

~~First Day~~

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, June 27, 1960 at 2:30 P. M.

Present were: Mr. R. Norris Williams, II.  
Mr. Charles E. Peterson  
Mr. George K. Trautwein, Chairman

Also present: Mr. John F. Lloyd, Redevelopment Authority  
Mr. John A. Bower, by invitation  
Dr. Margaret B. Tinkcom  
Mrs. Charles J. Maurer

338 South Fourth Street

Mr. John A. Bower, Architect for the owner of 338 South Fourth Street, brought three elevations for consideration of the Commission, which he left for further study of the Commission at its stated meeting, and floor plans. The property presents several problems, particularly concerning the property line to the south, which mutilates the southernmost window on the second story. Mr. Bower wants to move it eight inches toward the middle window. The problem of matching brick poses a problem in deciding between two windows and a door, or two doors and a window. The consensus of the committee was that the latter is the better plan.

NOTE: The stated meeting decision was to give Mr. Bower liberty to move the window. The elevation showing two doors and a window was generally approved.

217 Spruce Street

The drawing, as presented, was approved with the addition of shutters. The secretary was instructed to ask Mr. Roberts for a copy of the letter he sent to the Redevelopment Authority, mentioning shutters and other details.

NOTE: The stated meeting read the letter brought to the office by Mrs. Ingersoll, which included the required details. Mr. George B. Roberts's plans were approved.

502 Spruce Street

The committee asked for a further study of the fan light and the circular head dormer; it recommended that the first floor shutters be omitted. The Chairman expressed his opinion that this property is an example of "an operative builder" row of houses, having little distinction.

NOTE: The stated meeting concurred with the Architectural Committee's request and suggestions.

409 South Third Street

It was recommended that solid shutters be hung on the first story, matching the one remaining shutter, said to be original, and venetian shutters for the upper windows; new sash, new dormer, the railing repaired. It was also recommended that the bricks be cleaned and repointed in accordance with requirements set forth by the Redevelopment Authority.

409 South Third Street continued

NOTE: The stated meeting concurred in asking for a better drawing.

332 South Fourth Street

Mr. Simon's letter of April 1, 1960 was circulated. It was reported that he had had no reply and the secretary reported that a call to Dr. Godwin had been made and that he, agreeing with the Commission's requirements in his own mind, believed no letter was necessary. It was recommended that the owner answer Mr. Simon's letter in detail and that he comply with the request for a drawing of the doorway and dormer, even though he does not intend to install a new door at this time.

NOTE: The stated meeting concurred and agreed that another letter to Dr. Godwin is in order.

632 Spruce Street

A recent telephone call from the owner reveals that she is puzzled how to proceed, in view of a conflict between the recommendation from the Commission dated March 29, that the building remain as it is (the entire house having been thoroughly remodeled c 1890) and requirements from the Redevelopment Authority dated February 13, asking her to change the windows and the door. The Commission recommended that the Redevelopment Authority be asked to review its decision and Mr. Lloyd asked the secretary to refer the owner to him.

NOTE: The Chairman of the Commission, reviewing the problem of 409 South Third Street and 632 Spruce, noted that the Redevelopment Authority had made its recommendations to the owners before the Historical Commission had reviewed the proposed restorations, and that recommendations of the two bodies are somewhat at variance with each other. It was recommended that the Chairman write to the Redevelopment Authority, asking that its clients be referred to the Commission before receiving explicit directions for restoration of certified buildings, in order to avoid confusion in the minds of the property-owner. This recommendation was approved.

243 Pine Street

This house has not been certified. The owner would like to have a plaque for it, but as it was entirely rebuilt by the owner's grandfather, the consensus was that this house is not eligible for a plaque.

NOTE: The stated meeting concurred.

Mr. Robbin's Drawings

Three sets were submitted of the four sheets of door and window details. The chairman asked Mr. Peterson and Mr. Lloyd to study a set and he himself took one set for careful study. Mr. Peterson was asked to give his opinion at the stated meeting.

NOTE: Mr. Peterson reported that he had not had time to study the drawings, but will report later.

June 27, 1960

SALVAGE Mr. Lloyd reported that the Redevelopment Authority clearly states that salvage of reusable building materials is not one of his responsibilities, now will his organization undertake to store materials which might later be used in restoring certified buildings. It was Mr. Lloyd's opinion that the Old Philadelphia Development Corporation cannot undertake this work either. He suggested that the Redevelopment Authority approach some local groups, such as SHARA, asking it to organize such a project as a business enterprise.

NOTE: The stated meeting took exception to the Mr. Lloyd's belief that the Old Philadelphia Development Corporation would not be interested in storing salvaged building materials. Mr. Batten offered to explore the matter for the Commission. This offer was accepted by the Chairman

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 P. M.

Respectfully submitted

George K. Trautwein  
Chairman