

**THE MINUTES OF THE 509th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

14 January 2005

One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street

Room 18025

Michael Sklaroff, Esquire, Chair

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

James Brown, IV

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce

Kathleen Murray, Assistant to the President of City Council

David Perri, P.E., Department of Licenses and Inspections

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Harris Steinberg, AIA

Thomas Sugrue, Ph. D.

Norman Tissian

Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Law Department

Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Daniel Meehan, Meehan Builders

Beverly Blynn, 327 Pine Street

Anna Maria Ferrar, 212 Walnut Street

Jeff Carson, 212 Walnut Street

Tom McHall, RGV Builders

Rob Ventresca, RGV Builders

Paul Ventresca, RGV Builders

Steve Bolinger, Agoos/Lovera Architects

Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program

Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program

Greg Heller, Parkside Historic Preservation, 4220 Parkside Avenue

William G. Schwartz, Esq., 1904 Spring Garden Street

John H. Bushnell, Cope Linder Architects

George Friebis, 2722 Knorr Street

Bernard Neary, Esq., 2027 Sansom Street

Bill Zimmerman, 2027 Sansom Street

Gardner Kahoe, 111 North 49th Street

Peter Adels, 2330 Madison Square

Spencer Zahn, 2027 Sansom Street

William Newman, 2038 Sansom Street

Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blanda Architects

Alisa Orduna-Sneed, Councilwoman Janie Blackwell's Office, Kirkbride Center
 Brian and Melissa Pinheiro, 235 Bainbridge Street
 David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors' Association
 Christopher Tobin, 821 South 3rd Street
 Antonio DeSimone

509th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 509th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 508th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and seconded by Mr. James, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes, as corrected, of the 508th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 10 December 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Ad Hoc Committee on Murals

David Perri, Chair

Mr. Perri provided an overview of the Ad Hoc Committee's meeting. He stated that murals do not require a zoning review or building permit. He noted the desirability of community notice for all proposed murals; and reported that the Committee recommends that posters, similar to those used for zoning, be required to notify communities of proposed murals.

In response to the query about the number of murals per year, Ms. Golden answered that approximately 100 murals are undertaken each year by the Mural Arts Program.

Mr. Sklaroff commented that the proposed mural policy appears easy to administer, notifies the community of the proposal, and is fair. Mr. Wilds concurred. He believes that the proposed policy is balanced; however, he recommended that the Commission continue to reject murals on all façades other than party walls.

Mr. Copeland informed the Commission that, as a legal matter, the Commission can assert jurisdiction over a mural's content.

Commission members discussed the issue of context. Mr. Tissian commended the Mural Arts Program; however, he believes that murals have no place in historic communities. He added that they overwhelm the streetscape and visual landscape, and take the focus away from the historic architecture. He thought that context should not be ignored. Mr. James thought it important to find a fair and balanced approach and not "what if" ourselves into oblivion". He stressed that the community is most impacted by the mural; therefore, community awareness is very important. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the community should and would object to inappropriate or controversial murals.

Jane Golden of the Mural Arts Program noted that people in historic districts, like other Philadelphians, initiate murals.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the staff might approve a mural that meets the requirements

set forth in the proposed policy. Mr. James disagreed, countering that a Commission review would provide a forum for the community. He also believes that a definitive decision should not be made on content. Mr. Tyler remarked that wall signs were very prominent in Old City in the past and that historic preservation would be trumped by the First Amendment in any argument over context.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Report of the Committee with Policy Point 3 amended to read "The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit but may consider size, scale and relationship to the historic context." Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Ms. Murray dissented and Mr. Tissian abstained.

The Report of the Committee on Historic Designation

4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, Kirkbride Center

Kirkbride Realty Corporation, Owner

At the October 2004 Historical Commission meeting, Mr. Wilds made a motion to table this designation for a period not to exceed six (6) months to allow a sub-committee of the Committee on Historic Designation to visit the site with representatives of the staff, owner and nominator, and to recommend bounds and other conditions of the Commission's jurisdiction over the buildings, site, and appurtenances at 4865 Market Street. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

On 25 October, during the interval between the October and November meetings of the Commission, the sub-committee and staff met at the site with the owner as directed by the Commission. The sub-committee prepared a boundary recommendation. At the November Commission meeting, however, the owner posed further questions. The Commission again deferred taking an action and directed the staff to consult with the owner.

Ms. Spina reported that she spoke with Gardner Kahoe, corporate counsel for the owner. He noted that the owner contends that the portion noted as the Millcreek School on the map is sealed off and the hospital believes it should be excluded from the designation. He added that its elimination will maximize the commercial value of the property. Ms. Spina said that the Millcreek School occupies the north wing of the original 1859 Kirkbride Hospital and is physically connected to the original building. It was used for the worst of the patients. Mr. Kahoe reiterated the owners' position.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the listing of this property on the Philadelphia Historical Register with the boundaries as recommended by the sub-committee. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The Report of the Architectural Committee, 28 December 2004

2330 Madison Square

Gregory Oliveri and Peter Adels, owners

Gregory Oliveri, applicant

History: 1865

Project: Construct rear addition

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the wood siding of the first-floor addition is differentiated from the wood clapboards on the second-floor bay, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9.

This application proposes the demolition of a very small, non-historic rear vestibule and the construction of an infill addition in its place under an existing second-story bay. The south façade of the addition and existing bay above, which is now sided with asphalt shingles, would be sided with wood clapboards. The applicant claims that wood clapboarding is the historic material. To satisfy Rehabilitation Standard 9, the non-historic first-floor addition should be sided with a material other than the bay's historic clapboards.

The application also proposes the replacement of the front door. More information should be provided, but the proposed door appears appropriate.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted that the applicant revised his design to reflect Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised design as submitted. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1904 Spring Garden Street

1904-1908 Spring Garden LLC, owner

William G. Schwartz, Esq., applicant

History: Commission approved demolition of extant building in November 2004

Project: Construct 5-story residential building

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the design details of the front façade are improved, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

This application proposes the construction of a five-story residential building. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building currently on the site at its November 2004 meeting. The front façade drawings included with the present application contradict one another. One specifies large brackets supporting the central bay; the other does not.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and informed the Commission that the architect is in the process of revising the drawings. Mr. Wilds stated that the proposed construction is compatible with its context.

William G. Schwartz and Neil Sandvold, the architect for the project, attended the meeting.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1600-1622 Green Street

RGV Builder LLC, owner

John Bushnell, applicant

History: Vacant lot

Project: Review and Comment – Construct 16 townhouses

The Architectural Committee expressed its appreciation for the commendable presentation and commented that the proposal represents very high quality architecture. It especially noted the rear garages, which should serve as a model for similar developments.

This application proposes the construction of 16 townhouses on a vacant lot on the west side of North 16th Street between Green and Brandywine Streets. The development will not require the demolition of any structures.

Ten townhouses will face Green Street; six will face Brandywine. All will have rear garages entered from a driveway off North 16th Street. The houses will be faced with brick. They will include small fenced front yards and roof decks. The houses are designed to fit their context. Although not historic reproductions, they maintain the materials, scale, rhythm, fenestration patterns, and cornice heights of the neighborhood.

Commission members commented that the development is appropriate for the historic district. They noted especially the intelligent solution of situating the parking in the rear.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to comment favorably on the proposal, especially the rear parking. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1550 North 33rd Street, Smith Playground

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert J. Hotes, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1899, James Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Construct gatehouse, dismantle and store pavilion, restore and landscape playground

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

2027-2039 Sansom Street

Sansom Asset Management, Owner

Steven Bolinger, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1925, garage

PROPOSAL: Replace non-historic storefront

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, which stipulates the removal of the non-historic brick veneer and the installation of the new storefront and the sign, but denial of the exterior ductwork. It suggested that the ductwork be run through the interior of the building to the roof.

The application proposes renovations to a storefront in an Art Deco parking garage. Plans call for the removal of a white brick veneer and installation of a storefront window system in the historic opening. It also calls for a sign at the storefront and exterior ductwork at the rear.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. He reported that following the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant proposed the interior ductwork to the building owner; the owner rejected the suggestion. Steven Bolinger, the architect, asserted that the owner rejected the interior ductwork because it would have an adverse effect on the garage. He emphasized that his client is a tenant, not the owner of the building.

Bernard Neary, the owner of the nearby Roxy Theater, noted that the 2000 block is the most intact block of Sansom Street. He pointed out that none of the existing businesses have exposed ductwork. Commission members countered that the building in question already has exterior ductwork.

Mr. Wilds inquired about opposition to the proposal. William Newman, Spencer Zahn, and Bill Zimmerman were present to convey their opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff said that the tenant has not made a case for the exterior ductwork. He added that it appears that the interior ductwork would merely be an inconvenience for the owner. Mr. James questioned the need for the ductwork to extend the entire height of the building. Mr. Bolinger responded that the air-intake units are located on the roof.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

235 Bainbridge Street

Melissa Pinheiro, Owner

Nick Malespina, Applicant

DATE: Built between 1761 and 1770 for George Leadbetter, mariner and tavern keeper

PROPOSAL: Legalize the removal of a pent eave and addition of a coved pent eave

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of the removal of the pent eave, denial of the proposed pent eave which is inappropriate in shape, projection, and detailing, denial of the lights within the pent eave, and denial of the slate or artificial slate roofing, pursuant to Standard 6.

The project calls for the legalization of the removal of a half-gable pent eave and its replacement with a new coved pent eave. The half-gable pent eave was installed with the Commission's approval in 1979. The new pent eave would have a cove rather than flat soffit, would include lights in the cove, and would be roofed with slate. The illegally removed eave had lights in the flat soffit, but no record of their approval by the Commission can be found. Neither the shape nor the projection of the proposed pent eave is historically appropriate. The proposed eave is very flat and elongated in shape; it would project 26.5" from the facade. Historic coved eaves are tall with a bold, short curve; they project about 16.5" from the façade. The slate roofing proposed for the eave is also historically inappropriate. Cedar shakes or weathered wood-colored timberline

asphalt/fiberglass shingles would be appropriate.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Mr. Wilds was disturbed by the removal of a previously approved pent eave on this 1760s building. He also noted that the proposed replacement pent eave is inappropriate; its details do not match the historic pent eave. Mr. Steinberg concurred.

Brian and Melissa Pinheiro, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Pinheiro said that the old pent eave was hanging by a thread and that he was concerned about the possibility of injury to a pedestrian. He said that, owing to the holidays, he was under time constraints. Mr. Pinheiro canvassed the neighborhood to seek an appropriate design, which he modified for safety reasons to accommodate lights.

David O'Donnell, of the Queen Village Neighbors' Association, spoke in support of the illuminated pent eave, noting that the 3rd Police District is advocating greater lighting in the area.

Mr. Wilds offered to accept the lights, provided the correct pent eave is installed. Mr. Steinberg agreed and recommended that the owners hire a preservation architect. Mr. Sugrue concluded that the lights would be acceptable if the historically correct pent eave is substituted for the proposed eave, which is not correct. Commission members suggested that the applicant have the pent eave redesigned to be historically accurate before returning to the Commission for a subsequent review.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

821 South 3rd Street

Christopher and Angela Tobin, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Replace windows, rehabilitate facades, add decks, add entranceway with steps and replace garage door

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of simulated-divided-light windows on the side elevation only and true-divided-light windows on the front elevation; cutting a single-leaf door and transom on the side façade, rear decks with the 2nd floor deck pulled back to sit on the parapet wall and a new wood, paneled garage door, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed entrance on the side elevation, pursuant to Standard 3.

The proposal calls for alterations to this corner property including establishing a new entrance on the side of the building, constructing decks at the rear, removing the perma-stone from the front facade, painting stucco on the side façade, as well as installing new windows. The new side entrance is an ensemble salvaged from an elaborate Federal style mansion. The staff does not object to cutting down a window into an entrance, but the proposed door removes too much fabric and creates a false historic impression. The applicant has said he wishes to install windows with applied muntins for cost and design

reasons, but the applicant has not supplied any information to show the proposed windows.

Mr. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Wilds asked about the differences between the true-divided-light windows as compared to the proposed simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Rivera thought it important to maintain consistency on this important front façade.

David O'Donnell of the Queen Village Neighbors' Association offered support for the proposed window treatment, owing to economics and the owner's having undertaken an extensive burden for the rehabilitation of the property.

Christopher Tobin, the owner, noted that the additional entrance on the side would be a second means of egress. Mr. O'Donnell commented on the new side entrance, noting that it would add more light and be an enhancement to Queen Street.

Mr. Tobin acknowledged his acceptance of the Architectural Committee's recommendation, and that the proposed simulated-divided-light windows are top of the line. Mr. Wilds thought that the Commission should consider the simulated windows as a swap owing to the rehabilitation by the owner. Ms. Spina emphasized that the quality of the simulated-divided-light windows varies widely depending on the company and the Commission has not received any details of the windows that the owner proposes. Mr. Sklaroff cautioned against setting a precedent on this important façade, which should retain its historically correct windows. Mr. Rivera pointed out that the simulated windows would change the size of the opening. He concluded that the approval of the simulated-divided-light windows would not be precedent-setting owing to the extensive renovation cost incurred by the owner.

Mr. Sklaroff concurred with Mr. Rivera about the precedent and advised the Commission that a meeting to discuss windows should occur.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to approve the simulated-divided-light windows in all openings with no change in material and size, cutting a single-leaf door and transom on the side façade, rear decks with the 2nd floor deck pulled back to sit on the parapet wall and a new wood, paneled garage door, all with staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

107 Kenilworth Street

Antonio DeSimone, Owner/Applicant

DATE: built before 1807; top story removed, new facade c. 1925; rehabilitated/reconstructed, 2003-4

PROPOSAL: Legalize façade rehabilitation changes, 4th floor addition and deck
The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal on the condition that the applicant builds the cellar bulkhead and applies the correct molding to the dormer according to the previously approved elevation drawing.

The applicant approached the Commission staff to restore the façade of this circa 1800 building which had its top floor removed and a mid-20th century brick façade added. The staff of the Historical Commission worked with the applicant's architect on the design of a new brick façade to restore the original appearance of the building based on an 1807

fire insurance survey and physical evidence on the property. The owner was to return to the Commission with the design for the remainder of the building. However, the owner completed construction without getting other approvals or any permits for the non-façade work and the façade was not restored according to the approved plan. The façade design was modified because the owner wanted more headroom at the 3rd floor and asked the contractor to make the brick wall higher. The 3rd floor windows were moved up to accommodate this request. The façade, however, substantially complies with the approved design. The owner no longer wishes to reestablish the cellar bulkhead. The design of the 4th floor was built with a notched back to accommodate a deck. This can be seen from the street because the house to the east is lower.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Antonio DeSimone, the owner, offered his acceptance of the Committee's recommendation.

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

212 Walnut Street

Aldo Lamberti, Owner

Jeff Carson, Applicant

DATE: 1976, Geddes Brecher Qualls & Cunningham, architects – non-contributing in Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Add signage

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the spandrel signs on the north and east, but denial of the signs on the south and west. Mr. Levy recused.

This application calls for four signs, one on each façade of the building. On the north and east facades, the signs would be internally illuminated and sit in the spandrel between the first and second floors. On the south façade, the sign measures eight feet by eight feet and would be illuminated by an external florescent light. On the west façade, the fourth sign stands at the staircase and is internally illuminated. Unlike the submission previously seen by the Committee, this sign does not obscure the curved, brick wall.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction owing to the non-contributing status of the building. Mr. Copeland said that consideration can be given to the alteration's effect on the district. Mr. Tyler cited the ordinance to further clarify the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Steinberg stressed that this is an important building designed by Geddes for the bicentennial and urged the Commission to give careful consideration of this proposal. Mr. Wilds conveyed to the Commission that this building was discussed at great length during the process for the creation of the Society Hill District.

Anna Maria Ferraro and Jeff Carson attended the meeting. Mr. Carson noted that the signs were designed by an architect from Italy and that the owner is doing substantial rehabilitation to the restaurant. He said that the Walnut Street and 2nd Street signs would be 16 inches tall and fit within the spandrels between the first and second floors. The flat sign facing Dock Street would be six by seven feet and the sign facing the tower would be eight by eight feet with down lighting.

Mr. Sugrue thought that the west sign which faces Independence National Historic Park should be eliminated. Mr. Steinberg disagreed; he believed that the signs are an elegant enhancement.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which failed with a 2 to 9 vote. Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Tissian, Ms. Murray, Ms. Merriam, Mr. Wilds, Mr. James, Mr. Perri, and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 9 to 2. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Brown opposed the motion.

528 Pine Street

James Lokoff, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1805 by Benjamin Woolston; rehabilitated, 1971 – significant in Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish section of rear ell, build rear addition, add roll-up gate and parking pad

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, owing to lack of information.

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

327 South 2nd Street

Beverly Blynn, Owner

Daniel Mehan, Applicant

DATE: 1965 – contributing to Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Enclose roof deck

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and Standard 9.

On the visible rear of this house, the proposal calls for enclosing the roof deck. The slope of the rubber roof would be extended in the same plane and a series of casement windows would be installed to create a wall of glass. No other house in this row has the roof deck enclosed; this would set a precedent for the row. The owner is asking for the deck enclosure because the roof below the deck structure leaks.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Commission members inquired if the proposed location is on a public right-of-way. It was concluded that there is no public access in this location.

Beverly Blynn, the owner, and Daniel Mehan, the applicant, attended the meeting. Ms. Blynn said that all the houses have leaks owing to a design flaw. Mr. Mehan informed the Commission that the glazing would occur at the same plane as the railing, which will be removed.

Mr. Sugrue asserted that, owing to the design problem, there is a need for consistency in arriving at a solution. Since the Commission could reasonably expect other building owners in the row to come for similar applications in the future. He believes that the

proposed alteration is a sensible use of the space and concluded that an overall plan should be instituted to retain the consistency in the buildings' design. He recommended that the applicant be given conceptual approval for an enclosure, but should return with drawings done by an architect for review by the Committee and Commission. Mr. Wilds cautioned about the height of the fire wall.

Mr. James made a motion to approve in concept an enclosure with details to be reviewed by Committee and Commission. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suburban Station

One Penn Management, LLC, Owner

Raymond Rola, Applicant

DATE: 1929-30, Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, architects

PROPOSAL: Add window film

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the blacking out of the window, but approval of the frosted film, up to one-half of the window, pursuant to Standard 9.

As a part of the expansion of the existing restaurant space, the proposal calls for blacking out a window on the front façade of the building next to the window that was blacked out prior to designation. The window that is proposed to be altered is adjacent to the JFK Boulevard entrance of the Station.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and conveyed to the Commission the applicant's willingness to comply with the Committee's recommendation.

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

500 Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Chestnut Hill Academy, Owner

Eric Rahe, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Wissahickon Inn: 1882-84, Hewitt Brothers, architects, and William Mackie, builder; Commons Building: 1905, Frank Miles Day, architect; Gymnasium, Frank Miles Day; Kline Science Building: c. 1950, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Kingsley Gymnasium: addition 1956 and 1959, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Squash courts: Voith & Mactavish

PROPOSAL: Demolish buildings, construct two buildings and parking lot – in concept

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

Walnut Park Plaza, 6232-6250 Walnut Street

Mr. Tyler noted that this building was erected in 1928 as an apartment hotel from plans by Stetler and Deysher, and that the Walnut Park Plaza appears to meet Criterion C: it

embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values. As a brick, classical Revival apartment hotel, it embodies distinctive characteristics of a type and period. The involvement of Frederick McDonald Massiah, the contracting engineer and a man of color, and his use of reinforced concrete perhaps yield yet greater significance. Mr. Tyler concluded that the nomination needs editing or revising in areas such as the following:

1. Yellow fever, cholera, small pox and typhoid are not “in large part a result” of poor light and ventilation;
2. The periodic flooding of Cobbs Creek belies the adjective “placid”;
3. The three-story Strawbridge and Clothier warehouse measured about 120' x 80'; more interestingly, the Strawbridge and Clothier Athletic Field with a small grandstand at 63rd and Locust Streets occupied most of the block;
4. The 76ers did not exist in the 1950s; then they were called the Warriors.

Mr. Tyler said that despite these notations, he recommended the entry of this property to the National Register of Historic Places based on Criterion C.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the entry on the National Register, subject to a revision of the nomination. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff December 2004

Commission members had no questions about the report.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$29.18 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. James. made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary