

**THE MINUTES OF THE 434th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
14 October 1998**

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

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Carol Lawrence
Shelly Merhige, Office of the City Council President
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director for Housing, Office of Housing and Urban Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie G. Wolf, Ph.D.

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
R. Scott Jacob, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Steven Ferrara, Sign Spec, Inc.
Melissa Moore, Sign Spec, Inc.
Johanna Markind
Barbara McGinley
Frederick Slifer, The Salvation Army
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Civic Association
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Michael Fasone
Jason Creshes, Michael Singer Realty
Clare Yellin

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 434th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 433rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Ms. Wolf and duly seconded, the Commission Unanimously approved the minutes of the 433rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 9 September 1998,
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 September 1998, Robert Thomas, Chair.

208 Lincoln Drive, Isaac Rittenhouse House

Fairmount Park, Owner

Alvin Holm, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: New stair, door and pent on rear side

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for creating a new entrance into the house for a caretaker's apartment at the rear of the property. Plans call for adding a wood stair, cutting a window down into a door and building a pent over that door on the rear ell of the house. Other work on the house includes restoring a roof, some stucco and trim replacement.

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

220 Market Street

Michael Singer, Owner/ Michael Fasone, Tenant

Dennis DiDonatis, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; c. 1930 - storefront

PROPOSAL: New storefront to correct violation

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denying legalization of:

- 1. The new stained glass transom.*
- 2. The new tiles installed in the inner walls of the new storefront.*
- 3. The existing exterior roll-down grate.*

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approving:

- 1. The new wood storefront doors, moved to the plane of the original shopfront window and the removal of the visible exterior hardware on the two doors, with staff to review and approve details.*
- 2. A clear glass transom, with shop address and name painted on the glass, with staff to review and approve details.*
- 3. Beaded boards in place of the green tiles.*
- 4. Removing the exterior grate and installing one inside of the shopfront.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for making corrections to cure a violation for a storefront that the tenant altered without a permit. The storefront will now regain its former profile in plan. The new storefront elements in the violation include:

1. Two new doors that replace the former fixed shop window.
2. A stained glass transom above the new doors.
3. Tiles installed in the inner walls of the new storefront.

Mr. Thomas explained that Michael Fasone, the present occupant, had replaced the

shopfront with two doors to accommodate large pieces of furniture for his antique shop. He has now submitted a drawing showing corrections to the design as built. Mr. Thomas stated that this building does not have a service entrance at the rear, and that Committee members agreed to recommend moving the new doors out to the plane of the original shopfront window, and asked for the removal of the visible exterior hardware on the two doors. He also noted that Mr. Fasone agreed to comply with these recommendations.

Mr. Thomas described other issues raised by Committee members over the new stained glass window that Mr. Fasone installed within the transom, and the new tiles in the inner walls of the new storefront. He explained that Committee members recommended installing clear glass and painting the address and name of the store in gold directly on the glass and replacing the tiles with beaded boards. Mr. Fasone and a representative of the owner agreed to comply. Mr. Thomas also stated that Committee members objected to the existing exterior roll-down grate, installed without Commission approval prior to the current storefront alterations, and that Mr. Fasone stated that he will remove the grate and reinstall it inside the new shopfront. Mr. Fasone stated that the shopfront was deteriorated when he moved in, and that a previous occupant installed the green tiles.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association expressed concerns that this section of the city has lost many of its historic storefronts; he asked the Commission to deny the legalization of the new storefront, and to require a total restoration of the former storefront. Mr. Thom stressed that the new doors constitute a completely inappropriate design and do not follow the rhythm or pattern of the storefronts in this neighborhood. He also noted that the work was done without a permit, and asked the Commission not to reward the applicant for performing the work illegally. He stated that he notified Mr. Fasone of the building's designated status at the time of the work. Mr. Thomas and several Commission members also remarked that the owner of the building controls many historically designated properties in the city, and has been before the Commission for other addresses, and knows the procedure for obtaining a building permit.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to deny the proposal, and to recommend the applicant redesign the proposal to achieve more of the appearance of the historic facade. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2-8 Girard Avenue, Former Kensington Bank

First Union Bank, Owner
William Lockett, Applicant
DATE: 1877
PROPOSAL: Signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of all the signage except for the one over the main door, awaiting further information concerning the original appearance and current conditions behind the existing sign.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal, seen by the Committee two months ago, calls for refacing some existing backlit plastic box signs. He stated that research revealed that a permit exists for that signage, although it never came to the Historical Commission for review. The applicant has reduced the package of proposed signage to delete the long sign at the roof and to cast in bronze the plaques to either side of the door. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee

members suggested recommending approval of the proposed signage except for that over the main door, awaiting further information concerning the original appearance and current conditions behind the existing sign.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. James abstained.

209-211 Chestnut Street

MBM Group, Owner

Melissa Moore, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: ATM installation

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing a cash machine in an existing storefront window. He stated that Committee members objected to blocking up this opening, and that the standpipe directly in front of the proposed site would impede access for patrons of the ATM could cause injuries to users if unnoticed, and interfere with Fire Department operations. The applicant presented a new design to the Commission. The Commission decided the Architectural Committee should review the new design first, and asked the applicant to return next month.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the recommendation of its Committee to deny the proposal and to advise the applicant to return to the Architectural Committee with the revised proposal submitted at the Commission meeting. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1535 Locust Street

Bank Philadelphia, Owner

Melissa Moore, Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Illuminated sign

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for installing a new box sign on the bank. He stated that the Committee requested better photos and a section drawing for this project when this proposal last came to the Committee meeting. The photos show the lack of historic fabric behind the existing sign and the plan drawing shows the box projecting only two inches beyond the face of the building. Committee members voiced no objections to the proposal owing to the absence of historic material left behind the sign.

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

136 South Street, a.k.a. 600 South Hancock Street

George Evangelou, Owner

Lawrence Gilbert, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1834
PROPOSAL: Ramp; storefront alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

This proposal calls for installing a ramp along the Hancock Street facade and removing two bay windows to accommodate the ramp and a new door. As this work will only modify a non-historic storefront and complies with ADA requirements, the Committee did not object to the proposal. Mr. Baron stated that he discovered other visible alterations on the plans after the Committee meeting, such as two windows on a visible facade. He stated that Mr. Gilbert will install wood windows in this location.

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

3417 Spruce Street, Houston Hall, University of Pennsylvania

University of Pennsylvania, Owner
John Hunter, Venturi, Scott-Brown Associates, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1894; 1937 - east and west wing additions
PROPOSAL: Accessibility alterations; rooftop systems

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

- 1. Alterations to doors and building entrances to accommodate the handicapped.*
- 2. New rooftop penthouses for HVAC.*
- 3. Masonry and roof repair.*

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the discussion and the vote owing to his law firm's association with the University of Pennsylvania.

This proposal calls for:

1. Alterations to doors and building entrances to accommodate the handicapped.
2. New rooftop penthouses for HVAC.
3. Masonry and roof repair.

Mr. Thomas explained that the architect intends to raise the grade level of the terrace at the north side of Houston Hall for a new section of the building that will lie under the terrace. This will also allow for greater handicapped accessibility to the entrance to the original 1894 building as well as the east and west additions of 1937. This will necessitate shortening and replacing the sets of double doors there. The proposal will also entail heightening the terrace wall to accommodate the grade increase, and will use stones from the currently below-grade level of the terrace wall.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal also involves replacing existing HVAC rooftop penthouses with new penthouses more compatible with the character of the building. The architect designed the new mechanical rooms to allow for greater sensitivity to the roof lines and

scale of the building. They will match the color of the historic slate roof. The Commission thought the new penthouse scheme appears more appropriate with the historic character of the building than the existing.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendations. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

8 North 3rd Street

Hyung Koo Kim, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize tile covered storefront

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for legalizing the facing of the storefront with tiles without a permit. The tiles have no historic basis and add a second layer that covers historic fabric.

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

8605 Germantown Avenue

Metropol, Owner

Joseph Alteari, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1995

PROPOSAL: Trellis

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for building a trellis at the rear of the property facing a parking lot.

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

2013 Walnut Street

Patrick Whelan, Owner

Joseph Alteari, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, café doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of replacing the existing center panel of the shopfront window with a café type window, with applied wood trim.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal presents two alternatives to install operable "café type" windows in this existing shopfront. The first option consists of three sets of operating storefront café windows that open inward, with transoms above that line up with the transom over the main door. The second option involves the replacement of the existing center panel of the shopfront window with a café type window, with applied wood trim. Commission members

agreed with the Committee recommendation to approve option number two.

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

127 Kenilworth Street

Dominic and Sarah Ward, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1850 - original building

PROPOSAL: New building on historic lot

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review and approve details to match the historic photographs more closely.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for rebuilding a house on the location of an historic carriage house. The demolition of that carriage house occurred without Historical Commission approval. The Committee has viewed a proposal for this lot in the past and encouraged the rebuilding of the carriage house design to avoid rewarding an illegal demolition.

The current applicants purchased the property after the illegal demolition. The present application basically follows the original design, but omits the window on the first floor and adds a third floor with a slight setback above the cornice. Mr. Thomas stated that some Committee members expressed an interest in seeing a total reconstruction of the facade, and noted that this proposal resembles the demolished facade enough to do that. He also explained that the applicants stated that they agreed with many of the Committee 's comments, and explained that their architect had mis-drawn the proposal. Mr. Thomas noted that other Committee members contended that the applicants, who had nothing to do with the demolition of the historic building, should not have the restraints required for a total facade reconstruction. He explained that the Committee asked the applicants to consider working with Commission staff to redesign the second-floor windows, garage door appearance and height of the facade to resemble the corresponding elements seen in the designation photographs in the Commission file, and that the applicants affirmed their willingness to work with staff regarding these issues.

Mr. Sklaroff raised objections to the Architectural Committee 's recommendation, and questioned the Commission 's legal purview regarding new construction on the site of a demolished historic building. He suggested the Commission vote to deny the Committee 's recommendations, and to allow the applicants to build without interference from the Historical Commission.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to deny the Committee 's recommendations, and to allow the applicants to build without regulation by the Historical Commission, owing to the want of jurisdiction. Mr. James seconded the motion which the Commission did not vote on.

Mr. Sklaroff and other Commission members also objected to the application owing to the failure of the drawings to reflect accurately the applicant 's intentions for the building and the Committee 's recommendations. The Commission sought clarification regarding the proposed windows, "hayloft" door, garage door and the height of the building. The Commission discussed the appropriateness of a total reconstruction as well as a building of a new design that corresponds with the design, scale, and materials of the neighbouring buildings. Mr. Sklaroff recommended the applicants, their architect, the Architectural Committee and Commission staff work together to create a design that conforms with *The Secretary of the Interior 's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and its guidelines for reconstruction.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the recommendation of its Committee and to send the proposal back to the Architectural Committee, with the recommendation that the applicants, their architect, the Architectural Committee and Commission staff work together to create a design that conforms with The Secretary of the Interior 's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and its guidelines for reconstruction. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with seven votes. Ms. Kaplan, Ms. Wolf, Ms. Wischmann and Mr. Perri dissented.

Mr. Spilove turned the Chair over to Ms. Wolf owing to his interest in the following property.

135 South 18th Street, a.k.a. 1731-1737 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Management, Owner

Lance Wright, Applicant

DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: Legalize exterior roll-down grate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for legalizing an exterior roll down grate installed without a permit before the designation of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The applicant claims that the proposed grate would conform to the design requirements of the Code for such grates and match those existing on other shopfront openings of this building. Mr. Thomas stated that photographs showed the interior elements that would make an interior installation of the grate difficult.

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

Mr. Spilove resumed the Chair.

1612-1616 Locust Street, The Locust Club

Locust Club, Owner

Phillippe Chin, Applicant

DATE: 1960

PROPOSAL: Steel and glass entrance canopy

Architectural Committee Recommendation: To declare the application incomplete.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for installing a new metal and glass canopy to denote a new restaurant use at the front door of the Locust Club, a non-contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, but that the Locust Club has already installed the canopy, cut down the windows and installed a new door, windows and metalwork. He stated that Committee members also objected to the highly ornamental appearance of the canopy, which they cited as inappropriate for the building and the neighborhood. He explained that the Committee decided to take no action until the Commission receives more information regarding the full scope of the proposed alterations.

The Commission took no action on this proposal, declaring the application incomplete.

