

**THE MINUTES OF THE 440th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
14 April 1999**

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

Present

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

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Elizabeth Harvey, Historic Preservation Planner
R. Scott Jacob, Executive Secretary
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Gerry Maguire
Alvin Freiberg, Esq.
Alik Strakes, Preservation Alliance
J. Randall Cotton, Preservation Alliance
S. Neil Schlosser, SRK Architects
Janet Potter, Philadelphia Historic Northwest Coalition
John Imperatore, Lord and Taylor
William G. Schwartz, Esq.
William McDowell, Redevelopment Authority
Madeleine Antinucci, Streets Department
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Cynthia Kishinchand
David McKenna, Philadelphia Weekly
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 440th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 439th 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 439th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 10 March 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 30 March 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair.

421 South 16th Street

Michael Maguire, Owner/Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Rebuild facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with true divided light, wood window and cast stone sills in the same dimensions as the historic, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves rebuilding the front and visible rear facades of this rowhouse. The front and rear side wall have been declared “imminently dangerous” by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, and Mr. Maguire took down the front wall with a permit. The applicant proposes to rebuild the front wall, changing the opening sizes, using vinyl windows and a simplified door and frame. On the rear he seeks to change the shape of the rear ell to a full width structure, and use the backyard for parking. The rear ell currently forms half of a gable end shared with the neighboring building. Mr. Thomas noted that the owner took detailed measurements of the facade prior to demolition.

Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members thought the applicant should use true divided light, wood windows with cast stone sills in the same dimensions as the historic windows with the neighboring buildings serving as models for the window details. Apparently, interior design issues have necessitated the shortening of the first-floor front windows. Mr. Thomas explained that Committee members described ways of concealing interior details within the appropriately sized windows to the applicant. He noted that one Committee member thought the owner may make the required alterations to this new facade.

Mr. Wilds asked for clarification regarding elements of the proposed facade not mentioned in the Committee Report including the new front door and its frame. Mr. Baron stated that the Committee had asked that the new door and its frame match the original details, and noted that the applicant was shown photographs of appropriate door treatments on similar rowhouses.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the new door and its frame to match the original, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

401-417 West Johnson Street, Mayfair House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Solvibile, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licences and Inspections, Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: To deny the proposal on architectural or structural grounds and to refer the issue to the Committee on Financial Hardship with the submission of the required materials.

Mr. Perry recused himself from the discussion and the vote.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the complete demolition of the Mayfair House on the grounds of financial hardship. Upon demolition, the property will go to Fairmount Park. Over the last few decades developers have attempted to reuse the Mayfair but have failed. Mr. Thomas noted that Robert Solvibile, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licences and Inspections and applicant for the City, stated that this building is not imminently dangerous in structural terms, but falling debris and asbestos have posed health risks for neighbors and those individuals unlawfully occupying the building. He stated that the Department of Licenses and Inspections has sealed the building. Ms. Wolf noted that the building remains unsealed in several locations owing to ongoing vandalism.

Mr. Wilds stated that a report from the Redevelopment Authority outlining possible reuse proposals over the last five years as well as detailing the building's physical condition is underway. The Commission discussed issues relating to ten year tax abatement and other possible means of financing a reuse of the building. Mr. Wilds spoke regarding the City's budget for housing. Commission members decided to refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Robert J. Shusterman, Esq., Counsel for the Preservation Alliance, stated that his client still holds a facade easement on the Mayfair House. Patricia Aden of the Preservation Alliance confirmed the Alliance's support for sending the issue to the Financial Hardship Committee.

Mr. James made a motion to refer the issue to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

227 Market Street (216 Church Street)

Ilan Seidenwar, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate facades; fire escapes

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Denial of: (Scheme 1)

1. The proposed fire escapes. The applicant should install sprinklers or another less obtrusive means of meeting fire code regulations.

Approval of: (Scheme 1A)

1. The restoration of the Church Street facade, with staff to review and approve details.

2. The Market Street alterations, with the proposed second door placed flush within the storefront, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves the rehabilitation of a property that fronts both Market and Church Streets. The applicant proposed two schemes and seeks to:

Scheme "1"

1. Restore and replace in kind the windows and storefront on Church Street.
2. Retain the altered facade on Market Street and add a new storefront entrance.

Scheme "1A"

1. Restore and replace in kind the windows and storefront on Church Street.
2. Retain the altered facade on Market Street and add a new storefront entrance.
3. Add fire escapes on both facades.

The proposal includes the replacement of original windows and shopfront details. The proposal calls for the alteration of the Market Street storefront with a second recess on the left end to match the existing recess on the right end. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members thought the applicant should cut the added door into the flat glazing of the storefront without creating another recessed, faux-historic alcove and retain the details of that facade.

The unusual layout of this building with two fronts connected only on the first floor requires special consideration regarding fire safety issues. The applicant must go to the Board of Building Standards regarding the fire escapes, but has come to the Historical Commission first for comment and direction. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee requested more detailed plans to determine why the fire escapes must go on the exteriors, as well as possible interior solutions. Committee members thought the applicant should find a way to meet the fire codes, such as sprinklers, without adding these exterior fire escapes.

Mr. Jacob stated that the applicant informed the Commission staff of a revised proposal that does not involve fire escapes on the visible facades.

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

220 Market Street

Michael Singer, Owner/Applicant

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; storefront c. 1930

PROPOSAL: Facade and storefront alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with the sign band incorporated into the storefront cornice, pending staff review of a sample of the brick above the storefront.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal to cure a violation involves reestablishing the location and appearance of the historic storefront. In order to allow access for furniture to this antiques store, the proposed store window will swing inward on hinges and a wheel.

Mr. Thomas stated that the area above the facade's storefront will receive a new storefront cornice and windows. The area between the storefront and the second-floor windows is currently stuccoed. The cornice will match the one on a neighboring building with a sign band underneath. Mr. Thomas said Committee members discussed the possibility that the brickwork under the stucco may have sustained too much damage to re-expose it, and thought staff should review a sample. Mr. Baron stated that the applicant also proposes installing six-over-six windows on the upper floors, replacing the top cornice and removing the non-historic shutters and the roll-down grate. He explained that staff and the Committee asked for the retention and repair of the top cornice.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to the treatment of the shopfront, sign band, installation of six-over-six windows on the upper floors, repairing the top

cornice and removing the non-historic shutters and the roll-down grate.

266-270 South 2nd Street, Abercrombie House

John and Karen Sirlin, Owners

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1759

PROPOSAL: Addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Approval of:

- 1. A new fence around the north end of the yard, painted a dark color, with staff to review and approve details.*
- 2. A new screen fence around the HVAC on the roof of the new garage.*
- 3. The balustrade reconstruction, with staff to review and approve details.*

Denial of:

- 1. The proposed roof deck and safety fence.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal includes:

1. A new fence around the north end of the yard.
2. A new screen fence around the HVAC on the roof of the new garage.
3. The reconstruction of the balustrade on the roof with a roof deck and safety fence.

Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members expressed concern that the color and materials of the proposed fence will not match the woodwork of the cream-colored trim of the house and the new alleyway gate, and that painting it a light color will draw too much attention to it. He noted that the Committee preferred painting the fence and the alley gate a darker color such as rust red.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner also seeks to establish a deck on the roof with a code compliant safety fence. He proposes to position this fence behind the balustrade to minimize visibility. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee strongly objected to the safety fence, which will be visible in any position, and considered the house too significant for this alteration. He noted that this property already has a great deal of outdoor space. Mr. Thomas reported that the Committee did not object to the balustrade. He described the Committee's suggestion to construct it in fiberglass for easier maintenance and to minimize the superstructure required to support it.

David Amburn, architect for the proposal, described alternate schemes for the roof deck that he claimed will mitigate its appearance. He explained that the section between the area of the proposed balustrade would accommodate a scaled down but still accessible deck at the rear. Commission members wondered whether the deck would still be large enough for comfortable use after setting it back and in sufficiently to diminish its visibility. Mr. Amburn thought it would still provide the owners with its desired use as an observation deck. Mr. Tyler suggested placing more of the deck on the rear slope of the roof. Commission members still objected to the deck, but suggested constructing a mock-up of the reduced deck proposal to demonstrate the amount of visibility.

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

Approval of:

1. A new fence around the north end of the yard, painted a dark color, with staff to review and approve details.
 2. A new screen fence around the HVAC on the roof of the new garage.
 3. The balustrade reconstruction, with staff to review and approve details.
- Denial of:
1. The proposed roof deck and safety fence.

253 South Quince Street

Alexander Zausner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear cinder block wall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, conditioned upon the replacement of the wall, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the demolition of a cinder block wall at the rear of the property. The wall faces the 200 block of South Jessup Street, on which several houses front. The applicant has not submitted plans to replace the wall, and has implied the possibility of leaving the yard open. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members did not object to the demolition of the wall, but wanted to see it replaced, with staff to review and approve details. Commission members thought the applicant could rebuild a fence or a wall, with staff to review and approve details.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the added approval of replacing the wall with a fence, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1115-1131 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

Wendy Bennett, Applicant

DATE: 1895

PROPOSAL: Entrance canopies; signage; flags

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves the installation of a new bowed metal marquee on the front of the headhouse to signify the entrance to the Convention Center. The signage for the marquee includes two rows of bracketed individual letters in two sizes. The top row will consist of 2'9" high, white, internally illuminated letters. The bottom row consists of 10" high pale blue letters attached to the pewter colored sign board.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal also seeks preliminary approval of first-floor awnings for the other tenants of the headhouse. The canopies match the existing ones for the Hard Rock Café at the southwest corner of the headhouse in design only. The future tenants will come before the Commission individually for signage and colors for the awnings. Mr. Thomas explained that Committee members thought all the awnings should have complementary colors, if not the same. The proposal also includes the installation of five flagpoles across the loggia section of the facade. He stated that the Committee did not object to the flags or the method of their installation.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee asked the applicant about the removal of the old neon "Reading Terminal Market" sign at the southwest corner. Neale Quenzel, architect for the proposal, stated that the sign was removed for the Marriott Hotel, per its policy of no neon signage. He also thought the sign postdated the building's period of significance. Mr. Tyler spoke regarding the history of the Reading Terminal Market. He explained that the Reading Railroad took over the market space at this location for a new Center City depot, and was required to incorporate a market portion into its terminal. Commission members agreed that the sign does possess significance.

William McDowell of the Redevelopment Authority explained that the former location of the sign has been reconstructed and restored to a condition predating the sign. He asked whether the sign could go in another location, but one that coordinates with the direction of the neon arrow of the historic sign. Mr. Wilds suggested placing it in the same location of the corner niche, but over the restored balustrade. Mr. McDowell stated that the Marriott Hotel occupying the headhouse does not want the signage at all, so probably will not want it in the old location.

Mr. James thought this particular signage issue is a separate issue from the marquee and awning proposal before the Commission. Commission and staff members discussed concerns that approving the elevations submitted for the marquee and awnings that do not show the old "Reading Terminal Market" sign may constitute an approval for its permanent removal. Mr. Tyler recommended stipulating that the Commission's approval for this proposal does not imply approval of the permanent removal of the sign.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for the awnings and the marquee signage for the Convention Center only, with the condition that this approval does not imply approval of the permanent removal of the "Reading Terminal Market" sign. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried with eight votes. Mr. James dissented and Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to require the Redevelopment Authority to submit a report regarding the condition of the "Reading Terminal Market" sign and to apply within sixty day to address the future placement of the sign. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried with ten votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. Spilove excused himself and turned the Chair over to Ms. Wolf.

City Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner
Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1870 - 1901
PROPOSAL: Railings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

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

Mr. Baron explained that this proposal involves a new baluster railing design for the handicap access rails already approved for City Hall. The previously approved end baluster is no longer available.

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

1815-1837 North Broad Street, College Hall, Temple University

Temple University, Owner

Neil Schlosser, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Entrance pavilion

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal as submitted.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the discussion and the vote.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for building an entrance pavilion on the rear of the south side former party wall. The new addition will serve as the entrance for the building's new use. The University has developed a new campus plaza along Park Mall, and this new entrance will provide access to the building from that location.

Mr. Thomas stated that the addition will be faced with limestone on the first level and brick on the second, with a slate roof. He noted that Ms. Batcheler and Mr. Baron suggested reconfiguring the design of the stonework to correlate with the existing stone base, and that the other Committee members disagreed, and preferred the submitted design because it reads as an addition. Neil Schlosser, architect for the proposal, asked the Commission to approve the use of fieldstone for the lower portion the base of the addition instead of the proposed limestone owing to concerns over water seepage. The Commission did not object to the use of fieldstone in that location.

The application also includes a below grade addition on the north side of the building and new vents cut into the side wall. Mr. Baron stated that Committee members did not object to these aspects of the proposal.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with fieldstone at the lower portion of the base of the addition. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

Mr. Spilove resumed the Chair.

3142 Market Street, Centennial National Bank

Drexel University, Owner

John Cluver, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1876

PROPOSAL: Restore bank; addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

1. *The addition, with the grey brick base of the addition continuing up to the bases of the windows and finishing the mullions of the new “storefront” entrance of the building in a reddish color to complement the brickwork, with staff to review and approve details.*
2. *Replacing the roofing with a faux slate shingle or slate line type asphalt.*
3. *Reconstructing the window grates from old drawings and photographs.*
4. *Reestablishing the transom, doors and front steps with incised lettering.*
5. *Restoring the clock.*
6. *The retention of the original sign band, with a new cast stone sign carefully installed over it, with staff to review and approve details.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for restoring the Frank Furness designed bank and adding a new wing containing the handicap accessible main entrance.

The new wing will sit at the south side of the old bank building and will complement the historic structure in material and scale. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members found that the design appeared appropriate, but thought the grey brick base of the addition should continue up to the bases of the windows, as the grey stone base does in the existing section. He also explained that Committee members recommended that the applicant finish the mullions of the new “storefront” entrance of the building in a reddish color to complement the brickwork. The architect agreed to comply with the Architectural Committee’s recommendations.

The restoration work proposed for the historic portion includes:

1. Replacing the roofing with a faux slate shingle or Slate-line type asphalt.
2. Reconstructing the window grates from old drawings and photographs.
3. Reestablishing the transom, doors and front steps.
4. Restoring the clock.
5. Removing the deteriorated brownstone sign inset from the front of the tower and replacing it with a new cast stone sign that bears the name of the new use of the building, “Peck Alumni Hall.”
6. Additional signage incised onto the fronts of the steps leading to the old entrance.

Mr. Thomas stated that old drawings and photographs were consulted to aid the architect with all of the restoration work. He explained that Committee members expressed reservations over the signage aspects of the proposal, and asked the applicant to consider mitigating the impact of the incised lettering on the front steps and asked for the retention of the original sign band, with a new cast stone sign carefully installed over it. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members and staff discussed possible means of installing the new sign, and cited other examples where this procedure had been executed. He noted that the architect said he would examine possible means of installing the new sign in the joints of the retained historic sign.

Mr. Brownlee asked for greater attention to the proposed new entrance addition, including the finish of the metal work and its correlation with the historic building, with commission staff to review and approve details. The Commission did not object to the proposed restoration work.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation, with greater attention to the proposed new entrance addition, including the finish of the metal work and its correlation with the historic building, with commission staff to review and approve details. Mr. James

seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

3214 Powelton Avenue

3214 Powelton Avenue Associates, Owner

Tim Jaskolski, Applicant

DATE: 1882

PROPOSAL: Rebuild porch railing

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

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal seeks to cure a violation involving the rebuilding of a center rail on the porch between two designated houses. The applicant will have the missing newel post re-milled and will reconstruct the rail with a baluster pattern based on a mix of designs in the row. The Commission did not object to the proposal.

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

309 South Street

Nicole Loughran, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; Storefront - c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Roll-down grate; signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the installation of a roll down grate in place of the existing scissors gate. The applicant also proposes a sign installed on the face of the gate housing. The gate housing would cover the historic glass transom. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee opposed the proposal and suggested installing an internal gate behind the line of the front door that can protect the internal contents of the store while the scissors gate protects the windows, and that the Committee thought the sign should project rather than conceal the decorative cornice.

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

118 North Broad Street, PAFA, sw corner at Race Street

Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Owner

Charles Evers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1876

PROPOSAL: Wheelchair lift

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that the architect proposes to meet ADA requirements by installing a lift in the stairwell to the side of the main door. An internal elevator connects the basement to the other floors. To achieve this, the applicant proposes to remove the top two rows of bricks within the stairwell, and trim back the stone cap surrounding the well at street level. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee thought these alterations minimally visible and did not object. The proposal also calls for the placement of new stone treads on top of the stairs and a metal grate at the floor of the well.

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

315 South American Street

Eric Tucker, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1846

PROPOSAL: Star bolts

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the installation of star bolts to secure the front facade. The applicant submitted an engineer's report detailing the necessity of this procedure.

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

1300 Market Street, Wanamaker Building

Lord and Taylor, Tenant

John Imperatore, Applicant

DATE: 1902-1910

PROPOSAL: Black out doors; signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of blacking out the windows, and approval of directional signage and removal of the hardware.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for closing two of the three store entrances on Chestnut Street and blacking out those glass doors. Directional signage at each location will inform patrons that these are no longer entrances. He stated that the Committee objected to blacking out the doors, both interior and exterior, and thought the combination of directional signage and removing the hardware would serve to alert customers not to use these locations to enter the store. He noted that the Committee also thought that, if desired, the applicant could remove and store the hardware in case they want to reopen the doors at a later date.

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

Germantown Avenue, Broad Street to Hunting Park Avenue

Charles Denny, Streets Department, Applicant

DATE: c. early 19th century

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct roadway in asphalt

Architectural Committee Recommendation: That the Streets Department explore the following five options and supply the Committee with a cost estimate that also includes future maintenance of the paving material.

- 1. Reconstructing the street in granite block from curb to curb.*
- 2. Granite block between the tracks, asphalt to the curb.*
- 3. Asphalt or concrete between the tracks with granite block from tracks to curb.*
- 4. "Town square enhancement": examining the intersection of Germantown Avenue, Broad Street and Erie Avenue more closely.*
- 5. Asphalt from curb to curb.*

Mr. Thomas described the project as proposed by the Streets Department. The portion of Germantown Avenue slated for reconstruction extends from Broad Street to Hunting Park Avenue and currently consists of granite block between the trolley tracks and asphalt from the tracks to the curb. The street appears on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places as part of the recently designated Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The Streets Department's alternative to the complete reconstruction in asphalt consists of reconstructing the shoulders of the roadway in granite block and the area between the trolley tracks in concrete similar to the northern portions of Germantown Avenue that have been previously reconstructed. Both proposals call for the replacement of the trolley rails. Mr. Thomas noted that the Streets Department believes that granite block exists under the asphalt currently extending to the curb.

The rail size commercially available today measures only seven inches in depth, not the nine inches that was originally used and is necessary to anchor the granite block in place. This change in rail size necessitates the use of an alternative material (e.g., concrete or asphalt) between the tracks. Mr. Tyler suggested considering asphalt as a replacement material between the rails rather than concrete since it is a more flexible material and is more resistant to cracking.

After lengthy discussion regarding the proposal, Commission members decided it requires more investigation, and agreed to refer the issue to a special committee consisting of representatives from the City Planning Commission, Streets Department, Commission staff, interested parties from the neighboring community, and with Mr. Wilds and Mr. Thomas as Co-Chairs. The Special Committee will serve as a fact-finding body to assist the Commission in making its final decision.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to deny the proposal. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. James made a motion to refer the issue to a special committee consisting of representatives from the City Planning Commission, Streets Department, Commission staff, interested parties from the neighboring community, and with Mr. Wilds and Mr. Thomas as Co-Chairs. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

225 South 18th Street, Rittenhouse Regency

Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates, Owner
William Schwartz, Esq., Applicant
DATE: 1929
PROPOSAL: Awnings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing new awnings with a six foot projection to cover an outdoor eating area on the Potcheen Restaurant on Locust Street. The proposal originally called for a nine foot projecting awning, but zoning required a three foot reduction. The applicant submitted a new drawing that shows operating doors in one of the storefronts. Commission members did not object to the proposal.

Mr. Ward made a motion for approval. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1530 Locust Street, The Versailles, se corner at 16th Street

Versailles Affiliates, Owner
William Schwartz, Esq., Applicant
DATE: 1920
PROPOSAL: New aluminum windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves replacing all of the windows in the building with aluminum. The applicant proposes a reasonable, though not exact match on the brick mold panning. The applicant also proposes half screens. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee thought the proposed windows sufficiently replicate the originals.

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

2300 Spruce Street, a.k.a. 300 South 23rd Street

T. L. Wolfson, Inc., Owner
Philip DiDonato, Hoodco Inc., Applicant
DATE: c. 1845
PROPOSAL: Visible ductwork

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal as submitted, and approval of installing it on the roof of the one story rear portion of the building next to a rear deck for the subject property, recessed back from the street, subject to the submission of drawings reflecting this change and staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing a new duct and fan for a grill in the visible rear court of this corner property. He stated that Committee members discussed other possible locations for the duct, including next to the existing chimney and nestled in the corner of the party wall. The fan must rise at least forty inches above the roof line, so either of these locations place it over the roof deck of the neighboring building. Mr. Thomas noted that

Committee did not want to have the neighbors property infringed upon in this way, so considered other possible locations. The applicant did not want to install the vent inside the building as the apartments are quite small. Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant offered to install it on the roof of the one story rear portion of the building next to a rear deck for the subject property. It will sit recessed back from the street. He stated that Committee members did not object to this location.

Judith Eden of the Center City Residents Association objected to citing the neighboring deck as a reason not to place the ductwork and vent above the roofline, because the deck at 2302 Spruce Street was built without a permit.

Commission members discussed alternatives such as a ductless exhaust system. Ms. Kaplan thought the Commission should table the issue and ask the applicant to work with the Department of Licenses and Inspections to come up with a revised proposal. Other Commission members wanted to deny the proposal as submitted, noting that the applicant may return with a new scheme.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to deny the proposal. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1701 Locust Street, Warwick Hotel, ne corner at 17th Street

Warwick Hotel, Owner

Judith Robinson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Front doors; canopy lights

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the installation of new multi-pane doors and lighting at the already altered front entrance to this hotel. He stated that Committee members did not object to the proposal.

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

1829 (1827-1831) Pine Street

Michael Carosella, Owner/Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; altered - c. 1950; rehabilitated - 1998-99

PROPOSAL: Re-clad rear bay; half screens

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the half screens and painting the wooden face of the rear bay using a dark color after removing the surface material, replacing damaged sections and incorporating corner boards, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner would like to install half screens on the bottom half of the windows and re-clad the rear bay in vinyl shingles. He stated that the Committee did not object to the half screens, but asked the applicant to paint the frames to match the window trim. Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant said he did not know the original cladding material for

the rear bay, but the current asphalt shingles look original. He stated that Committee members did not recommend approval of the proposed vinyl shingles and thought the applicant could paint the wooden face of the bay after removing the surface material and replacing damaged sections, and asked the applicant to use a dark color and to incorporate corner boards.

Mr. Wilds questioned the visibility of the rear of this property and the Commission's jurisdiction over this location. Mr. Baron confirmed that the rear of this property can be seen from South 19th Street.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Wilds abstained owing to his objection to the Commission's exercising its jurisdiction over the rear of this property.

Addendum

Valley Green Inn, Wissahickon Drive, Fairmount Park

City Of Philadelphia, Owner

Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission, Applicant

DATE: c. 1800 - 1850

PROPOSAL: New roof on front porch

This proposal involves the replacement of the shingle roofing material of the front porch with a standing seam tin roof. The low pitch of the roof has allowed water to seep through the shingles. Mr. Tyler commented on the appropriateness of the proposed material. The Commission did not object to this replacement.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the proposal. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 9 April 1999, David Brownlee, Chair.

Additions to the Historic Street Paving Thematic District - Skidoo Street; 200 block of Port Royal Avenue; Forbidden Drive (a.k.a. Wissahickon Drive)

Mr. Sklaroff asked the Commission to table the discussion and vote regarding Port Royal Avenue and Forbidden Drive until the next Commission meeting.

Skidoo Street, located in East Falls, is a granite block street of moderate integrity. A brief discussion arose regarding the name of this street. The name was changed to Skidoo Street within the last five years. Madeleine Antinucci of the Streets Department stated that her Department opposes the addition of this street to the Historic Street Paving Thematic District citing the grade of the roadway, slick conditions in wet weather and recent water main breaks as reasons not to designate this street. She asked the Commission to consider the possible safety risks these issues may present.

Skidoo Street has been slated for repaving in asphalt later this year. Mr. Tyler stated that he approved the repaving of this street approximately two years ago as he thought it did not meet the standards for listing on the National Register.

Cynthia Kishinchand, who lives near Skidoo Street, noted that wrong way and speeding drivers also pose safety risks, and that the granite blocks serve to slow traffic down. She also pointed out that none of the neighbors have objected to the designation of the street. No houses face Skidoo Street.

Mr. Sklaroff wondered whether this street could be blocked from vehicular traffic. Commission members thought this issue required further investigation, and agreed to table this street until the next meeting as well.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to table the addition of these streets to the Historic Street Paving Thematic District until the next Commission meeting. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Future historic districts

Mr. Brownlee explained that the Committee discussed the possible sequence for the designation of the new historic districts. The Committee reviewed the following district candidates:

- * Spruce Hill in West Philadelphia.
- * Streetcar Suburb in West Philadelphia.
- * Penn Knox / Wister in Germantown
- * Spring Garden in North Philadelphia
- * Strawberry Mansion in North Philadelphia

Mr. Brownlee reported that the Committee selected Spruce Hill in West Philadelphia and Penn Knox / Wister in Germantown as the next historic districts after Girard Estate.

He also noted that he did not say the old sequence (i.e. 1. Spruce Hill, 2. Penn Knox, 3. Strawberry Mansion) has been abandoned as stated in the Report. He explained that his comments merely acknowledged that the Committee should consider the current circumstances of the proposed districts and how they may deviate from those of a decade ago, when the Committee initially set the sequence.

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

The Commission members had no questions concerning Mr. Tyler's report.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob

Executive Secretary