

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Herbert Levy, Chair
Commission Conference Room
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street
26 August 1997

Present

Herbert Levy, Chair
Tony Atkin
Penelope Batcheler
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historical Research Technician

Also

Rosemary Rau, Philadelphia Canoe Club
Ilan Seidenwar, 306 Market Street
Allen Roth, Joseph B. Callaghan, Inc.
James Strater, Philadelphia Canoe Club - Kendall Co.
Wesley Wei, AIA
Frank Mellor
Christian A. Busch, Robert DeSilets, Architect
Robert DeSilets, Robert DeSilets, Architect
Lance Kraemer, Lance R. Kraemer Associates
Nathalie Peeters, Venturi, Scott Brown Associates
Tim Noble, Noble Preservation Services, Inc.
Ellen Metz, 327 Spruce Street
Edward Rosner, 1830 Rittenhouse Square
Margaret MacLaren, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Nicole Westerman, Capital Program Office
Lenore Millhollen, CCRA
Robert Powers, Powers & Company, Inc.
Judy Plasket, GMH Mat.
Tom Hall, TEH Architects
Jon Merz
David Amburn, Amburn-Jarosinski
Marc Pinard, Marc Pinard Architect
Chris McLaughlin, Ralston House, Inc.
Barbara McGinley
Mike Perna, Katona Roofing
David Pickford
Patricia Carrol, Esq.

Mr. Levy called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

Philadelphia Canoe Club, Fairmount Park

Philadelphia Canoe Club, Owner

Rosemary Rau, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860, several 20th century alterations

PROPOSAL: New wood windows

Rosemary Rau of the Philadelphia Canoe Club and Jim Strater of Kendall Company discussed the proposed wood windows with true, 7/8 inch muntins to replace the existing six-over-six windows. The new windows, which include sash and frames, would slightly change the proportions of the window, closing down the window by 1-1/2 inches. The proposal also includes a custom brick mold which would replicate the original. The Committee questioned the need to replace the frames and all of the original trim on the exterior of the windows. Mr. Strater and Ms. Rau stated that some of the frames do need replacement, but photographs did not show the deterioration. The Committee asked the staff to work with Mr. Strater to determine which frames may be saved. Also, the Committee asked that the windows be installed from the interior to save the exterior trim. Ms. Rau agreed.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of new sash and approval of any repairs to the extant frames. Approval of new frames in certain windows if staff agrees that the extant frame is beyond repair. Sash and frames should be installed from the interior.

123 South Broad Street, Fidelity Building

First Union Bank Corporation, Owner

Allen Roth, Applicant

DATE: 1927-28

PROPOSAL: Masonry cleaning, repair

Allen Roth of the Joseph Callaghan Company described the proposal for the masonry repair of the building. The main problem consists of water infiltration on horizontal surfaces, especially at the several projecting cornices and corners. Mr. Levy questioned the installation of copper cap-flashing because the copper's high visibility against the limestone and because of its propensity to bleed and stain the stone after oxidizing. Mr. Roth agreed to investigate the use of lead covered copper which would have a grey color and would not stain the limestone.

Mr. Roth stated that the proposal also includes replacing damaged stones, patching and cleaning. The owner will only use water to clean the limestone, but may require a chemical cleaner in extremely soiled areas.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve a stone match and cleaning samples on the condition that the cap-flashing is of lead-covered copper.

306 Market Street

Ilan Seidenwar, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Signage; legalize storefront

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee and Commission approved new windows for the storefront in 1995. The installed storefront did not follow the approved plans. Mr. Baron displayed photographs showing that the opening for the new windows is framed by two metal posts and a lintel, closing down the opening. The owner built the new storefront to fit into the opening. The Committee acknowledged that the posts and beam are needed for structural support and voted to approve the storefront as built as long as the owner paints the frame to match the window frames.

Also, Mr. Seidenwar, the owner, installed a three-paned transom in another bay of the storefront instead of the approved two-pane transom. The Committee discussed the possibility that the original transom may have had three panes and voted to approve the change.

Mr. Seidenwar showed the Committee photographs of the brick above the first floor. Last month the Committee and Commission approved a signband as long as the sign covers only the rough brick. The photographs show about five courses of fine brick under the second floor windows, and Mr. Seidenwar asked for advice on cleaning the brick. Staff agreed to work with the owner.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront on the condition that the frame of the opening is painted to match the window frames; approval of the three-pane transom; approval of cleaning the bricks below the second floor windows with staff to approve details.

2001-2007 Spring Garden Street, Spring Garden Methodist Church

Marvin Fagg, Applicant

DATE: 1863-65

PROPOSAL: Ramp

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for a handi-cap access ramp to the side door of the church. The proposal calls for a concrete ramp along the side of the church with a wrought iron picket railing. Mr. Baron suggested having the ramp built of cast-stone or painted brown to match the brownstone of the building. The Committee noted that the paint may peel after considerable use and the colorings in concrete tend to fade. Committee members stated that the grey of the concrete would not be inappropriate for the ramp. The Committee, however, did state that the plates and anchors for the railing should be stainless steel to eliminate the rust stains of ordinary steel elements and suggested painting the handrail brown instead of black.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the ramp on the condition that the contractor use stainless steel for the railing's plates and anchors. The Committee suggested painting the railing a brown color.

132 North 3rd Street

Wesley Wei, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830; c. 1940 - top 3 floors removed; 1986 - storefront altered

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation; window, door replacement

Wesley Wei, architect and owner of the building, stated that the building originally had five stories. In the 1940s a previous owner removed the top three floors after the building suffered a fire. At about the same time, the owner altered the first-floor side elevation with a garage door and new windows. The proposal includes new one-over-one windows on the side elevation, new garage door, cleaning of the front stone facade and pointing. Mr. Baron noted that the original six-over-six windows on the second floor on the side elevation should stay as six-over-six. The Committee and Mr. Wei agreed.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of new windows and door as long as the second-floor windows have a six-over-six configuration; approval of cleaning and repointing with staff to approve samples and window details.

#11 Boathouse Row, University of Pennsylvania Boat Club

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Frank Mellor, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1875-76

PROPOSAL: Re-roof with asphalt shingles

Frank Mellor presented the proposal. The proposal calls for re-roofing the boathouse with asphalt-fiberglass shingles. The Committee discussed the appropriate color of the shingles and settled on a dark grey color that closely matches the original Pennsylvania slate color. Mr. Mellor explained that the boat club plans to replace the visible areas of the roof at this time, but may not work on the entire roof.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of Slateline dark grey shingles.

925 Chestnut Street, Federal Reserve Bank

Jefferson Hospital-Rothman Institute, Owner

Robert DeSilets, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Driveway gate, signage in concept

Robert DeSilets and Christian Busch returned to the Committee this month to discuss the signage proposal for the

Bunting and Shrigley building on the corner of 10th and Ludlow Streets. Mr. Baron noted that the proposal no longer includes the bridge connecting the Bunting and Shrigley building with the Cret building on 10th and Chestnut Streets.

The proposal includes the removal of the planters on Chestnut Street; removal of the illegally installed Blue Cross/Blue Shield and "925 Chestnut Street" signs on 10th Street. At the Bunting and Shrigley building the proposal entails installation of signs over the drive through entrance and exit, and the installation of signs flanking the new door on 10th Street. The signs over the drive-through will be stone with incised letters like the frieze on the Cret building. The bronze plaque signs flanking the door would be attached to the surface of the stone. The proposal also includes hanging a Jefferson Hospital flag over the entrance, using an existing flagpole socket.

The Committee also discussed the reconfiguration of the Cret-designed gate across the alleyway. The new configuration would have two new posts to add stability to the gate, a horizontal signband, and a light. Mr. Busch stated that this gate links the Cret building with the Bunting and Shrigley building. Any new elements to the gate, which had been reconfigured in the past, will be constructed of a different colored metal to distinguish them from the original Cret design.

The Committee and architects discussed a new design for the addition at the end of the alleyway which will house the elevator. The architect has changed the fenestration to small square windows. The Committee preferred the original window configuration.

The Committee voted to recommend approval in concept with staff to approve a stone sample.

1231 Rodman Street

Ernest Varalli, Jr, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1852

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to restore the facade of the building. The proposal includes new shutters, windows, transom, cornice, door and door surround. Mr. Baron explained that the existing door surround is not original. Ernest Varalli, the owner, proposes to install a door surround that matches the original. The house next door at 1229 provides a good example, which Mr. Varalli plans to copy. The owner plans to keep a six-panel door, but Ms. Batcheler noted that the six-panel door may not be correct. She asked that Mr. Baron work with the owner to find a more appropriate door design based on historic photographs.

The windows include new six-over-six true-muntin sash in

existing frames. Mr. Baron noted that the existing windows are replacements and in very poor condition. The Committee discussed the appropriate measurement for the muntins. The new shutters will sit on the existing pins and hardware. The Committee noted that the center bar of the shutters should fall just below the meeting rail of the windows and the second floor may have had panel shutters instead of Venetian.

Mr. Varalli explained that the cornice has rotted and needs to be replaced completely. He plans to match the cornice of a house on the same street which appears original. The Committee discussed the appropriate details for the cornice.

The proposal also includes cleaning the brick and a metal gate at the alley entrance. Mr. Varalli proposed a metal gate for security, but the Committee suggested a solid wooden gate with vertical boards. The wood gate would be more appropriate and would provide privacy as well as security. Mr. Varalli explained that a metal gate would give the impression of solidity and would allow light into the alley. The Committee suggested a wood plank rectangular gate which would allow light into the arched opening.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the door surround; approval of a new door, sash with muntins to match the existing; approval of shutters, cornice and cleaning with staff to approve shop drawings and a masonry cleaning sample; approval of wood gate. The Committee asked staff to review details of each of these items for approval.

1300 Locust Street, Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Nathalie Peeters, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902-04

PROPOSAL: Masonry restoration; new fence, side door

Suzanne Pentz abstained from the discussion and vote.

Nathalie Peeters and Tim Noble presented the proposal for the Historical Society. The proposal involves the front portico of the building, including the gate and masonry repair, and a larger conceptual proposal for the entire building.

Mr. Noble stated that the Society installed the railing, non-historic fabric, to keep people from sleeping on the steps. The Society wishes to move the railing up several steps to create a more friendly look to the building; however, Mr. Baron noted that it will no longer perform its function. The Committee suggested moving the railing to the top step instead of to the middle of the staircase, but Ms. Peeters stated that would allow people to sleep under the cover of the portico.

Mr. Noble stated that his firm has elaborated on a previous study and performed its own high-tech study of the bluestone marble. The stone suffers from microscopic cracking which

absorbs sulfur and other contaminants. First, the stone will be consolidated in detailed areas with a conservator. The cleaning of specific areas of the marble will use the JOS System, which uses micro-abrasives. The proposal also includes the removal of the portland cement pointing from about 100% of the marble and 60% of the brick, and repointing with an historic, high-lime mortar compound. The Committee was concerned that the new pointing color would not match the original pointing which has stained and colored. Mr. Noble acknowledged that matching the mortars proves difficult. The Committee agreed to view the cleaning and pointing of the portico area as the test area for the entire building. The architect plans to use the stone from the door on 13th Street for dutchman repairs of the stone in other places.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the door on 13th Street; approval of the gate and moving the railing; approval of the cleaning and pointing with staff to approve samples and a site visit by the Committee.

132 Christian Street

Charles Burdumy, Owner

Lance Kraemer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1810

PROPOSAL: New windows, door, chimney

Mr. Levy abstained from the discussion and vote.

Lance Kraemer, architect for the project, presented the proposal to rebuild the chimney, install a fence of brick and wrought iron, install new windows, shutters and door. Mr. Kraemer stated that a large amount of the chimney still exists and he will match the bricks to the original. The Committee asked that the fence have only brick and no wrought iron or a simpler iron design. Mr. Kraemer agreed to simplify the iron.

The Committee discussed the door proposal and stated that the transom should have three lights. Members agreed that the proposal should include three-light basement windows and six-over-six sash for the rest of the floors. All of the windows will be wood with true-muntins.

Mr. Kraemer noted that the proposal calls for a new cedar-shingle roof but if it proves too expensive the owner wishes to install a asphalt/fiberglass roof. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has also approved weathered-wood-colored asphalt-fiberglass shingles.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the chimney; fence with simpler iron detail; new windows; new door with a three-light transom; new shutters, and cedar shingle roof with staff to approve all details.

251 Quince Street

Joseph Baker, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: New wood shutters

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for new wood shutters with new hardware. The lower floor will have solid, paneled shutters and the upper floors will have Venetian shutters.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

327 Spruce Street

Ellen Metz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1812

PROPOSAL: New windows, shutters, roof

This proposal calls for a new curved top 6/6 wood true muntin dormer window as well as louvered shutters for the 3rd floor and a new shingle roof. The owner proposes to cover the roof with weathered wood color asphalt shingles and close a barely visible modern side window with matching brick.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review details.

1729 Mt. Vernon Street, Thomas Eakins House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Nicole Westerman, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New fence

Although last month the Committee saw a proposal for replacement of the current wood fence with a reproduction of the historic wood fence, Public Property now proposes a more secure metal fence. This fence will allow visibility into the side yard and help deter crime.

The Committee voted to recommend approval since no historic fabric would be removed and the vertical iron fence fits the architecture of the period.

1830 Rittenhouse Square Street

Nancy Conner, Owner

Robin Komita, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: New windows, cut bathroom vent

This proposal includes several new windows and cutting two vents through the limestone masonry facade for a bathroom vent and dryer. Committee members objected to any cutting of the masonry, but explained how the vents could extend out the top of

the bathroom window without lowering the whole ceiling. It was noted that the duct work could be reconfigured to vent out the non-visible east facade of the building as well although the applicant did not find this acceptable.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the window changes and the vents so long as they exited through the window and not the masonry.

2027-29 Chestnut Street

Mid City Residential Association, Owner
Ingerman Construction, Applicant

DATE: 1927

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation; new windows

The Ingerman group plans to lease the long vacant YWCA building and use the upper floors for low income housing. The lower floors will contain their offices but will otherwise remain unused for now. The proposal includes new 6/6 aluminum windows on the barely visible side and rear facades and repair of the existing windows on the front facade. On the first floor, they propose to remove the 1950s horizontal windows and brick veneer and install new windows similar in configuration to early 20th century windows. They also propose covering the base below those windows with metal panels. The Committee objected to that treatment and thought that once they removed the brick they should either restore the stone below or come back with pictures of the condition and a further design. The plans also show general cleaning and repainting of the balconettes and marquis.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with the exception of the aluminum at the base of the building. They asked staff to review any masonry restoration samples for approval.

2117 Spruce Street

Linda Brenner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1860 & 1890 (top floor)

PROPOSAL: Repointing

The proposal calls for repointing this rowhouse. The applicant's mortar mix includes a proprietary product which may or may not include enough lime to make a soft enough mortar. Committee members agreed to an approval but asked the staff to inquire further into the mix to make sure it would be soft enough.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review a sample for approval.

251-57 South 17th Street, Medical Arts Tower

Towmed Limited, Owner
Judi Plasket, Applicant
DATE: 1930
PROPOSAL: New doors

This proposal calls for altering the two pairs of doors in the central entryway to two single doors each with a sidelight. The management seeks to provide lighter wider doors that will prove easier to operate for the elderly or people on crutches. The new doors will have a brass finish and retain the symmetry of the present doors.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with the condition that the panel on the bottom of the sidelight be raised to match the lower panel of the door.

249 South Van Pelt Street

Jon Merz, Owner/Applicant
DATE: c. 1860
PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation; new doors, windows, balconettes

This proposal calls for replacement of a modern garage door with a carriage door taken from similar carriage house models. The owner plans to replace the upper floor windows with true divided light wood windows with 7/8 inch muntins. The Committee thought the existing four over four windows more correct than the two-over-two windows shown in the drawing. They asked for a revision of the central balcony doors to reflect the pane size of the flanking windows, creating a vertical three pane arrangement. They agreed to Mr. Merz's blue colors for the trim, but thought them inappropriate for the brick wall. They encouraged him to consider stripping the paint off the brick or to repaint with a more brick-like color such as dark red or sienna.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the plans, altered somewhat to show three pane doors in the center bay window of the second floor, 4/4 panes in the flanking windows, squared off rather than round moldings on the carriage door and a more brick-like color for the masonry. They asked staff to approve paint, window and millwork details.

261-63 South 22nd Street

George Poulos, Owner/Applicant
DATE: c. 1890
PROPOSAL: Legalize stucco on side wall

This proposal calls for legalizing the restuccoing of the side wall.

The Committee voted to recommend approval

2039 Delancey Street

Daniel Neducin, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation

The architect proposes to restore the front facade of this rowhouse with new windows, cornice repair, masonry cleaning, pointing and brownstone repair. The work includes reopening second floor windows that had been reduced in size. The new windows, constructed of wood, will contain true divided lights. The contractors will strip flagstone from the brownstone steps and rebuilt them with brownstone or a brown cementitious material to look like brownstone.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review details, particularly of the masonry work.

2101 Cypress Street

Jo Buyske & Joseph Friedberg, Owners

Marc Pinard, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1885

PROPOSAL: enlarge garage door, cut pedestrian access in carriage door

The proposal entails alterations to this Hewitt designed carriage house. Plans show the removal of a modern balcony and the substitution of a simple railing on the yard facade. The applicant proposes cutting a new pedestrian entrance into the historic carriage door on 21st Street and widening a garage entrance on Cypress Street. On 21st Street Committee members thought that the applicant should cut the new pedestrian door out of the existing carriage door, all the way to the edge, so as not to add too many extra joint lines. On Cypress Street the applicant could widen the garage door up to two feet, but cut symmetrically on the center line of the facade.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the modifications that the Cypress Street garage door could be widened a foot to each side but must remain symmetrical. The pedestrian door on 21st Street can be cut through the existing carriage door but must extend all the way to its edge.

237-47 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel

Jerry Pantelidis, Owner

Christopher Beardsley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: New metal canopy, doors, planters, paving design

The proposal calls for removing a canvas awning over the front door and installing a new metal canopy. New wood doors will replace modern aluminum ones, and free standing planters and a new paving pattern will adorn the sidewalk. The architect

showed a rendering which differed from the measured drawing. The Committee approved of the wider metal canopy of the measured drawing but preferred the small pane glass of the doors in the architect's rendering.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the small pane glazing of the doors.

2201 Delancey Street

Barbara McGinley, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1865

PROPOSAL: Legalize replacement of slate with asphalt shingles

This proposal involves the legalization of work that has already been completed without a permit. The work includes the removal of scalloped slate shingles from a three sided mansard and their replacement with square slateline asphalt shingles. The cornice has been repaired to match the original, but the metal roof ridges at the corners have been removed and not replaced.

The complex contractual arrangements of the project involves Mrs. McGinley the owner who claims that she did not know about the historical designation or its implications. She hired Mr. Pickford to work on the house. He explained that because he lacks a license to work in Philadelphia, he gave the job to contractor Jayne & Fisher who in turn subcontracted the job to Katona Roofing. Mr. Perna representing Katona Roofing explained that his company expected the main contractor to pull any necessary permits and that he thought the Commission found these slateline asphalt shingles to be an appropriate replacement in any case. No representative of Jayne & Fisher appeared at the meeting.

Mr. Baron explained that after receiving calls from people in the neighborhood at the very beginning of the project, staff asked a building inspector to notify the applicant of the need for a building permit. Staff also called Mark Katona Roofing and spoke to Mr. Perna to inform him that a permit must be obtained and that in cases where the existing slate remains the Commission has consistently asked owners to reinstall slate or a hard mineral fiber slate substitute in the shape of the existing original shingles. Mr. Perna explained over the phone that Katona Roofing had a subcontract and that the original contractor would take care of the permit. He said that they would seal up the building with the underlayment of felt and roofing paper to prevent damage from water infiltration in the mean time. He was asked not to remove sound areas of intact slate and told that any work performed without a permit would involve risk on the part of the applicant since it clearly did not appear to meet the Commission's standards. Because of the impending rain, the Commission staff did not ask for a stop work order, and Mr. Perna told the Committee that Katona Roofing completed all the work to protect themselves from the liability of water infiltration of

the roof. He thought that when Mrs. McGinley contracted with a general contractor that she had every right to expect that they would handle the permits. He said that in his experience is as a subcontractor, the general contractor has the responsibility for the permit. Ultimately, the City holds the owner responsible for obtaining a permit.

Mr. Baron showed several letters in the file demonstrating that the Commission notified the McGinleys first of the individual designation of the property in 1974 and several more letters regarding district designation in 1995. The later letters specifically mention that the Commission reviews work to roofs.

Mrs. McGinley's lawyer, Patricia Carrol, explained that Mrs. McGinley's late husband used to handle all business activities. The roof leaked and some slate shingles fell off the roof. She also said that while Mrs. McGinley was not left without funds, she has special burdens because of a son institutionalized for schizophrenia and a retarded child living at home. She said Mrs. McGinley expected that the contractor would take care of the necessary paperwork and thought that in fact a permit had been obtained.

Mr. Baron suggested that some kind of equitable compromise be reached that did not unduly penalize Mrs. McGinley but also treated this property consistently with other projects in the neighborhood. Within the last few years applicants within several blocks of this property have been asked to spend substantial sums to reroof their mansards with slate. These people would have a legitimate quarrel if the Commission allowed someone to forgo the same requirements because no one took the responsibility to obtain a permit. He suggested that the applicant recover the Delancey Street portion of the mansard in scalloped slate or a hard slate-like substitute such as Eternit or one of the many equivalents. The metal edge rolls could be reinstalled at the corners, making a natural break point for a different material and the asphalt could be retained on the other two visible facades. This would leave approximately 80% of the existing asphalt roof intact. Mr. Katona, when asked, responded that to reroof that portion of the mansard, as suggested, would cost between \$3500-\$4500.

Mr. Tyler explained the hardship section of the ordinance to the applicant which allows her to apply to the Hardship Committee for a possible exemption from the full requirements of the standards of the ordinance. He provided the applicant with a copy of the ordinance and Rules and Regulations.

Committee members said that, although a building owner always has a legal responsibility to obtain a permit, in this case plenty of blame exists on the part of several parties. They suggested to the applicant's lawyer that perhaps a deal could be brokered where the cost of reroofing the Delancey Street side of the mansard could be shared by all four parties. If the

applicant insisted on applying for total exemption through the Hardship Committee, their recommendation to the Commission would be to replace all of the mansard in slate since all of it is highly visible and character defining.

The Committee voted to recommend in favor of the above described compromise to reroof the Delancey Street mansard in slate or a hard look alike material. They thought that this compromise already took into account financial hardship. If further relief was to be considered, their recommendation to the Commission would be that in order to meet The Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the entire roof would need to be replaced in scalloped slate or a look alike material. They did not think that the compromise should itself be compromised because the blame lay with a number of parties who should be licensed and insured.

3609-25 Chestnut Street, Ralston House

Chris McLaughlin, Building Manager/Applicant

DATE: c 1885

PROPOSAL: Repair/encapsulate chimneys

This proposal encompasses repair to the numerous chimneys on a large institutional building. The inside of the attic shows water infiltration and the chimneys themselves show spalling. Committee members thought that this problem probably results from the institution's cutting down the chimneys to the level that water from higher on the roof spills directly onto their masonry caps, visible holes in the flashing and the Portland cement pointing of the chimney. A proposal from Culbertson Restoration calls for repairing the flashing, replacing some damaged brick, repointing and sealing the chimneys with a paint on plastic called Decathane. The product has been used in Great Britain on a housing project and the manufacturer has agreed to provide the product free of charge to establish an American example. The actual labor for the installation will cost \$35,000. Committee members thought that the Decathane could potentially do more harm than good and would probably have a shiny look. They advised the applicant that a better solution might be to put a metal cap on top of each chimney and fix the pointing and flashing and see if that doesn't cure the leaking. The sealing could always be done as a second step. Mr. McLaughlin said that some of the sealant had been demonstrated on a piece of the shingle roofing and did not seem to change the color. He also said that his board would like to solve the problem in one application and not incur the cost of sending someone onto the roof a second time. Committee members recommended that a sample be applied to the brick to see the effect on the appearance.

The Committee voted to recommend approval although they strongly advised the applicant to try the metal capping alternative first and thought that the plastic could be a waste of money.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura M. Spina and Randal Baron