401 North Broad Street

401 North Broad Street Associates, Owner

Francis X. Sloan, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929

PROPOSAL: De-glaze windows, install vents behind

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with the vents and internal walls painted a dark, flat, charcoal color to mitigate their appearance.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the removal of glass panels in one bay on the side of this building. The applicant will leave the existing frames in place, and install the vents behind. He explained that the Committee asked the applicant to paint the vents a dark, flat, charcoal color to mitigate their appearance. Several other bays at this location will receive internal walls directly behind the glass to help insulate the space.

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

Mr. Wilds recommended asking the owner of 401 North Broad Street or their tenants to set up larger groups of submission for all future proposals. Mr. Baron stated that he would offer to work with future applicants to help bring submissions together.

REPORT of the Financial Hardship Committee, 1 October 1998, Wayne Spilove, Chair.**5520-5524 Arch Street, Samuel Yellin Studio**

Clare Yellin, Owner

Frederick W. Slifer/Salvation Army, Applicant

DATE: 1915

PROPOSAL: Demolition of building

Financial Hardship Committee Recommendation: approval of demolishing the building on the grounds of financial hardship, with photographic recordation of the current state of the building and copies of the architectural plans for the building, and copies of the historic photographs Ms. Yellin offered to reproduce for the Commission files.

Mr. Tyler explained that this proposal calls for the demolition of the Yellin iron works building. He stated that Clare Yellin, owner of the building, finds that since relocating her shop to West Chester she has had trouble even giving the building away. Estimates for rehabilitation run in excess of one million dollars without including the cost of toxic waste removal, which would raise the cost by about \$500,000.00. Ms. Yellin intends to give the building and property to the Salvation Army for use as a children ' s playground.

Mr. Tyler stated that Ms. Yellin can no longer continue the family business while paying for the maintenance of the Arch Street studio. The estimated cost of maintaining the building per year amounts to more than \$12,000.00. Ms. Yellin stated that the estimated worth of the building in 1993 was between \$20,000.00 and \$25,000.00. Mr. Tyler informed the Commission that his examination of Ms. Yellin ' s and of Samuel Yellin Ironworks federal income tax returns revealed that both have negative incomes. In view of this, the Committee agreed that the cost of maintaining the building in question constitutes a financial burden for Samuel Yellin Ironworks

and Ms. Yellin.

Ms. Yellin explained that she will remove all of the ironwork her grandfather Samuel Yellin installed in the building, and that a few pieces will go to the Salvation Army so it can install them in an adjacent location. Mr. Tyler noted that this could form part of an interpretive program to mitigate the loss of the building. Ms. Yellin also offered to make copies of architectural plans as well as company and family photographs depicting the history of the building and the studio for the Historical Commission files. Mr. Tyler stated that the Committee asked for photographic recordation of the current state of the building for the files as well, and that Ms. Yellin and Mr. Slifer agreed to comply.

Mr. Sklaroff recommended the Commission raise the funds required to purchase and install a State Historical marker for the site of the studio. The cost would run approximately \$1,000.00.

Mr. Tyler stated that he would compose a nomination for the historic marker, and inform the Commission of any expense.

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

123 Christian Street

Chris Russo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1825

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows, security door

Financial Hardship Committee Recommendation: Legalization on the grounds of financial hardship:

- 1. The security door*
- 2. First and second floor vinyl windows, but only until the applicant or a future owner wishes to replace them, at which time the Commission must review and approve appropriate replacement windows and frames.*

And to recommend denial of legalizing:

- 1. The glass block basement windows, with staff to work with the applicant to correct the basement windows.*

Mr. Tyler explained that this proposal calls for legalizing several alterations to this house completed without a permit. The current owner claims that a former owner closed the basement windows with glass block and changed the first and second floor windows to vinyl windows with snap-in muntins before he purchased the property in 1994. The applicant added the security door for safety considerations, which he outlined in a letter to the Commission.

Mr. Tyler explained that the applicant claims he does not have the money to remove the vinyl windows, that he still needs the security door, and that the estimated cost of installing historically appropriate windows and frames would amount to roughly 18% of his gross yearly income, as evidenced by financial data submitted by the applicant. Indeed, he qualifies for consideration for relief under the definition of low to moderate income set forth at section 10.2.a of the Commission ' s Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Tyler stated that Committee members discussed alternatives to replacing all of the windows and door in an effort to mitigate Mr. Russo's expense. He explained that the Committee thought the glass block basement windows appear most inappropriate for this facade, and considered them of greatest importance. Committee members agreed that the security door, though inappropriate for the building, performs an important function in protecting the applicant's family. Mr. Tyler added that the Committee also considered allowing the retention of the vinyl windows until the applicant or a future owner wishes to replace them, at which time the Commission must review and approve appropriate replacement windows and frames.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously, and to reinstall the metal roof ridges at the corner of the mansard.

2201 Delancey Street

Barbara McGinley, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Legalize replacement of slate roof with asphalt

Financial Hardship Recommendation: Legalization of the new shingles on the side and rear mansards on the grounds of financial hardship, and to deny legalization of the new shingles on the front mansard, and to ask the applicant to replace the front mansard with slate shingles that match the originals in color and design.

Mr. Tyler explained that this proposal involves the legalization of work that the applicant had completed without a permit. The work includes the removal of scalloped slate shingles from a three sided mansard and their replacement with square slate asphalt shingles. The new roofing material bears a resemblance to slate roofing material, though not the variety and style it replaced. Ms. McGinley had the cornice repaired to match the original, but the roofers removed the metal roof ridges at the corners and did not replace them.

Mr. Tyler related a brief history of the roofing project. He explained that the complex contractual arrangements of the project involves Mrs. McGinley, the owner, who claims that she did not know about the historical designation or its implications. She hired Mr. Pickford to work on the house. Mr. Pickford informed the applicant that, owing to his lacking a license to work in Philadelphia, he gave the job to contractor Jayne & Fisher who in turn subcontracted the job to Katona Roofing. In the midst of this confusion, no one pulled a permit for the work.

When this proposal came before the Historical Commission last year, the Commission opted to reject the recommendation of its architectural Committee to legalize the side and rear portions of the mansard, and ask the applicant to replace the front mansard with slate shingles that match the originals in color and design. Ms. McGinley was willing to comply with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. At that time the Commission voted to send it to the Financial Hardship Committee.

Mr. Tyler stated that the owner has applied for relief under the financial hardship provision of the ordinance, section 14-2007((7)(k).7), and section 10 of the Rules and Regulations. Section 10 provides for application by persons other than those who meet low/moderate income levels as defined by HUD. Section 10.2.a states that the "Commission

recognizes the existence of circumstances under which the rigid application of this standard [i.e. HUD] would result in unnecessary hardship. Examples of this include, but are not limited to, extraordinary medical expenses. . . ." Section 10.3.a provides for the confidentiality of personal financial information.

The applicant's tax return, which includes all her assets and income, indicates that she inherited what superficially appears to be a comfortable estate. By affidavit, Ms. McGinley stated that she currently supports four of her nine adult children who reside with her and are unemployed. A fifth lives in Florida on a farm purchased by her husband; this farm has not succeeded commercially, and Ms. McGinley provides the sole support of this son.

Most significantly, of the other three children one is mentally retarded, one has multiple sclerosis, and a third, now 31 years of age, suffers from schizophrenia and has resided in mental institutions or supervised housing for the past 15 years. The medical expenses of this third exceed the Adjusted Gross Income for 1997, as, obviously, do the total medical expenses incurred in 1997. Indeed, even after the 7.5% reduction of allowable medical expenses, the medical deduction for 1997 exceeds the AGI. Ms. McGinley spends capital to meet all other living expenses of herself and dependents. The long-term care of the three disabled children requires the preservation of considerable capital.

The cost estimate for the re-roofing of the three sides of the mansard in slate totals \$26,250 plus fees and permits, with an additional contingency of \$5,520 plus permit for any necessary sheathing replacement. This expenditure qualifies for consideration as a hardship within the meaning of the ordinance and the Rules and Regulations.

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

The Report of the Historical Commission Staff September 1998, Richard Tyler

Mr. Tyler commented on the monthly staff report. He discussed the various undertakings regarding the Louis Tiffany and Maxfield Parrish mosaic mural *Dream Garden*, and announced the proposed date for the continued meeting of the Designation Committee as 20 November 1998.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary