

**THE MINUTES OF THE 442nd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 June 1999**

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

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Baldinger, Deputy Planning Director, City Planning Commission
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Carol Lawrence
Robert Thomas
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Urban Development
Stephanie G. Wolf, Ph.D., Vice Chair

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

F. Price Connors
Gregory Seaney
William Mead, Peale Valley Tile / Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Wendy Rosen, Peale Valley Tile / Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Nancy Heinzen, Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Emily Smith, Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Vance Koehler
Bruce Cassidy, Esq.
Paul Rakita
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association (SHCA)
William Bertolet
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission (FPC)
Stephanie Craighead, FPC
Amy Freitag, FPC
Virginia Naudé, Norton Art Conservators, Inc.
Kira Merdinshv, Vitetta Group
Mary Ossi, Vitetta Group
George White
Edmund Bacon
Scott Kalner, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Vincent Maiello, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Edward Montgomery
Elizabeth Browne, SHCA
Ronald Donatucci
Claire Donato, Mark Thompson Associates

Mark Thompson, Mark Thompson Associates
Norman Tissian, SHCA
Catherine Franklin, Penn-Knox Neighborhood Association
Aliko Strakes, Preservation Alliance
Carl Zucker, Esq.
Carl Massara, Carl Massara Architect
J. Watt, Carl Massara Architect
Barbara Gilbert
K. Robinson
William G. Schwartz, Esq.
Walter Chatham
Fredric Mann
Mrs. Fredric Mann
Marc Brookman, Duane Morris and Heckscher Attorneys
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Ian Rubinstein
Claire Oliver
Alice Wells, Weekly Press
Shelly Lucero
Patricia Aden, Preservation Alliance
Patricia Royston
Jonathan Weiss, Esq., Silverman Cooperson and Frieman
Lenore Millhollen, CCRA
John Lawson, SHCA
Lorna Katz, SHCA
Perry Whyte, Jr.
Herbert Lipton
Mary Sales
Richard W. Snowden
Jon Cabin
Peter Finelli
Robin Schatz, Councilman DiCicco's Office
Philip Kunz
Michael Lutzo
Stephanie Lutzo

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 442nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:15 A.M.

MINUTES of the 441st 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 441st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 12 May 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 25 May 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair.

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:

Denial of:

- 1. The metal and glass canopy; extending the front steps; railing at front stoop.*
- 2. Rooftop addition, awaiting further study of its visibility*
- 3. Demolition of the chimneys.*
- 4. Demolition of the rear ell; the applicant to return after conducting further study regarding its possible reuse, but with the recommendation that the garage could be replaced and expanded, with further study.*
- 5. Demolition of the entrance pavilion, with the recommendation that the applicant return with a more convincing reason for its demolition.*

Approval of:

- 1. Replacing six-over-six windows on historic facade with two-over-two windows.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for:

1. The demolition of the one story entrance pavilion at 1916 Rittenhouse Square, both chimneys on 1914 Rittenhouse Square and the rear ell and garage on Manning Street.
2. A new four story gallery addition and wider rear ell with vaulted roof deck.
3. A new two story garage attached to the remaining historic structure.
4. A fifth floor living room addition and roof deck with clear railing atop the mansard roof of the historic structure to provide views of Rittenhouse Square.
5. The demolition of the front stoop and its extension out toward the street with a glass and metal canopy.
6. Replacing six-over-six windows on historic facade and reestablishing the historic two-over-two configuration.

Mr. Thomas stated that one year ago the Architectural Committee reviewed the possibility of demolishing the pavilion built as the entrance to Henry McIlhenny's residence for comment only to assist the then prospective owner in his decision to purchase the property, and that at that time the Committee thought the pavilion could be demolished; however, the Commission took no action on that opinion.

The architect proposes to build a new addition over the present site of the pavilion that responds to the basic shape of the historic facade, with a concave mansard and arched dormers, but with dissimilar details and materials to differentiate the addition from the historic portion. Mr. Thomas noted that the proposed addition does conform with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* in that it respects the historic building in scale, proportion, materials and massing while maintaining the appearance of a new addition.

The new section of the mansard will have slightly lighter gray slate shingles. The proposed brick for the facade of the addition will not match the historic, but the architect for the proposal chose a color to complement it. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee thought the applicant should eliminate the several bands of limestone coursing at the base of the new addition. He added that Committee members believed the ground-floor windows of the addition did not reflect the residential aspect of the building, and asked for a more “pedestrian” appearance. The owner intends to use this space as a gallery for his art collection, and needs high windows to accommodate its installation, but that still provide the desired amount of natural light. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee also objected to the proposed painted steel lintel over the three ground-floor windows. At the Committee meeting, the architect agreed to redesign the windows to complement the scale and orientation of those on the historic facade, but with decorative, perhaps brownstone, panels in the lower portions.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not think the applicant should demolish the chimneys on 1914 Rittenhouse Square Street. Apparently, the current location and orientation of the chimney would block the view of the Square if the owner is allowed to build the rooftop addition.

Mr. Thomas reported that the Committee unanimously disapproved of the proposed rooftop addition and the plexiglass guardrail surrounding it. He explained that Committee members discussed the possibility of rotating the rooftop addition 90 degrees and relocating it over the new addition that replaces the entrance pavilion or back toward Manning Street, and also requested more information regarding the visibility of the proposed rooftop addition from different locations in Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicant agreed to meet with Commission and Committee members and staff to conduct tests to examine the visibility.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner wishes to demolish the existing rear ell because the twelve-foot-wide former servants wing apparently cannot meet the spatial needs of the new owner, and that Committee members acknowledged that the adaptive reuse of the building may require a wider rear ell. He stated that the Committee requested further study for the possible reuse of part or all of the rear ell.

The proposal also calls for the lengthening of the front stoop, the construction of a clear glass and metal canopy and a railing. These new elements are contemporary in design and would create a vestibule at the front entrance. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee strongly objected to this aspect of the proposal.

The existing dormer windows have two-over-two windows, while the rest of the windows on the historic building have six-over-six. Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant seeks permission to replace all of the windows to match the two-over-two, and that Committee members agreed.

Edmund Bacon, former Executive Director of the City Planning Commission, spoke in favor of the proposal, and appealed to the Commission to approve all aspects of it. He maintained that the new owner of the property is doing the historic building justice by restoring and revitalizing it.

Marc Brookman, Esq., attorney for the applicant, stated that the applicant will resubmit a revised proposal reflecting the Committee’s recommendations.

William Schwartz, Esq., counsel for a party in opposition to the proposal, asked whether the applicant has made a claim of financial hardship, and noted 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. Thomas stated that there has been no request to go before the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Fredric Mann, who resides on Rittenhouse Square, described a petition containing nearly one thousand names of individuals opposing the proposal. He and other members of the community expressed strong objections to the proposal, and especially the demolition of Henry McIlhenny's entrance pavilion. Price Connors, who wrote the guide for Rittenhouse Square, asserted that the pavilion stands as an important relic of a bygone era as well as of McIlhenny, one of the Square's most noteworthy residents.

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

220 Delancey Street

Mary Sales, Owner

Carl Massara, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1843; facade - 1970

PROPOSAL: Relocate front door to passageway entrance

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of a new front door recessed five or six feet back within the alley and maintaining the gate in its existing condition. Ms. Batcheler voted to recommend denial of the proposal.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for creating an on-street entrance and addition in the side alleyway currently leading to the back yard of the house. The proposal would not alter the appearance of the facade, except for the glazing of the transom. When the house was reconstructed under the aegis of the Redevelopment Authority it lost its old front entrance, leaving it with an awkward alley entrance. The alley sits entirely on the property of 220 Delancey, unencumbered by an easement.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner wishes to have an identifiable entrance at the street facade as well as expand the living space of the first floor. The present actual door into the dwelling is within the alley and accessible only through the alleyway gate. The applicant also plans to build a greenhouse addition at the rear of the property, which would obstruct the rear entrance to the alley.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee discussed the possibility of recessing the new "real" front door five or six feet back within the alley and maintaining the gate in its existing condition, and that the applicant agreed to comply should the Commission vote to deny the original proposal. Mr. Thomas reported that all of the Committee members except Ms. Batcheler thought this an acceptable modification. Ms. Batcheler objected to the proposal.

Several members of the community expressed strong objections to the proposal, citing the gated alley as an important feature of the building, and that these passageways constitute a common and important element of many historic buildings in the neighborhood and cautioned that approving the in-fill of this alley may set a dangerous precedent. The Commission was presented with a petition signed by nearly seventy persons from the neighborhood opposed to the proposal. Robin Schatz of Councilman DiCicco's office read a letter of opposition from Mr. DiCicco.

Carl Zucker, Esq., counsel for the owner, presented the Commission with information regarding a 1978 Pennsylvania Supreme Court ruling that extinguished an easement on the alleyway to the benefit of 229 Pine Street. Carl Massara, architect for the proposal, showed the Commission photographs of two other historic properties in that neighborhood with treatments similar to the Committee's recommendation.

Bruce Cassidy, Esq., counsel for the owners of 222 Delancey Street, presented photographs showing the visibility of the alleyway from Delancey Street. Commission members agreed that a small amount of light can be seen through the small opening in the existing gate. The rear yard can be seen if one stands in front of the small opening and peers through it. Mr. Cassidy also spoke regarding the case introduced by Mr. Zucker, and questioned its relevance to this proposal.

Elizabeth Armour, who resides at 222 Delancey Street, stated that she and other neighbors attempted to meet with the owner to reach some compromise, but to no avail. Norman Tissian of the Society Hill Civic Association asked the Commission to defer the issue until the owner meets with the Association.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with five votes. Mr. Wilds, Mr. Brownlee and Ms. Lawrence dissented. Ms. Wolf abstained.

Rittenhouse Square, Fountain

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Emily Smith, Friends of Rittenhouse Square, Applicant

DATE: Fountain - 1913

PROPOSAL: Replace tile on fountain with original design

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Preliminary conceptual approval of the proposal, with a request for the submission of greater color palate detail, samples of the actual proposed tiles and further study of other period tile work, specifically work done by the Enfield Company.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for removing the existing turquoise tiles on the fountain in Rittenhouse Square and replacing them with tiles set to the original design by Paul Cret, architect for the fountain. He stated that the applicant showed the Committee tile samples depicting the colors proposed for the restoration. A hand-colored photograph from the time of the fountain's construction depicts an approximation of the original coloration. The applicant also found a detailed description of the colors used, which correlate with some of the tile samples.

Mr. Thomas reported that the Committee did not object to the proposal in concept, but requested greater color palate detail and samples of the actual proposed tiles, and that the Committee also recommended studying other period tile work, specifically work done by the Enfield Company, which manufactured the original tiles.

Mr. Wilds noted that the existing turquoise tiles constitute an important aspect of the fountain's history, and have achieved significance on their own. Mr. Baron explained that the original design by the architect of the fountain and park also has great significance. Nancy Heinzen of the Friends of Rittenhouse Square stated that the original tiles were removed in 1917, three years after their installation, because two City Commissioners did not like them. Wendy Rosen, also with the Friends of Rittenhouse Square, explained that many of the present tiles are too damaged to repair or clean.

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

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

320 Chestnut Street, Carpenters' Hall

Carpenters' Company, Ruth O'Brien, Executive Director, Owner
Charles Evers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1770-1774

PROPOSAL: New bronze handrails; interior shutters

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with four-leaf shutters.

Mr. Thomas explained that this application calls for adding a simple railing to the back steps of Carpenters Hall as well as installing interior shutters. He stated that Committee members discussed the number of shutter panels, and the importance of correlating the new shutters with existing four-leaf shutters. The method of installation will cause minimal damage to the historic material of the interior window frame.

Mr. Thomas explained that the proposed two-inch bronze tube railings will match existing railings at the front entrance to the building. In order to avoid damaging historic fabric, the railings will attach into the paving instead of the bottom step, as in the other location. The head of the railings will be anchored into center of the wooden pilasters flanking the door.

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

500 West Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Chestnut Hill Academy, Owner
Craig Klofach, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1882-1884

PROPOSAL: Roof replacement; restore woodwork

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

- 1. Approval of the restoration work, with staff to review and approve details.*
- 2. Tabling the application to replace the roof until the Commission receives more information regarding the shape and fabric of the former and, possibly, the original roofing material and any funding limitations.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to restore wood trim on this Victorian building and replace the roof. He explained that the applicant will work with Commission staff regarding the proposed restoration work, and that the Committee did not object to any aspects of the restoration.

Mr. Thomas explained that the architect also seeks to use red asphalt shingles to replace the current roof of hard red mineral fiber shingles, itself a substitute for a ceramic shingle roof. Apparently, the existing roof dates from c. 1980, and the former roof was covered with gray, possibly slate, shingles. He said that the Committee examined historic photographs to determine the shape and material of the earlier roof, but was unable to identify enough detail.

One 1910 photograph shows what appears to be diamond cut slate shingles. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members recommended conducting more investigative research, with the aid of minimal selective demolition to ascertain the shape and fabric of the former and, possibly, the original roofing material.

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

Mr. Spilove resumed the Chair.

City Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Peter Brown, Capital Programs Office, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901

PROPOSAL: Roof replacement; masonry restoration; minor exterior alteration

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

This proposal calls for:

1. The renovation and restoration of the courtyard and street side exterior envelope in the northeast quadrant of City Hall and the masonry portion of the tower.
2. Roof replacement
3. Cast-iron and window restoration and replacement
4. Masonry cleaning and repair
5. Gutter and copper repairs
6. Door renovation and replacement
7. Related mechanics, plumbing and electrical systems work.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee members reviewed an extensive report, plans and elevations detailing the multitudinous elements of the proposed work. The Committee narrowed the scope of its review at its meeting to those aspects of the proposal that differ from previously approved treatments used on the East Center Pavilion of City Hall and changes to the building.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed work will follow methods used in the cleaning, restoration and repair of the East Center Pavilion three years ago with a few exceptions. This proposal may involve the use of improved cleaning methods. Some deteriorated or spalling portions of the granite base, the ashlar blocks and the cornice above require removal of loose surfaces and subsequent re-tooling of the newly exposed surfaces. This procedure will leave irregularly shaped patches of tooled granite. Mr. Thomas reported that Committee members agreed with the necessity for this procedure and to recommend its approval.

Approximately 20 of the 431 window openings in the project area will require partial or full sash replacement. One non-original window sash on the east wall above the courtyard will be replaced with a paired casement unit, detailed to match adjacent existing windows. The proposal also calls for the replacement of the 172 air conditioning units within the windows with new units in uniform cabinet sizes and colors. Wood doors and frames at the roof level and one at the basement level will be replaced with painted galvanized steel units. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to these alterations.

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

motion which carried unanimously.

201 Pine Street

First Union, Owner

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

DATE: 1868

PROPOSAL: Signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Approval of:

- 1. Refacing the existing sign over the front door on Pine Street.*
- 2. The metal wall plaques at the Pine and 2nd Street entrances to the parking lot.*
- 3. The non-illuminated flat wall sign on the west wall reading "Customer parking*

Only."

- 4. The sign over the rear door, facing the parking lot.*
- 5. The "Bank Parking Only" sign in the middle of the rear wall of the parking lot.*
- 6. Refacing the existing ATM sign, but with smaller letters not in a sloped*

configuration.

Denial of:

- 1. New flat, internally illuminated wall sign on the west wall seen from Pine*
- 2. New flat, internally illuminated wall sign on north wall overlooking the parking*
- 3. The two "Bank Parking Only" signs along the perimeter wall of the parking lot*

Street.

lot.

closest to the entrances.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves legalizing several signs for this corner bank, and that the Committee reviewed and voted on each of the signs individually.

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

1228 Waverly Street

Justina Suchadolski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1830

PROPOSAL: New rear fence

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that the proposal calls for replacing a stockade type fence with a wood hatchet head vertical picket fence. He stated that the Committee did not object the proposal.

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

352 South 4th Street

C. J. Moore, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1791

PROPOSAL: Glaze rear porch

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for glazing a modern rear porch. The new window will match the glazed arch just below it on the first floor.

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

440 Spruce Street

Richard Autieri, Owner

Margaret Jones, Applicant

DATE: 1770

PROPOSAL: Rear demolition; new addition and deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to demolish a modern rear addition and replace it with a smaller brick addition and deck. He explained that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

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

1300 Market Street, Wanamaker Building

Amerimar Wanamaker Management Company, Owner

Donald Lavin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902-1910

PROPOSAL: New entrance on Juniper Street for restaurant tenant

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

Mr. Thomas stated that this proposal seeks to create an entrance in the show window, at the second bay north of Chestnut Street on Juniper, for an Au Bon Pain restaurant. The restaurant will remain open for longer hours than Lord and Taylor, necessitating a door to the street. The proposed doors closely resemble an existing set a few bays north. Mr. Thomas noted that the Committee welcomed more activity at this remote corner of the Wanamaker building. Commission members agreed.

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

Fairmount Water Works, Philadelphia Museum of Art and Lloyd Hall sites

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Claire Donato, Architect/Applicant

DATE: early to mid 19th century - Water Works; 20th century - Museum and Lloyd Hall sites

PROPOSAL: Parking; landscaping

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Tabling the lighting and paving material aspects of the parking portion of the proposal, and to approve all other aspects of the proposal, with the inclusion of a pedestrian walkway to the side of Fairmount Avenue.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal, now greatly revised, calls for restoring the grassy area next to Lloyd Hall and the historic South Garden at the Water Works. The project places parking in the vicinity of the restored forebay of the mill house and in a single row on each side of Fairmount Avenue and Aquarium Drive. As presented previously, the precincts of the forebay and the Italian Fountain will have fewer parking spaces than they now have.

The project proposes to re-establish the historic boundaries of the Water Works for purposes of interpretation. Work includes lowering the existing grade within the forebay to reveal the edges of the Mill House buildings and the historic forebay bridge so that the Water Works appears again as a peninsula. A portion of a recreational trail will run adjacent to the forebay, as will some parking spaces. Plans also call for the restoration of the 1930s Beaux Arts garden on the west side of the Italian Fountain with the aid of original designs.

The South Garden restoration includes the repair and restoration of the marble fountain, the Graff Memorial, Peace Fountain, spring house, brick walks and other garden appurtenances, as well as the rehabilitation of the underground pump room for the fountain mechanicals. Plans also call for the restoration of the historic fence designed by Frederick Graff, Jr. at the southern boundary of the Water Works precinct.

Mr. Thomas described the parking aspect of the proposal. Earlier conceptions for the parking called for one way traffic only, with cars entering Aquarium Drive from Kelly Drive and exiting from Fairmount Avenue onto Kelly Drive. Apparently, Fairmount Avenue cannot be used as an exit, so the proposal now entails a modest widening of Fairmount Avenue to accommodate two way traffic. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members did not object to this parking scheme, but requested the inclusion of a pedestrian walkway to the side of Fairmount Avenue, and asked the applicant to return with greater detail regarding the paving material and lighting scheme for the parking areas. Mr. James wanted staff to approve these details.

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

824 South Front

Ronald Donatucci, Equitable Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865; Shopfront - c. 1914

PROPOSAL: Remove storefront; construct residential front

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with the front door on the right side of the front and staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for removal of storefront from this corner building and construction of a residential front. The applicant seeks to reinstall the original two-over-two window sash and shutters. The applicant distributed copies of an old building permit that dates the storefront to 1914. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee thought the applicant could restore the original residential front, but directed him to revise the plans to put the front door on the right side of the front, as houses from this period would have doors opposite the chimney, which is on the left side of this building. The applicant submitted a revised drawing reflecting the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Brownlee expressed concern over approving a proposal to restore a residential facade for which there are no photographs and no written description. He noted that the existing storefront has historic significance, while the proposed is based on conjecture. Mr. Brownlee asked for detailed photographic documentation of the storefront and its cornice should the Commission approve the proposal.

Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the revised proposal, with detailed photographic documentation of the storefront and its cornice, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with seven votes. Mr. Brownlee dissented.

119 Lombard Street

Edward Robinson, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1743

PROPOSAL: Window planters; clear plastic basement window covers

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Approval of:

- 1. The window boxes provided they are attached with brackets to maintain some distance from the brick and not installed into the pegs in the sills.*
- 2. Hinged wooden basement window covers or French drains.*

Denial of:

- 1. Clear plastic basement window domes.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for window boxes and plastic domes over the basement windows. He stated that the Committee agreed to recommend approval of the window boxes provided they are attached with brackets to maintain some distance from the brick and not installed into the pegs in the sills.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee informed the applicant that it could not approve the proposed plastic window domes. He suggested the applicant employ French drains to relieve the water infiltration. With this method, gravel, placed within the window well, discharges the water into the ground at a slower rate. Mr. Thomas noted that, upon examining an historic photograph of the building showing wooden basement window covers, Committee members thought the applicant could rebuild them with hinges, so the covers can remain open if desired. The applicant stated he would try the French drains, and if that did not work, he will install the wood window covers if approved.

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

2022-2024 Chancellor Street

Jan Rubin Associates, Owner

Dominic Aspate, Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Renovations; remove rear dormer; new deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for minor window replacement on the

Chancellor Street facade and substantial changes on the St. James Street rear facade. The plans call for removal of a dormer and section of roof for a deck. They also show cutting of a long window in the rear wall and the installation of a new air-conditioning unit in a visible location.

Mr. Thomas noted that this block of St. James Street does not see much traffic except as a service alley. This property sits at a jog in the street, further mitigating its visibility. He stated that the Committee decided to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted owing to the remote location of the rear facade. Mr. Brownlee objected to the proposal.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried with seven votes. Mr. Brownlee dissented.

1701 Locust Street, Warwick Hotel (Prime Rib Restaurant)

Warwick Hotel, Owner

Prime Rib of Philadelphia, Tenant

Jonathan Weiss, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1923-1925

PROPOSAL: Illuminated canopy with poles

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for removal of an illegal canopy on the Prime Rib Restaurant and installation of another canopy in its place. The applicant submitted a revised scheme reflecting the Committee's recommendations, which staff distributed to the Commission members. The revised plans show a seven-and-a-half-foot projecting canopy, in burgundy canvas,

with gold letters on each side to match existing canopies on the building, closed at the end, and with brass support poles three feet out from the building. The canopy will be installed within the arch in such a manner as not to cover the terra cotta jamb molding.

The applicant stated that a light, connected to an existing light fixture within the arch, will illuminate the interior of the canopy. The proposal does not include the use of "egg crate" for the underside of the canopy.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the revised proposal, with staff to review and approve details of the canopy and additional down-lighting from within the canopy using the existing light fixture within the arch. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2039 Walnut Street

Commonwealth Real Estate, Owner

Shelly Lucero, Applicant

DATE: 1858

PROPOSAL: Banner sign

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for installing a large banner sign projecting from the middle of the central window of a bay. He stated that the Committee objected to the

proposal, and wanted the applicant to place signage withing the windows of the bay.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant has requested the Commission table the proposal until the 14 July 1999 Historical Commission Meeting.

2027 Spruce Street

Barbara Capizzi, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1875

PROPOSAL: Build basement areaway and door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for cutting an areaway and door to provide basement access. The neighboring house has a similar, but non-original access door. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee objected to adding an element this large to the front of the building and exposing below-grade material that will not match the brownstone facade.

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

Addenda

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission if it would consider proposals for 1600 Pine Street and 1910 Rittenhouse Square Street, neither of which went before the Architectural Committee. The Commission wanted the two proposals sent to the Committee first.

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

Mr. Tyler reminded the Commission to attend the special training sessions scheduled for the third Wednesday of every month at 8:00 a.m. in the Commission Conference Room, 18th Floor, One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street, or, if specified, the Commission staff offices. Commission members discussed possible options for meeting times, including after the regular meetings. Mr. Spilove asked staff to send all of the Commission members a questionnaire to determine the best time and day of the week to schedule the training sessions.

Harry Batten Memorial Fund

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve an expenditure of \$24.90 for lunches for the Architectural Committee.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary