing and deciding on this issue.

Mr. James asked Mr. Klein if he would consider tabling the application for further discussion. Mr. Klein replied that, even before he bought the property, he verified with zoning that he could have a two-car garage. He then applied to the Historical Commission for an approval in concept for the two-car garage which the Historical Commission approved. With the Zoning Board and the Historical Commission approvals, he bought the property.

Mr. Klein also stated that he has met with the neighbors and has heard their opposition to the design; however, he has every intention of building a two-car garage.

Sandra Williams, a neighbor, testified that Mr. Klein only met with neighbors on one occasion. The Haases, previous owners of the property, did not live at the house and only used the single-car garage on occasion. Mr. Klein intends to live at this residence and will use the garage on a daily basis. She also objected to the process of notifying neighbors.

Mr. James objected to the comments that questioned the integrity and process of the Commission.

Ms. Wolf stated that the presence of a two-car garage on the lot comes under the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The design of the garage and the impact of it on the historical fabric of the house is within the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. Mr. Klein noted that the garage did not require a zoning variance. Mr. James stated that the Commission acknowledges that the proposal conforms to Zoning requirements. Mr. Shusterman reiterated the neighbors claim that the garage negatively impacts the historic building and street.

Phillip Rakita, a neighbor, questioned the color of brick shown to the Committee. Mr. Thompson noted that Mr. Jacobsen has not chosen a brick yet and will show several brick samples at the site. Mr. Tyler stated that the Commission's staff will notify interested parties when the samples are in place.

Ms. Wolf called the question. The Commission carried the motion unanimously.

Mr. James asked that the discussion of the zoning compliance be entered into the minutes.

15 South 7th Street, Atwater Kent Museum

City of Philadelphia, Owner

DATE: 1825

PROPOSAL: Alteration to tent pavilion

Mr. Baron explained that the Atwater Kent Museum wishes to change the design of the tent pavilion which the Commission approved last month. The new, smaller design will have a sloped roof, but no signage.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the new design. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which passed with twelve votes. Ms. Wolf abstained.

The Report of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, April 1997, Richard Tyler.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina