

**THE MINUTES OF THE 444th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
11 August 1999**

**Commission Conference Room, One Parkway, 1515 Arch St., 18th Fl.
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Carol Lawrence
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
Steven Mullin, Director and City Representative, Department of Commerce
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Robert Thomas
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie G. Wolf, Ph.D., Vice Chair

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

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Daniel Gerber
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Alan Gilbert
Barbara Gilbert
Fredric Mann
Michael Dunn, KYW Radio
Bob Kravitz, Action News
Patricia Aden, Preservation Alliance
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association
Beth Holden
Margaret Chapman
Cynthia Eiseman
Joseph Del Ciotto
David Anderson
Richard Meyer, Richard Conway Meyer Architects
Barbara Kretchmar
George Thomas
Tom Kretchmar
Michael Bach
Cara Carroccia
William Bertolet
Susan Montgomery
Alan Wilson
Michael Pentz
Edward Weiner

William Farmer
Edward Montgomery
Paul Horning
Nahalley Tussi, Philadelphia Inquirer
Virginia Restemeyer
Pamela Whitehead
Robert Hannan
Audrey Osborne Cooper
Nancy Smith
Lenore Millhollen, CCRA
Robert Peters
Joseph Pileri
Thomas Kramer
Bobbie Burke
Janet Greenstein Potter, Foundation for Architecture
Glen Abrams, City Planning Commission
Theresa Miller
Julie Welker
Marc Brookman, Esq., Duane Morris and Heckscher
Charles Thomson
Ian Rubinstein
Claire Oliver
Marc Uravic
Alik Strakes, Preservation Alliance
William G. Schwartz, Esq.
Joel Wachs
Katherine Crowley
Constance Cove
Walter Chatham
Julie Hersch Waxman
John Soroko, Duane Morris and Heckscher
Louis Del Soldo
Raimond Bentman
William Kriebel
Harris Hollin

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 444th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 443rd 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 443rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 14 July 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

Old Business

THE REPORT of the Special Meeting of the Architectural Committee, 8 July 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair

700-718 Walnut Street; 201-219 South 8th Street

Samuel Rappaport Family Estate, Owner
Peter Shaw, Applicant
John Thrower, Architect
DATES: 1868; 1898 700-710 Walnut Street
c. 1807 712-716 Walnut Street
c. 1965 718 Walnut Street
1961; 1969 201-219 South 8th Street

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation; partial demolition and complete demolition; build residential tower
Review in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal in concept, with retention of the York Row storefront and installation of arch-head dormers.

Mr. Spilove recused himself from the discussion and the vote owing to his association with the applicant, and turned the Chair over to Ms. Wolf.

Mr. Thomas explained that this submission for a Review in Concept proposes the mixed use development of the entire block bounded by Seventh Street, Walnut Street, Eighth Street, and St. James Street. It includes the adaptive reuse of the PSFS Complex, the construction of a forty-six-story luxury residential high-rise with 309 rental units, parking in the lower nine floors of the tower, and the creation of an entry court off St. James Street. It will preserve three houses of York Row to a depth of fifteen feet. The Committee and Commission approved in concept a comparable proposal by this developer in 1995 and again in concept with this architect and a different developer in February 1999.

The front exteriors of the existing group of historic buildings at the southwest corner of Walnut and 7th Streets will remain intact and restored. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee and community members recognized the importance of rehabilitating and reusing these neglected and highly significant structures. The proposal will entail the demolition of several additions in the interior of the block to make way for the entry court off of St. James Street.

The proposal will also include substantial demolition of the three remaining houses of York Row. The proposal calls for the complete demolition of a mid twentieth century building on the corner of Walnut and South 8th Streets and another building on the east side of South 8th Street. In February 1999 the Commission approved the concept of truncating the York Row houses, subject to the restoration of the facade of 716 Walnut Street, adding historic dormers on all the York Row houses and raising the roof height of the corner building at 8th Street to hide the meeting point of the gabled roof with the new structure. Mr. Thomas noted that the drawings submitted for the proposal show the retention of the newer storefront on 716 Walnut Street and the restoration of the dormers, but with the wrong dormer roofs. According to the developer, the York Row storefront is necessary for the proposed use of that location as retail space. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee did not object to leaving the storefront, but wanted the arched dormers.

The applicant must seek demolition permits for several of the properties, including York Row. Peter Shaw, the applicant, confirmed that this application is for conceptual approval, and that he will return to the Commission for final approval at a later date. Mr. Shaw stated that the financiers of the proposed development have concerns that in the future the Commission may reject today's conceptual approval. He asked for approval for demolition, subject to certification of financing and application for a foundation permit. He asserted that financing is in place, but requires approval for the proposed demolition.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the proposal in concept, with the revised dormers and with the added provision that the Commission will endorse a permit for the proposed demolition, upon the certification of a commitment for financing and the securing of a foundation permit. The construction documents for the proposed development will, of course, be subject to review and approval by the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 July 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair.

100-18 South Broad Street a.k.a. 1400 Chestnut Street, Land Title Building

Alliance Realty Ltd. Partnership/Preservation Alliance (easement), Owners

Pamela Whitehead, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1897-1902

Proposal: signage; marquee

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the banners, plaques and re-installation of the door on Chestnut Street with staff to review and approve details. The Committee also voted to recommend approval of the marquees, a single bay in width, with perforated metal covers on the letters, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for signage, a new door on Chestnut Street and two metal canopies for a new Tower Records store. The doorway on Chestnut Street will re-establish an original opening. Signage includes bronze plaques and large neon channel letters on the central marquees, as well as banners. The marquee first designed on Broad Street spanned three bays. At the Committee meeting the architect for the project stated that after negotiations with the Art Commission and the Preservation Alliance, the proposal has been changed to a marquee in a single bay, to match the one on Chestnut Street, and the letters will have perforated metal covers rather than plastic.

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

25 East High Street

Mary Taylor, Owner

Willie Walker, Contractor/Applicant

Date: c. 1796

Proposal: legalize vinyl siding

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner covered the front of the house in vinyl siding, including the cornice and other details without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The contractor, who says that he thought the owner already had a permit for the work, seeks to legalize the work.

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

232-34 North 2nd Street

Guido Buratto, Owner

Douglas Seiler, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1870

Proposal: star bolts; storefront alterations; fire escape extension

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the star bolts, windows, fire-escape extension, concrete platform and storefront with staff to review and approve details. The Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission consider the painting vs. cleaning options after the architect and owner investigate the cost of cleaning the facade and present the information at the meeting.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for:

1. installing star bolts, new storefront windows and a rear gate;
2. altering the stone platform;
3. repainting the facade;
4. extending the existing fire escape;

Mr. Thomas stated that the owner wants to save money by just painting over the facade.

Mr. Brownlee noted that the cost of painting and repainting the facade over time will cost as much as or more than cleaning the existing paint off of the bricks. Mr. Thomas noted that the proposed concrete platform in front of the building may not meet ADA requirements.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the stipulation that the applicant use a brick red color, should he opt to paint the facade.

4626 Hazel Avenue

Margie Politzer, Owner

Date: c. 1920

Proposal: storm windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner wishes to install storm windows that match the meeting rail and color of the original windows. They will be installed leaving a portion of the wood window frames exposed.

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

Members of the Commission and staff discussed the possibility of allowing staff to review and approve appropriate screens and storm windows at staff level.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to allow Commission staff to approve appropriate screens and storm windows at staff level. Mr. Mullin seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1115-45 Market Street, Reading Terminal Market

Theresa Mueller, Store Owner/Applicant

Date: 1893-95

Proposal: construct enclosed market stall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with glass in the clerestory on the northern wall and a cornice reduced in size and aligned with the horizontal muntins of the

exterior windows, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr Thomas explained that although the location of this work exists on the interior of the market, a special ordinance and the Reading Terminal Market rental agreement grants the Historical Commission jurisdiction over any interior work. One of the central tenets of this review has been the retention of open-air stalls as opposed to creating small enclosed spaces. This proposal calls for an enclosed area to serve as a workroom to make chocolates. Apparently, the occupant of this stall needs a climate-controlled space to make the chocolates and the added space will accommodate required equipment.

Mr. Thomas stated that the staff expressed concerns that this proposal would set a dangerous precedent to allow enclosed spaces within the market. He noted that other enclosed spaces existed before the current controls. This stall would have its own roof, nine feet below the market ceiling, retaining the open-air effect found throughout the market. Also, this stall would be tucked into a corner, not in the middle of the market. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee thought the design should have glass in the clerestory on the northern wall of the stall, and should correspond to the muntins of the exterior windows.

Ms. Kaplan made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve details. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

406 South Camac Street

Michael Bach and Cara Carroccia, Owners/Architects/Applicants

Date: c. 1830

Proposal: add mansard; three-story rear addition; deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of Scheme 1, denial of Schemes 2, 3, and 4 and approval of the door and windows with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Committee and Commission reviewed a version of this proposal last month. He explained that the owners presented the Committee with four schemes for adding to the house. Scheme 1 is the smallest proposal with a two-story addition on the rear with a deck. Scheme 4, the most ambitious, proposes to enlarge the house with a mansard story on the roof, a three-story addition at the rear, with a projecting bay and roof deck. The other two schemes fall in between. Other houses in this row have been expanded with two-story additions and decks as in Scheme 1. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee wanted to remain consistent with earlier approvals.

Members of the Commission discussed the significance of little houses in terms of the unique architectural heritage of Philadelphia, and observed that schemes 2, 3 and 4 overwhelm the building and do not meet *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* because of the over-large scale, adding a story in place of a dormer and the original roof, and the change in the house design from the original half gable to a full gable roof.

The proposal also includes new windows and shutters on the second floor and a louvered front door. The same type of door can be found on numerous houses along Camac Street. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members did not object to these aspects.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Mullin dissented.

35 South 2nd Street

Café Spice 2, Owner

Shabir Kazmi, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1870

Proposal: Facade alterations; signage; café doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of wood double-leaf doors in all bays, the metal signs sitting on the transom bars just clearing the top of the doors, the awning and the railing at the rear with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal includes:

1. installing new four-leaf metal doors as open café windows;
2. a new two-leaf entrance door;
3. new “halo” lit metal signs and an awning;
4. a railing on the rear ramp.

The building originally had double-leaf doors in each bay, but the storefront was changed to a Colonial-Revival storefront around 1910. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee thought the proposal should have double-leaf doors with panels at the bottom in each bay. He noted that at the Committee meeting the architect expressed concern over the amount of projection the double-leaf doors would have when they were open. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members did not think the projection would cause a problem, and wanted the owner to install the historically accurate doors. The Committee members also thought the applicant should place the signs within the transoms above doors and storefront windows.

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

217 Delancey Street

Stephen Klein, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1755; 1998-99, addition

Proposal: planter across sidewalk

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that when the owner built the driveway to the new garage on Philip Street, it changed the grade of the sidewalk dramatically. The owner now wishes to install a planter at the edge of the driveway to prevent pedestrians from tripping on the steep incline. Mr. Thomas stated that the property line lay approximately 44 inches from the garage and the planter would sit within his property. At the Committee meeting the owner produced a document from the Department of Streets granting approval to repair the sidewalk. Paul Hallowell, representing the owner, stated that permits for the curb cut and the grade change were secured.

Norman Tissian, President of the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the one of the charms of Philip Street is the undulating sidewalk and that this will destroy some of that charm. Catherine Apothaker, who lives next door to the proposed location, strongly objected to the planter. She maintained that the Commission did not approve the curb cut in the first place, which she cites as the root of this problem. Commission members noted that this proposal only deals with the proposed planter, not the details of the additions to the house that the Commission approved in 1997. Commission members suggested tabling the issue to allow

staff to confirm whether the planter lies within the property line and does not encroach on the public right-of-way.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the application subject to the staff confirmation that the planter lies within the property line and does not encroach on the public right-of-way. Mr. Perri seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. James abstained.

807 South Hancock Street

Leeann Moldovany, Owner

William Farmer, Contractor/Applicant

Date: c. 1810

Proposal: side deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for a wood deck along the side of the rowhouse. The owners of the house also own the empty lot next door. He stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

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

602 South Front Street

Joe DeFrancesco, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1795

Proposal: Alter/legalize facade and roof work

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new windows, shutters, transom, dormer alterations and metal roof with wood framing around the garage opening instead of a stone lintel, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee and Commission reviewed this project several times. The Department of Licenses and Inspections has issued numerous violations because the work did not follow the approved plans. In this proposal, the applicant seeks to correct parts of the violation and legalize others. The proposal calls for enlarging the windows and installing wood, true-divided light windows with wood paneled shutters, a reduced transom over the front door, wood siding on the glass dormer and a metal roof designed to minimize the non-historic appearance of the roof skylights. The current owner did not perform the illegal work.

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

118-26 North Broad Street and across Cherry Street, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts

Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts (PAFA), Owner

Peter Saylor, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1872-76

Proposal: comment on scheme to link PAFA with former federal building at the NW corner of Broad and Cherry with a bridge, tunnel or addition on closed portion of Cherry Street

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee did not vote, but concurred with the State 's finding that any construction should not touch the Furness-designed building.

Mr. Thomas explained that the architect wished to bring this proposal to the Architectural Committee for comment only. This is not an application for an approval in concept. The Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts has acquired the federal building across the street and wants to connect the two buildings in some way. Peter Saylor, the architect, has designed several schemes to achieve this. Proposals range from bridges across Cherry Street; creating an enclosed "winter garden," which includes the closing of Cherry Street to traffic; and an underground tunnel. The State Bureau for Historic Preservation will only consider the underground schemes for approval. One of the "acceptable" schemes calls for a tunnel underground joining the two buildings with, perhaps, an ADA ramp and the other for a tunnel and "winter garden" that will require the closing of Cherry Street. The museum will have to relocate numerous utilities to have the garden and that may prove cost-prohibitive.

The Commission did not take any action.

116-18 Chestnut Street

Buffalo Billiards, Owner
Robert Rohe, Architect/Applicant
Date: c. 1880
Proposal: signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas stated that this proposal calls for signs within the store window, signband and pediment and a large, wood, projecting sign, 10' 6" by 12" with lights shining on the sign. Mr. Thomas stated the Committee thought the proposed sign in keeping with the scale of the building and does not obscure historic fabric.

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

112 Chestnut Street

Wasseem Kalla, Owner
James Campbell, Architect/Applicant
Proposal: ADA ramp

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review and approve details

Mr. Thomas recused himself from the discussion and the vote owing to his firm 's association with the proposal.

Mr. Baron explained that this proposal involves re-grading the sidewalk with a railing to comply with ADA regulations. The railing will match existing railings found on the storefront.

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

1914-1916 Rittenhouse Square Street; 1915-1919 Manning Street

Henry McNeil, Owner

Walter Chatham, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street - 1859; Entrance Pavilion - 1957;

Rear ell - late 19th century and mid 20th century; garage - c. 1960

PROPOSAL: Demolition of entrance pavilion, rear garage and ell; new additions; rooftop alteration and addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Approval of:

- 1. extending the front steps, with brownstone to match the original, with staff to review and approve details;*
- 2. removal of the existing shutters on 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street, subject to their replacement with shutters befitting this style of building, with staff to review and approve details;*
- 3. the demolition of the one story entrance pavilion at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street and the rear ell and garage on Manning Street;*
- 4. a new four story gallery addition, with staff to review and approve details;*
- 5. the sunken roof deck, without the planting screen, and staff to review and approve details;*
- 6. the revised rooftop addition as presented 27 July 1999.*

Conceptual Approval:

- 1. A new two story garage and wider rear ell, with Committee and Commission to review materials and details*

Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission will review aspects of the proposal from the report of a special meeting of the Architectural Committee held 8 July 1999, as well as from the report of the regular Committee meeting held 27 July 1999. To mitigate confusion, Mr. Thomas presented only current aspects from both of the reports, and disregarded those rejected by the Committee at the earlier meeting.

This proposal calls for:

1. extending the front steps;
2. removal of the existing shutters on 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street;
3. the demolition of the one story entrance pavilion at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street and the rear ell and garage on Manning Street;
4. a new four story gallery addition;
5. a fifth floor living room addition and roof deck with clear railing atop the mansard roof of the proposed new four story gallery addition; and
6. a new two story garage and wider rear ell with vaulted roof deck.

Mr. Thomas explained that the proposal no longer calls for the metal and glass canopy and metal railing at the front entrance, but the owner still wishes to bring the steps forward several feet, using real brownstone to match the original. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the enlargement of the steps.

The owner also wants to remove the existing shutters from 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street. He does not intend to replace them. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee acknowledged the inappropriateness of the current shutters for a house of this period, but wanted the applicant to return for approval of the installation of shutters befitting this style and period of building.

The owner seeks to demolish the one story entrance pavilion at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street along with the rear ell of 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street and the garage on Manning Street. Mr. Tyler explained that over one year ago, the Architectural Committee, at the request of the present owner, reviewed the possibility of demolishing the entrance pavilion for comment only to assist the owner in his decision to purchase the property. The Committee thought the pavilion could be demolished; however, the Commission took no action on that opinion.

At the request of the Committee, the applicant constructed a mock up with poles to demarcate the proposed rooftop living room atop 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street and rooftop deck. Mr. Thomas stated that he viewed the mock-up and found it visible from many locations, including directly across the street, but less visible than in former schemes which placed the living room over 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street. The revised proposal calls for sinking the roof deck floor below the top of the mansard, thus necessitating a smaller amount of visible railing. The railing will be constructed in non-reflective glass. He explained that the Committee asked the applicant to lower the pitch of the proposed skylight to mitigate its visibility.

In response to the Committee's recommendation at an earlier review of this proposal, the applicant has lowered the first floor windows of the new addition. The new design extends the windows down to a more pedestrian level, but with interior shutters in the lower half to accommodate the owners special needs for that location. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal to demolish the entrance pavilion and to construct the new addition in its place.

Mr. Thomas noted that he, along with J. William Cornell of the Architectural Committee and members of staff, examined the rear ell and determined that much of it was constructed in the 1950s. Mr. Cornell, a long-time contractor in Philadelphia, remembers working on the rear addition in the 1950s, and retains the original drawings for the alterations and addition in his office. For this reason, the Committee did not object to the proposal to demolish and replace the rear ell and garage. The owner chose a garage door of "pierced" metal, to allow for light and air into the rear yard. The proposed garage will have these doors on both ends for this purpose.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee agreed to recommend approval in concept of the proposed rear ell and garage, but with review of details later.

The revised proposal for the rooftop addition will sit primarily on the new addition at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street. Only a glass-enclosed staircase will sit on the historic building at 1914 as well as an enclosed stairwell behind the chimney on 1914. The rooftop addition will have glass doors on the northeast corner, two windows on the west facade and one window on south facade. Copper sheathing will cover the walls, and a cornice will top the addition. This proposal has the room two feet farther south compared to the original submission. A mock-up of the eastern wall sits on the building. Mr. Thomas noted that the addition, since it will sit on the new addition, will not be mistaken as a part of the historic building. Committee members also asked the architect to minimize the cornice details.

Mr. Mullin made a motion to accept the combined recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion. The Commission did not take action on the motion.

Mr. Brownlee expressed reservations about approving the current fenestration details of the proposed addition at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street, and asked for further review. Mr. Mullin agreed to rephrase his motion.

Mr. Mullin made a reworded motion to accept the combined recommendation of the Architectural Committee to include further review of the fenestration details of the proposed addition at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street. Mr. Ward again seconded the motion. The Commission did not take action owing to the continuance of the issue to a special meeting of the Commission.

Several members of the community voiced strong objections to the proposal. Miles Kelly who resides near the subject property noted that this house already has many windows with full views of Rittenhouse Square, and that the proposed additions will block views of the Square for himself and other homeowners. Barbara Gilbert, also a neighbor, quoted the section of the ordinance regarding the Historical Commission's obligation to consider how proposals affect neighboring structures. Edward Montgomery, former Chair of the Historical Commission, urged the Commission not to approve the current proposal. Michael Schade of the Center City Residents Association conceded that these historic structures deserve revitalization, but expressed concern with this proposal, as well as the apparent unwillingness of the Commission staff to inform the community of the details of this application. Janet Potter of the Foundation for Architecture described the entrance pavilion as a "folly" in the architectural sense, and asked why follies do not deserve as much attention as other structures. She also asserted that the proposed design for the addition to replace the pavilion only reflects the interior design, as evidenced by the indiscriminate placement of the windows, and is not sensitive to exterior issues such as the relationship with neighboring buildings in terms of rhythm and scale.

George Thomas, Architectural Historian, strongly objected to the recommendation to approve the demolition of the entrance pavilion and the rear ell. He commented on the significance and appropriateness of the pavilion for that location, and the unsuitable design and scale of the proposed addition at 1916 Rittenhouse Square Street. George Thomas also stated that research of Sanborn maps shows that the rear wing dates to 1907, not to the 1950s.

Patricia Aden of the Preservation Alliance stated the Alliance's objections to the proposal, including the lack of correlation between the fenestration of the proposed addition and of the historic structure, the amount of windows on the rear ell, and the rooftop addition. Ms. Aden spoke regarding the cultural significance of the entrance pavilion. She also commented on the importance of the Manning Street elevations.

Bobbie Burke, co-author of a book on the history of Rittenhouse Square and vicinity, objected to the design of the proposed addition, particularly the fenestration. She presented photographs of several row houses that were constructed after the rows they fit into. She explained how some of the "in-fills" complement the rhythm and scale of the rows, while others appear out of place because there is no correlation with the fenestration, scale, or materials of the neighboring buildings.

William Schwartz, Esq., counsel for a party in opposition to the proposal, maintained that a proposal involving the entire demolition of a building or a significant part thereof requires review by the Committee on Financial Hardship, unless the demolition is in the public interest. Mr. Schwartz also criticized the Commission staff for not making the plans for the proposal available to interested parties. He also noted that pulling the north wall of the addition back two feet will not eliminate its visibility, and that the current mock-up only constitutes 13% of the intended addition.

Claire Oliver, who lives at 1912 Rittenhouse Square Street, expressed strong concern over the potential loss of the windows, and ultimately the use of her fourth-floor rooms because this proposal will build up the rear ell to a height beyond any previous ells. She explained that

her house was constructed after 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street, and about a story higher. These window openings date from the 1880s.

In the interest of time, the Commission decided to continue the discussion and vote on this application to a special meeting of the Historical Commission. The applicant and attorneys for the owner agreed, as did the community. Mr. Jacob took a list of interested parties for this proposal to notify them of the date and time of the special meeting.

1509 Walnut Street

Avado Brands, Inc., Owner

Edward Palmer, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1902

Proposal: illuminated accents on signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal is to legalize two star lights above the new storefront.

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

2406-08 Delancey Street

Dieter and Sara Forster, Owner

Reed Axelrod, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1860

Proposal: two-story addition; parking; gate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that 2406 Delancey Street sits towards the rear of the property and has a front yard. The owners wish to build a post-modern addition to the front of 2406 Delancey Street to create a link between the two buildings. The front yard will have a metal gate that will open to a parking pad. Mr. Thomas stated that 2406 Delancey Street already has a one-story addition on the front. In addition, the owner proposes to restore the third story windows, which lie in the main visible area when the gates are closed, and to shift the chimney to the east side of the building to cover the new heating vents that must be installed on that side of the house. The link will be clad in standing-seam metal, which will resemble terne, and the front facade in oversized buff brick. The gate will have red brick piers and painted steel gates.

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

119 South 18th Street

Howard Winnig, Owner

Beth Holden, Applicant

Date: c. 1850

Proposal: awning; signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the storefront, and an awning that sits

closer to the building face with staff to review and approve details. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the flat-wall signs above the storefront.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal includes:

1. changing the non-historic storefront;
2. an awning made of aluminum tubing;
3. metal letters above the storefront; and
4. three flat-wall signs between the windows on the second floor.

Mr. Thomas stated that the storefront currently has a roll-down grate. The awning will project out from the housing of the grate. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee did not object to the concept of the awning, but thought it overwhelms the storefront. He stated that the Committee suggested pushing the awning closer to the gate housing and to have only a slight curve.

The applicant showed the Commission revised drawings reflecting the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf asked for clarification of the Committee's recommendation to deny the installation of the signs above the storefront. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the sign over the door, only those above the storefront.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendations, with approval of the sign over the door. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

123 South 18th Street a.k.a. 1735 Sansom Street

Michael Singer, Owner/Applicant

Proposal: legalize removal of chimney and window replacement

The applicant requested a continuance for one month.

1118-20 East Berks Street

David Rogers, Owner

J.J. DelCiotto, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1740

Proposal: construct factory around historic house

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with at least a two-foot space between the factory building and the house.

Mr. Thomas explained that 1118 and 1120 East Berks Street appear on the Philadelphia Register. However, sometime before 1992, 1118 was demolished without Historical Commission approval. The owner of the gear factory next door wishes to expand his factory to the house at 1120 and into its backyard. Originally the owner wanted to demolish 1120, but has recognized the historic importance of this wood house, a rarity in Philadelphia.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal includes extending the factory around the house and investigating ways to use and, perhaps, rehabilitate the house. He explained that the Committee suggested leaving at least two feet around the house so that maintenance and cleaning can take place. Also the rear should have a light-well to satisfy zoning concerns for light and air in the back of the house.

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

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 27 July 1999,
David Brownlee, Chair

250 Lyceum Avenue, "Fairview Cottage"

Mr. Thomas made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation to designate 250 Lyceum Avenue. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

313 Chestnut Street

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation to rescind the entry of 313 Chestnut Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, July 1999, Richard Tyler

Mr. Tyler asked if Commission members had any questions about the report.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve an expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary