

**THE MINUTES OF THE 439th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
10 March 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
Carol Lawrence
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

Aliki Strakes, Preservation Alliance
Mark Wade
Patricia Aden, Preservation Alliance
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association (SHCA)
Nicole Westerman, Capital Programs Office
Yves Gaulthier, Kieran, Timberlake and Harris Architects
Sarah Elk, Pennsylvania Prison Society
Sherman Aronson, Dan Peter Kopple and Associates
Amy Sherwood
Dyan Krajnikovich
Pamela Diaconis
John Collins, Delta Group
Garth Connor, Environmental Protection Agency
Janet Potter, Foundation for Architecture
Joseph Alteari, DAS Architects
Christopher Beardsley, Christopher Beardsley Architect
Edward Palmer, G. Niles Bolton, Architect
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association(CCRA)
George Manos, George Manos Architect

William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer, Rebmann, Maxwell and Hippel, LLP, Attorneys
George O'Connell, Esq.
Geoffrey Jarvis, Esq., Sprague and Sprague Attorneys
Lisa Armstrong, Armstrong Kaulbach Architects
Frederick Kaulbach, Armstrong Kaulbach Architects
Charles Mottershed
Claire Donato, Mark B. Thompson Associates, Fairmount Water Works
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Mark Thompson, Mark B. Thompson Associates, Fairmount Water Works
Victoria Steiger, Schusterman and Steiger
Michael Nairn, South Street Design Company
Maevernon Varnum, Art Defense League
Chari Towne, Schuylkill River Keeper
Joseph Gembala, Esq.
D. Nicholas
Thomas Nickels, Coalition for Philadelphia Art
Richard Sprague, Esq.
Robert Lockyer, Esq.
Peter Clowney, WHYY
C. Wofford, WHYY
Jason Beccaris
Nancy Fenimore
Stanhope Browne, Historic District Designation Now!
Gregory Aschendorf
Lenore Millhollen, CCRA
Janet Mason, Coalition for Philadelphia Art
Jessica Yen, Rittenhouse Row
Alexander Messinger
John Holland, PSAC River Keeper
Norma Van Dyke, SHCA
Catherine Franklin
Marianna Thomas, Marianna Thomas Architects
Steven Levinson, President, Rittenhouse Place Condominium Association
Robert Shusterman, Esq.
Robert Hotes, AIA Philadelphia
Bernice Hamel, SHCA
Michael Wilner, Esq.

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 439th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 438th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ward and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 438th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 10 February 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

MINUTES of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, regarding the Society Hill (and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West) Historic District.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ward and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously

approved the minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 23 February 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 23 February 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair.

601-45 Walnut Street, a.k.a. 124-48 South 6th Street, Curtis Building Lobby, Dream Garden

Estate of John W. Merriam, Applicant

Geoffrey Jarvis, Esq., Attorney for Applicant

DATE: 1912-1916 - execution of mosaic mural and its installation

PROPOSAL: Removal (defined in Ordinance as "Demolition")

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Postpone this matter until such time as staff and Committee members can review the information and respond as appropriate.

Mr. Sklaroff, Ms. Kaplan, Mr. Brownlee, Ms. Wolf and Ms. Lawrence recused themselves from the discussion and the vote.

Richard Sprague, Esq., Counsel to the applicant, asked the Commission not to send the issue back to the Architectural Committee, but rather to send it directly to the Financial Hardship Committee. Discussion by members of the Commission and the public followed.

Mr. Thomas offered the following resolution;

Whereas the applicant submitted a bare bones permit application without necessary supporting information, the staff properly concluded that the application was incomplete.

Whereas the applicant supplemented the application with more information at the Architectural Committee hearing itself, but such information should be submitted in advance so the staff, and the Committee members can consider it.

Whereas the Architectural Committee recommended that the Commission postpone the matter to enable the staff and the Committee to properly deal with the application.

Now therefore, be it hereby resolved that this Commission invokes the authority of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, Subsection (7)(h), of Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code to defer action on this application for six months from the date of this resolution, or until such time as the Commission is prepared to act on the application, whichever is earlier.

This time period should provide sufficient time for review by the Architectural Committee, and the Hardship Committee (if necessary).

Subsection (7)(h) of the Code also provides that:

"During the time that action on a permit application is deferred, the Commission shall consult with the owner, civic groups, public and private agencies, and interested parties to ascertain what may be done by the City or others to preserve the building, structure, site or object which is the subject of the permit application."

Mr. Ward seconded the motion to adopt this resolution, which carried with eight votes to none. The Chair did not vote. Mr. Sklaroff, Ms. Kaplan, Mr. Brownlee, Ms. Wolf and Ms. Lawrence all recused themselves.

700-718 Walnut Street; 201-219 South 18th Street

Samuel Rappaport Family Estate, Owner

John Thrower, Architect/Applicant

DATES: 1868; 1898 700-710 Walnut Street

c. 1807 712-716 Walnut Street

c. 1950 718 Walnut Street

1961; 1969 201-219 South 8th Street

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and complete demolition; build residential tower

Review in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval in concept of:

- 1. Demolition of the miscellaneous additions at the rear of the PSFS buildings.*
- 2. Partial demolition of the rowhouses along Walnut Street with retention and restoration to a depth of fifteen feet.*
- 3. Demolition of the building at the corner of Walnut and 8th Streets, conditioned upon the construction of a clearly contemporary building in its place, with details submitted for approval.*
- 4. Demolition of the garage/office along South 8th Street.*
- 5. The proposed facade treatment for the new construction, with the lobby level windows raised to accentuate the first floor of the tower*
- 6. The proposed height of the residential tower and parking garage.*

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

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:

1. The adaptive reuse of the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society (PSFS) complex.
2. The construction of a nearly forty-story luxury residential high-rise with approximately 320 to 325 rental units.
3. Parking on the western portion of the parcel.
4. The creation of an entry court off St. James Street. It will preserve the three houses of York Row to a depth of fifteen feet.
5. Demolition of several additions in the interior of the block to make way for the entry court off of St. James Street.

The Committee and Commission approved in concept a comparable proposal by a different architect and developer in 1995.

Mr. Thomas stated that the front facades of the existing group of historic buildings at the northeast corner of Walnut and 7th Streets will remain intact and refurbished. Addison Hutton,

Frank Furness and George Howe, three of Philadelphia's most celebrated architects, each designed sections of these former PSFS buildings. The Walnut Street Theater has expressed an interest in occupying a portion of these structures with a "studio theater." Committee and community members recognized the importance of restoring and reusing these neglected and highly significant structures.

Mr. Thomas explained that the proposal will also include the substantial demolition of the three remaining houses of York Row. Mr. Tyler explained that the initial proposal shown only to staff called for the demolition of everything except for the skins of the facades, but discussions with the applicant resulted in the scheme to retain the front fifteen feet. 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.

Ms. Wolf and other Commission members asked that the applicant preserve the three rowhouses back to the roof ridge so they would still read as houses, rather than as awkward fragments. Mr. Brownlee asked the Commission to hold the applicant to the highest standards for the restoration of York Row, which he cited as exceedingly rare examples of early rowhouses. Commission members the restoration of the facades of the York Row houses back to the ridge line, the restoration of 716 Walnut Street facade to its original appearance. Mr. Wilds suggested asking for the reconstruction of the dormers as well. Following some discussion, the Commission agreed to the retention of these buildings to a depth of fifteen feet with the reconstruction of the dormer windows and the restoration of the facade of 716 Walnut Street.

Mr. Baron stated that the Committee expressed concern that the demolition of the corner building will exaggerate the awkwardness created by preserving only the front portion of the rowhouses, and that he asked the applicant to consider bringing a section of the new construction up to the sidewalk line along Walnut Street to conceal the side of the westernmost rowhouse to enhance the illusion of its completeness.

Several members of the community opposed the height of the proposed residential tower, as well as the design of the parking garage that will occupy the lower levels of the structure.

Mr. Thomas explained that Committee members thought the windows of the Tower's first floor appeared too diminutive for the base of such a large-scale building. He said that Committee members suggested raising the lobby level windows and creating a building face to accentuate the first floor of the tower.

Other members of the community noted that the increased population density generated by this tower and other new projects on South 8th Street, such as Disney Quest and additions to Pennsylvania Hospital, necessitate careful consideration of aspects that may create traffic congestion. The developer of the site maintains that the project could not work without the proposed height of the tower and the number of parking spaces owing to the spatial constraints of the site. The developer intends to use the rear court on the north side of St. James Street as the main vehicular entrance.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the restoration of the facades of the York Row houses back to a depth of fifteen feet, the restoration of 716 Walnut Street to its original appearance, and the reconstruction of the dormers. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried with twelve votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

1115-1131 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse, Red Bell Brewery, at Filbert

Street

Redevelopment Authority, Owner
Robert DeHaven, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1895
PROPOSAL: Neon blade signs

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

1. The signage
2. Relocating the Filbert Street entrance, using salvaged masonry.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing two blade signs to represent the Red Bell Brewery. The new sign scheme will provide greater visibility from the sidewalk under the Filbert Street overpass, and addresses design requests from the Art Commission. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the new signs or the method of installation.

Mr. Thomas also reported that the architect for the proposal asked the Committee to review a new aspect in the development stage involving the already approved relocation of the Filbert Street entrance to the adjacent bay. The architect asked whether he could use salvaged stone that will not match the joint pattern of the existing, or use new stone that may not match the existing stone's color.

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

421 Spruce Street

Mark Wade, Owner/Applicant
DATE: c. 1950 - facade
PROPOSAL: Reface facade

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

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves a complete refacing of a mid twentieth century facade. The existing facade consists of multicolored, tapestry brick and wood multi-pane sash windows. The architect proposes a new facade of stucco, scored to resemble masonry. The new elongated windows will contain casement type sash. Mr. Thomas noted that the Committee recommend approval because the current facade contributes to the district only in terms of scale and rhythm.

Mr. Thomas stated that a Committee member asked the applicant to reduce the size of the faux ashlar blocks created by scoring the stucco, or to consider refacing the building in red brick to relate to the neighboring facades. Mr. Baron noted that another width of brick would stick out too far, and a thin brick veneer would appear artificial. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members preferred stucco to a brick veneer. The applicant intends to use a champagne color stucco to complement the stuccoed synagogue across the street.

Mr. Tyler disagreed with the Committee's recommendation, and contended that the applicant should retain this "contributing" facade. Mr. Brownlee noted that this c. 1950 building only contributes to the historic district in terms of scale and rhythm, not an association with the Redevelopment period of Society Hill. He thought the proposed design will maintain this contributing character.

Mr. James expressed concern that the Committee report does not mention the iron balconies shown on the drawing. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee did not object to those elements as part of the proposed facade. Excepting Mr. James, the Commission did not object to the proposed facade, including the iron balconies.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with twelve votes. Mr. James dissented.

311 Lawrence Court

John DiTunno, Owner

Robert LaRouche, Applicant

DATE: 1970

PROPOSAL: Fourth-floor greenhouse

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the design scheme with the steeper pitch.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves enclosing a fourth floor roof deck as a greenhouse. He noted that the Commission approved the concept of the greenhouse at its December meeting but asked the Committee to review the design. The applicant presented two design options, and stated that the owner prefers the scheme with the steeper roof pitch. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members agreed that the steeper pitch of the glass-top roof better allows water runoff to keep the windows clean.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Lawrence 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: Addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new addition, with the shingled top portion to extend farther down the facade, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas described the application for demolishing an incompatible addition and building a larger, more compatible addition for the Art Department. He explained that Committee members discussed the appropriateness of the materials proposed for the new addition, and reminded the architects that the new construction should not resemble or replicate the historic building too closely. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee thought the shingled top portion should extend farther down the facade to complement the historic building more. Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation and thought the proposed addition complemented the historic portion exceptionally well.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sklaroff seconded

the motion which carried unanimously.

2125 Fairmount Avenue, Eastern State Penitentiary

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Nicole Westerman, Capital Programs Office, Applicant

DATE: 1829; c. 1850 - addition at end Cell Block One

PROPOSAL: Temporary roof

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

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves demolishing the non-historic second story of one of the Cell Block One and installing a temporary roof that covers the skylights, the cell block and the former exercise yards. The cost of the correct historical roof would be approximately 1/5 to 1/2 more than this temporary roof. Mr. Thomas described the prison's necessity of using the limited funds to its best advantage, which, as the applicant maintains, the temporary roof accomplishes. He added that the applicant proposed setting the new roof back slightly to mitigate its appearance, and that the Committee thought that improved the proposal.

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

2931 Market Street, 30th Street Station

Amtrak, Owner

Sherman Aronson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929-1934

PROPOSAL: New signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds recused themselves from the discussion and the vote.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for installing new signage on the traffic islands around the train station.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds recused themselves.

233 Bainbridge Street

Amy Sherwood, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830; c. 1920 - facade

PROPOSAL: Cover over yard

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for covering over a rear yard to create an addition. The addition faces a courtyard of houses. This may require a zoning variance. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

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

motion which carried unanimously.

215 Lombard Street

W. M. Garage Associates, Owner

Joseph Alteari, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1977-1981

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations; café doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for installing a coffee shop in a set of modern, relatively nondescript storefronts. The windows will operate as doors. He stated that Committee members expressed some minor objections to the tiled panels at the bases of the windows, but agreed to recommend approval as submitted.

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

2116 Pine Street, at se corner of Van Pelt Street

Christopher Beardsley, Owner/Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear addition; new parking slot with gate; roof deck; window restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

Approval of:

- 1. The demolition of the rear addition.*
- 2. The garage gate*
- 3. Window restoration*

Preliminary approval of:

The roof deck, using steel supports and painted a dark color to mitigate their appearance to reveal the slope of the roof, applicant to return for final approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the demolition of a one-story addition on the rear of this corner property to create a parking space with a gate. The owner proposes to restore windows on the side facade that a former owner had altered. He also proposes a roof deck on the top of the building with a rail constructed of steel and canvas. Mr. Thomas noted that the staff recommendation called for a paneled fence-like gate and a roof deck made much less visible, and that the Committee recommended eliminating the screening at the base of the proposed deck and using steel supports, painted a dark color to mitigate their appearance, to reveal the slope of the roof. Christopher Beardsley, owner and applicant, stated that the roof deck will sit flush with the facade. Commission members did not object to the roof deck with the Committee's recommendations.

Judith Eden of the Center City Residents Association objected to the proposed roll-down parking area gate. Mr. Beardsley affirmed his willingness to revise the garage door design to meet the Commission's specifications. Ms. Eden asked whether staff could review and approve the new design for the gate. The Commission agreed to allow staff approval.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve the details of a revised proposal for the garage door. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1709 Walnut Street

Green Village Food Market, Owner

George Manos, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1928

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal as submitted, and to approve:

- 1. A second, glass and metal door and side light similar to those on the other end of the facade instead of the mural, with no exterior hardware.*
- 2. The logo, with staff to review and approve details of the lighting scheme.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for installing a flush fire door in the eastern most bay of this storefront facade and covering it with a photo mural. The architect also proposes a logo attached to the parapet wall at the top of the building. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members asked the applicant to install a second door and side light similar to those on the other end of the facade instead of the mural. They suggested incorporating the mural behind the glass of the second doorway and sidelight.

Mr. Thomas added that Committee members inquired about the elongated light fixture above the proposed logo on the parapet, and that the architect for the proposal explained that the long fixture will provide the desired uniform light over the logo. He stated that the Committee requested the applicant return to staff with a new lighting proposal for review and approval. Mr. Thomas showed the Commission new drawings reflecting the Committee's recommendations.

Judith Eden of the Center City Residents Association stated that at a recent Zoning Committee meeting the applicant agreed to limit the signage to one blade sign, and to delete the photomural and logo sign from the proposal. She expressed concern that the applicant is submitting different design schemes to different agencies. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Commission can still vote to approve this proposal. Ms. Kaplan and Ms. Merhige wanted to see a unified proposal for all the agencies and community groups involved.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Ms. Kaplan and Ms. Merhige dissented.

1807 Delancey Street

Martin Weinberg, Owner

Joseph Graci, Engineer/Applicant

William Schwartz, Esq., Counsel for Owner

DATE: c. 1864; c. 1890 - facade alterations

PROPOSAL: Rear garage and deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with six-over-six, true divided light windows, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the addition of a garage and deck at the rear of this Delancey Street house. He stated that the Committee recommended that the applicant use six-over-six, true divided light windows, rather than the nine-over-nine sash shown in the submission, and that the applicant agreed to comply.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Kaplan seconded

the motion which carried unanimously.

1509 Walnut Street

Avado Brands, Incorporated, Owner

William Palmer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, without the illumination.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for revised signage for this pizza restaurant including two metal suns with internal illumination. He stated that Committee members objected to the illumination of the sign. Although the Commission members agreed with the Committee recommendation, they did not find the internal illumination entirely objectionable, and so voted to allow the lights on a trial basis.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the proposal, with the signage installed temporarily for review. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with twelve votes. Mr. Brownlee dissented.

1839 Spruce Street, a.k.a. 275 South 19th Street, Rittenhouse Place

Rittenhouse Place Condominium Association, Owner of building's common areas and facade

Cary Borish, Co-owner of ground-floor restaurant condominium unit/Applicant

DATE: 1924

PROPOSAL: Ramp

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

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

Mr. Baron explained that this proposal calls for the installation of an ADA ramp at the Spruce Street entrance to the restaurant. The Commission did not object to the proposal.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried with twelve votes. Mr. Thomas recused himself.

2318 Delancey Street

Russell Newman, Owner

Alexander Messinger, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1875

PROPOSAL: Modify rear deck and cut new gate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, without the illuminate globe lights, and with a bare wood finish.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for building a new rear deck and a rear

fence facing Fidler Square. He stated that the Committee did not object to the deck or fence, but did ask the applicant to withdraw the globe lights from the proposal, and that the applicant agreed to comply. Mr. Thomas added that the Committee also recommended approval of a bare wood finish for the work.

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

1 Vine Street, a.k.a. 300 North Delaware Avenue

Penn's Landing Development Corporation, Owner

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage at a parking lot

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves the installation of illuminated signs on this parking lot. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission designated this vacant lot as an archeological site with significance as the site of a shipyard from the late seventeenth century into the early nineteenth century. He explained that the staff thought the proposed locations around the periphery will not interfere with the former excavation site. Mr. Brownlee asked that a staff member monitor the digging.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, conditioned upon the presence of a staff member to monitor the digging. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Fairmount Water Works

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Claire Donato, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1812-1872

PROPOSAL: Parking and landscaping

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the parking lots adjacent to the Fairmount Water Works and the forebay proposal, and that the expansion of parking along and adjacent to Fairmount Avenue and Aquarium Drive requires further study before the Committee can vote on its conceptual approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal in concept calls for the lowering of the area of the forebay to expose a portion of the land-side wall of the mill house and the masonry bridge and for the reconfiguration of parking within the Water Works complex. The parking will serve the Water Works, Lloyd Hall, the Art Museum and general Park usage.

Richard Tyler suggested that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the forebay location and the abutting lot, but not over the two other proposed sites. Owing to this circumstance, Mr. Tyler wondered whether the Historical Commission constitutes the appropriate forum for discussion and imposing restrictions regarding this proposal. Mr. Brownlee disagreed, and asked the Commission to conceive of these locations as an "historic landscape," and not to back down from the responsibility. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not arrive at a decision as to whether we have jurisdiction.

Mr. Thomas summarized the Architectural Committee Report regarding this proposal. He

described the locations of the proposed parking lots and existing conditions. Several members of the community, including landscape architects and representatives from the National Historic Landmark Program and the National Park Service voiced their objections to the proposal. Many of the same individuals attended the Historical Commission meeting. Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission stated that the architect for the proposal and the staff of the Fairmount Park Commission will consider the comments and suggestions from the community and the Architectural Committee.

Patricia Aden of the Preservation Alliance asked for a firm commitment on the part of the Fairmount Park Commission to return to the Historical Commission for review and approval of all aspects of this proposal. Ms. Stuhlman commented on the Fairmount Park Commission's intentions to continue to seek the approval of the Historical Commission for this proposal.

Mr. Brownlee discussed the site planning history of the Art Museum, and stated that plans and site elevations have always shown the Art Museum site containing all the land up to and including the Italian Fountain. He also said that Paul Cret's Beaux Arts landscaping design for the rear of the Art Museum incorporated the ground up to the Plaisted Hall site and up to Kelly Drive.

Mr. James asked for clarification as to which aspects they should vote on at this meeting. Mr. Tyler explained that the Commission should consider the forebay location and its parking lot in concept only. Commission members thought the Fairmount Park Commission must affirmatively state its intention to return to the Historical Commission for approval of all the aspects of the proposal. Ms. Kaplan suggested tabling the issue entirely so the Commission can review the proposal as a whole, not piece by piece.

Mr. Wilds asked if the Fairmount Park Commission has seen this proposal. Ms. Stuhlman stated that it has not. Mr. Brownlee suggested deferring further consideration until the Fairmount Park Commission has reviewed this proposal. Ms. Stuhlman explained that the Fairmount Park Commission required that the Historical Commission review this proposal for preliminary conceptual approval before it would review it. Mr. James thought the Commission could approve the forebay aspect of the proposal in concept so it can go on to the Fairmount Park Commission.

Mariana Thomas, architect and consultant, asked the Commission to avoid a piecemeal approach to this proposal, and to consider the whole landscape as well as the Water Works and its forebay as an historic unit. She also asked for a broader examination of the forebay aspect of the proposal owing to its historic importance.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to defer voting on this proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried with nine votes. Mr. Thomas, Ms. Wolf, Mr. Ward and Mr. James dissented.

Old Architectural Committee Business

1732 Spruce Street

William Most, Trustee for Owner

Gregory Aschendorf, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize door replacement

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Baron explained that this proposal came to the Architectural Committee in January, and involves legalization of a pair of doors installed without a permit. The panel patterns of the doors the contractor removed match the jamb of the doorway. Counsel for the applicant stated that the owner hastily had the doors installed after the tenants of the building filed suit against her over a recent break-in. Commission members noted that the new glass-paneled doors do not appear any safer than the old doors. Mr. Aschendorf explained that the old wooden doors were hacked open with an axe, and that the new doors are reinforced with wire mesh glass.

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

Society Hill (and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West) Historical Society

Mr. Brownlee, Chair of the Committee on Historic Designation, asked the Commission once again to consider the classification of several buildings in the historic district as "contributing," or "non-contributing" to the district. He explained that some of the buildings currently listed as "non-contributing" were constructed under Redevelopment Authority controls and subject to its review. According to the statement of significance for the district, the "Redevelopment" era of Society Hill constitutes a significant period of the community's development.

Mr. Brownlee suggested that the Commission could vote to classify all the Redevelopment Authority buildings as "contributing," or review each property individually for classification. Commission members preferred classifying all of them as "contributing."

Ms. Wolf made a motion to classify all buildings constructed under the controls and review of the Redevelopment Authority as "contributing." Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Brownlee stated that at the 23 February 1999 Special Meeting John Jordan of the Washington Square West Civic Association asked the Commission to consider modifying the proposed name for the district from "Society Hill and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West Historic District," to a less convoluted name that does not imply that Washington Square West is an historic district. He suggested using a name that Ms. Harvey of the Commission staff had developed, using parenthesis around the words "and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West."

Ms. Merhige made a motion to change the name of the district to "Society Hill (and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West) Historic District." Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the nomination for the Society Hill (and Pennsylvania Hospital of Washington Square West) Historic District as amended. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Members of the community thanked the Philadelphia Historical Commission and its staff with a round of applause. The Commission recognized the efforts of Ms. Spina and Ms. Harvey and the rest of the staff regarding the district, and the contributions of the residents of Society Hill.

REPORT on the activities of the Historical Commission Staff, February 1999, Richard Tyler
Mr. Tyler noted a few highlights from the staff report.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditures for the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission lunches.

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

Mr. Tyler also asked the Commission to approve the expense for staff participation at an upcoming preservation conference in Washington DC.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary