

**THE MINUTES OF THE 422nd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 October 1997**

**City Council Caucus, Room 401 City Hall
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public
Property
Arlene Matzkin
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Dennis P. Ward, III
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and
Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie Wolf, Ph.D.

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historical Preservation Technician
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
R. Scott Jacob, Historic Preservation Specialist

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also, with affiliation and/or project

Gary O'Roarke, 1260 Housing
John Donnelly, BP Corporation
Bobbie Burke, Preservation Alliance
Tom Ferrick, Philadelphia Inquirer
Alfred Cappelli, Jr., 310 Market Street
Allison Kelsey, Preservation Alliance
Patricia Aden, Preservation Alliance
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance
Ed Bronstein, AIA
Claire Oliver, Claire Oliver Fine Art
Christian A. Busch, Robert A. DeSilets Architect
Kiki Bolender, Schade and Bolender Architects
Doris Fanelli, Independence National Historical Park (INHP)
Hollis Provins, INHP
Dennis Reidenbach, INHP
Bill Brookover, INHP
Thomas Koenig
Siraik Zakarian
Joseph Demato
Carl Zucker, Attorney for Claire Oliver Fine Art

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 422nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:10 A.M.

MINUTES of the 421st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Brownlee and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 421st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 10 September 1997, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE REPORT, 30 September 1997,
Arlene Matzkin, Chair

Ms. Matzkin read the Committee's recommendations before discussion of each proposal.

325 South Street

Michael Morrison, Owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1798; storefront c. 1890

PROPOSAL: New storefront

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial. Applicant should repair the historic storefront and the stained glass transoms. They voted in favor of removing the existing material covering the historic storefront to explore conditions.

Ms. Matzkin explained that this proposal includes the demolition of an existing storefront and its replacement with a newly designed one. She added that the historic storefront was covered up without a permit, and that the wood frame supporting the stained glass transom windows shows signs of failure. Mr. Tyler stated that this proposal violates standards 1, 2, 4, 6, and 9 set forth in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Mr. Spilove pointed out that part of the South Street shopping district's character stems from the amount of variety among the storefronts. Mr. Brownlee explained that historic storefronts make up part of that variety, and a preservable example of an historic storefront should remain an integral fixture in the street scape. Mr. Tyler stated that the transient nature of shops such as those on South Street has historically necessitated change. He further

stressed the importance of preserving an historic element to illustrate what drew merchants and consumers to the area.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to disapprove the proposed modern storefront, to approve removing the existing material covering the historic storefront to explore conditions, and to approve repair of the historic storefront and the stained glass transoms, with staff to review and approve all details. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

917 South 2nd Street

Charles Langan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1800

PROPOSAL: Legalize Demolition; reconstruction

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the demolition of everything except the chimney and foundation; reconstruction, with staff to review and approve all drawings and details; the owner must rebuild the dormer.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Committee and Commission had approved the rehabilitation of this rare, wood residence, but that the owner, Mr. Langan, commenced partial demolition of the building owing to the advanced deterioration of many structural elements. The owner objected to having to restore the dormer, claiming that it was not an original element. The Committee disagreed and noted that the dormer constituted an important feature.

Mr. Wilds recommended photographing the building's remaining superstructure as a record of the historic building techniques for research purposes. Mr. Brownlee concurred that the rarity of this surviving wood building merits thorough documentation. Mr. Wilds asked about dating the wood siding. Mr. Tyler explained that dendrochronology testing may cost too much for this situation.

Mr. Brown made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve all details, and photographic documentation of structural elements prior to demolition.

310 Market Street

Alfred Cappelli, Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize sign

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Ms. Matzkin explained that this proposal entails legalizing a sign installed without a permit or Commission

approval. She further stated that the current first floor tenant installed the sign over recently restored historic transoms.

Mr. Cappelli, the owner, stated that he does not find the sign objectionable, and believes his tenant needs the sign to compete with similar businesses in the vicinity. He showed the Commission members photographs of other storefronts to illustrate the proliferation of what he considers over-large and garish signage on or near the same block as his building. He specifically cited 315 Market Street, an historically designated building now occupied by a business in direct competition with his tenant, which has a 4' by 14' sign with purple awnings.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Cappelli how this building came before the Historical Commission. Mr. Cappelli explained that in July or August of 1996 the Department of License and Inspection came through the neighborhood issuing violations.

Mr. Sklaroff recommended asking a member of the Commission staff to review the north side of the 300 block of Market Street to ascertain which signs are in violation. Mr. Spilove suggested reviewing both sides of Market Street from Front Street to 4th Street. Robert Barnett, former Commissioner of the Department of License and Inspections, affirmed that the Department issued violations for buildings on the 100, 200, and 300 blocks of Market Street with non-approved signage. Mr. Tyler suggested that deferring a decision for a period not to exceed six months to allow staff time to investigate the other signs on Market Street from Front Street to 4th Street, and to inform the Department of their findings. Mr. James took exception to tying together this application with other signs not before the Commission.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to disapprove the proposal, and to defer enforcement of the violation for the sign for six months, after which time the sign must come down. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with ten votes. Mr. James dissented.

2111 Mount Vernon Street

Sohrab Rabii, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Replace six windows and sills in wood

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to replace six windows on the front facade with two-over-two, wood, double-hung sash, installed in the existing frames in jamb liners,

and to replace several sills in wood to match the originals.
Mr. Tyler stated that replacement in kind conforms with the Standards.

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

1300 Locust Street, Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Owner

DATE: c. 1905

PROPOSAL: Rooftop HVAC, handicap door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the discussion and the vote because his law firm represents the owner.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to install large HVAC mechanical units on the roof, which would sit twenty feet back from the Locust Street elevation, and for final approval of cutting a side door for handicap access. Mr. Tyler confirmed that both proposals follow the Standards.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried with ten votes.

149-151 North 2nd Street, Fire Museum

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1898

PROPOSAL: Replace wood windows with aluminum windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposed windows using the "Gun 3" molding.

Ms. Matzkin explained the proposal to replace windows with clad wood windows that seem to fulfill the sightline requirements asked for by the Committee, and that two Committee members voted for a true wood window replacement.

Mr. Wild made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, conditional upon using the "Gun 3" moldings for the new windows. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

34 South Front Street

Claudio Sandolo, Owner

Cynthia Cardonick, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Awnings, neon sign

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of an open-sided awning over the front door only, and a wooden sign of the initially proposed proportions.

Ms. Matzkin clarified that the applicant only applied to install awnings over the south four bays, not over each first floor window as stated in the Committee meeting minutes. She further explained that the Committee thought the proposed four awnings on the south half of the building's facade would create an unbalance on a facade with eight uniform openings.

Ms. Wischmann questioned the Committee's decision concerning the awnings, pointing out that rejection based upon aesthetic principles falls outside the jurisdiction of the Commission. Ms. Wolf stated that the proposed awnings probably have an historic precedent, adding that awnings on one half of a building's facade was common historically.

Mr. James asked to see a drawing of the proposed sign. Mr. Jacob circulated the submitted drawing of the proposed neon sign, which he explained was too dark and unclear to copy for Commission members. Mr. James questioned approving a sign before the Commission has seen a clear and more detailed drawing. Mr. Sklaroff asked why the Committee voted to disapprove the proposed neon sign. Ms. Matzkin explained that in order to minimize pedestrian health risks, a projecting neon sign requires encasement in a wide, clear plastic or glass box, which the Committee found objectionable.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve the four open-ended awnings as originally proposed. The Commission accepted the Committee's recommendation concerning the neon sign, and voted to deny the sign proposal until the Committee reviews and approves detailed drawings for a wood sign. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with ten votes. Ms. Kaplan dissented.

Covered Bridge - Wissahickon at Thomas Mill Road

City of Philadelphia, Owner

David Slocum, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855; c.1870 - alterations; 1937 - partial reconstruction

PROPOSAL: Repair

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of repairs, temporary removal of side boards, replacement in kind if necessary, and erection of scaffolding and railings.

Ms. Matzkin explained the proposal to remove the board and batten siding to view the trusses and see what requires repair or replacement, and to build necessary scaffolding and a railing. She added that the applicant should number and record the materials to ensure proper reinstallation.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1220 Pine Street

Paul Bouikidis, Owner

John Donnelly, Applicant

Matthew Weinstone, Applicant

DATE: c. 1820; c. 1900 - altered

PROPOSAL: Windows, door, bargeboard, partial roof replacement, repointing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposed vinyl windows at the second floor and of the existing door frame and transom, and asked that the contractor modify the door frame to fit the opening and to glaze the transom. The Committee recommended approval of the repointing, reopening the ground floor windows, installation of wood, true muntin, two-over-two windows on the first floor, replacing the wood bargeboard conditional upon it matching the extant beaded board, and replacing the metal roof molding on the rear side of the building to match the existing.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the applicant informed the Committee that the owner does not want to continue any of the proposed restorations if the Commission denies approval of the vinyl windows. Mr. Donnelly, the contractor, distributed a letter to the Commission members delineating the history of the rehabilitation project and expressing the dissatisfaction felt by himself and the owner regarding the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Donnelly explained that the completed window replacements with glued-on wood muntins bear a close resemblance to the historic windows, and circulated photographs of examples of both. He added that any visible difference would be hidden by storm windows.

Mr. Spilove asked the applicant whether he had applied to the Department of Licenses and Inspection for a permit prior to installing the vinyl windows. Mr. Donnelly explained that he did not because he did not think installing windows required a permit. He added that he received a permit to commence interior work prior to beginning the project, but did not apply for an exterior work permit until after the work began.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicant to confirm that Mr. Baron informed him of the Historical Commissions position concerning replacing wood windows with vinyl. Mr. Donnelly answered affirmatively, and stated that the only portion of the new windows visible from the exterior are the glued-on wood muntins owing to the storm windows. Ms. Wolf pointed out that if the owner decided to removed the storm windows the entire exterior frame would be exposed. Ms. Matzkin stated that the mullion's depth of 1/8 inch does not provide a shadow line, and that the vinyl window's installation into the wood frame closed down the opening. She added that the glued-on muntin is larger by 3/8 of an inch. Mr. Tyler stated the muntins could fall off within five years owing to adhesive failure, and that vinyl sash have a life expectancy of only twenty to twenty-five years.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Donnelly asked that the Commission approve the installation of two-over-two, true wood muntin windows to alleviate the owner from any further delay.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve wood, true-muntin windows with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

500 Chestnut Street, Independence Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Dennis Reidenbach, Assistant Superintendent, Applicant

DATE: 1730

PROPOSAL: Security bollards

Mr. Tyler explained the proposal to install wood-encased steel bollards to replace the present wooden bollards along Chestnut Street with returns on Fifth and Sixth Streets, and installing AIA bollards, iron bollards capped with a ball, at the other entrances to the square. Mr. Spilove informed the Commission that this site was selected to receive funding for "anti-terrorism protection."

Mr. Tyler added that several Committee and Commission members visited Independence Square on 6 October 1997 to view mock-ups of the proposed bollards. At that time the Commission and Committee members asked the applicant to look into changing the grade or gage of steel to enable a greater space between the bollards. Mr. Tyler stated that engineers for the project have found that they can increase the distance by six inches.

Mr. Tyler explained that the Commission members

received copies of several historic treatments of bollards in front of Independence Hall. He added that these early representations served as models for the present bollards. Ms. Kaplan asked for the total number of bollards at the end of installation. Hollis Provins, Chief Ranger at Independence National Historical Park, explained that the number of bollards on Chestnut Street frontage would drop down from 92 to about 82. He further stated that the returns have 36 bollards. Ms Kaplan reiterated the Planning Commission's opposition to the large number of bollards.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the consensus reached by the combined Commission and Committee present at the site visit to recommend the use of AIA bollards in the Square behind Independence Hall, and fabrication of the form of the historic wooden bollards in steel with a domed cap, with any welding ridges eliminated, and painted brown-gray for Chestnut Street and the 5th and 6th street returns. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with nine votes. Ms. Kaplan dissented, and Ms. Wolf abstained.

2211 Walnut Street

1260 Housing Development Corporation
John Donnelly, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Brownstone repair, new windows in existing frames
Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the arch top sash in existing frames, and brownstone patching with an integral brown mortar. Mr. Baron gave the applicant a technical brief describing this repair method for brownstone.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to repair the badly damaged brownstone facade. She circulated a letter from Mr. O'Roarke, representing the owner, itemizing the two methods that are proposed. The letter explained that the applicant and owner would rather use the stucco and painting method than the method recommended by the Committee described in the technical brief used by the New York City Landmarks Commission.

Mr. O'Roarke stated that the Committee recommended method would cost about twice as much as stuccoing and painting. Ms. Wolf pointed out that once painted, the facade would require frequent maintenance, and could, in time, cost more to maintain than patching the brownstone. Mr. Tyler stated that both methods conform with the *Standards*.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve both methods proposed to

repair the brownstone, with staff to review and approve stucco mix, color, and all details, and to approve proposed windows. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1710 Pine Street

Dr. Stanton Smullens, Owner

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Paint removal, repointing, replace shutters

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff to approve a mortar sample.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to remove paint from the facade, repoint the bricks, and install shutters to match existing.

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

1700 Locust Street

Victor Fiore, Owner

Edwin Bronstein, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1895

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation, replace railing, install lights, signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of windows, awnings, paint removal, new steps, planter, signage, removal of the Locust Street entrance, and lighting. The staff should review samples of the paint removal and the brick and stone used in the door in-fill pier. The Committee recommended disapproval of the proposed modern railings.

Ms. Matzkin explained the proposal for a total facade rehabilitation. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the Committee's recommendation concerning this property does not mention the proposed awnings. Ms. Matzkin explained that the Committee felt favorable about the awnings, and that their absence in the recommendation was an oversight.

Lenore Millhollen, of the Center City Residents Association, stated that she took exception to the entire facade proposal, and expressed particular concern over the number of awnings. Ms. Matzkin explained that the Commission consistently votes in favor of awnings as long as they fit within the window and do not obscure original architectural details.

Patricia Aden, Senior Vice President for Programs and Advocacy for the Preservation Alliance, stated that the

Preservation Alliance expresses its concern that the cumulative impact of each element of this proposal, which she referred to as excessive, would overwhelm the building, rendering it a mere backdrop for the proposed awnings, signage, and lighting. She recommended approving a "more balanced" approach, which would eliminate the lighting tube around the cornice, and some of the awnings. Mr. Bronstein, the architect for project, asked Ms. Aden which awnings the Preservation Alliance found acceptable. Ms. Aden stated that the first floor seemed appropriate. Mr. Bronstein stated that the motivation behind the awnings and lights originated in an attempt to draw attention to the upper portion of the building.

Ms. Kaplan pointed out that the first floor windows have changed recently, and that awnings do not constitute a permanent change to the building. She added that celebrating the top of the building, which has not been altered, detracts from the remodeled lower floors. Mr. James expressed concern that the awnings would obscure the architectural details on the upper portion of the building, not highlight them.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Committee thought the existing railing serves to complement the historic character of the building more than the proposed modern railing.

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

265-271 South 15th Street

Michael Karp, Owner
Paul Corson, Tenant
Patrick Dewey, Applicant
DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll-down grates, install new awning
Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of exterior grates and proposed awnings, to recommend approval interior grates, and suggested Mr. Corson consider a wood blade sign or window signage rather than the awning.

Mr. Sklaroff and Ms. Wischmann recused themselves from the discussion and the vote owing to their law firm's association with the owner.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to legalize exterior grates and approve an awning for one of the tenants on the first floor of the building. She explained that the exterior grates are attached to and cover unique carved stone and brickwork. Ms. Wolf made an argument that the

brickwork is far too significant to approve any awnings that would cover the facade. Mr. Tyler stated that the tenant contacted the Historical Commission to verify the building's historic designation prior to the installation of the grates.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation specifying no awning. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried

115-117 North 15th Street, The Metropolitan

Franklin Tower Historic Association, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Applicant

DATE: 1828

PROPOSAL: New Awning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to remove the existing awning over the front entrance, and replacing it with a smaller awning that allows the ornate stonework around the door to show.

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

235 South 10th Street

Tom Koenig, Owner

Phil DiDonato, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Exhaust fans

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the fans, conditional upon the installation of a wood screen build high enough to conceal them.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to install two exhaust fans into the wall to accommodate the restaurant's kitchen. She explained that Committee members could not locate another feasible location for the fans, so they recommended shielding the public right-of-way with a louvered fence. She stated that regarding the minimum fence height requiring zoning variances the Committee minutes wrongly read ten feet and should say six feet. Mr. Koenig, the owner, expressed concerns that a fence would decrease the amount of air pulled into the kitchen by the fans. Ms. Matzkin assured him that louvers facilitate normal air flow.

Mr. Spilove stated that the fence serves to minimize the amount of air and grease hitting pedestrians as they walk by.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve all details, including the new wood screen. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1913 Delancey Street

Kirk Kirkpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1917

PROPOSAL: Alter entrance

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained the proposal to close up an added door, lengthen a window into a new door on the other end of the facade, lengthen existing windows below ground, create a new below-ground step, add a new railing at the second floor doorway for safety, and replace the damaged bricks in the relieving jack arch. She added that the Committee considered all of these improvements.

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

1912 Rittenhouse Square Street

Claire Oliver, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1895

PROPOSAL: Awning, material for steps

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of a shed-type awning to fit within the opening, with reversed coloration, and with staff to approve the color of the cast stone for the steps.

Ms. Matzkin explained the proposal to install a shed-type awning to fit within the opening over the door, and that the Committee only suggested changing the awning's coloration. She added that the Commission already approved the front entrance steps, but the applicant has now decided to use cast stone, which the Committee approved conditional upon it matching the stone around the entrance.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to approve color sample of cast stone. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove excused himself, and passed the gavel to Ms. Wolf.

120 Elfreths Alley

Miriam Punzalan, Owner

Dick Caswell, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1728

PROPOSAL: New windows, dormer, shingles, shutters, door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review and approve details based on further above-ground archaeology.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal to install new twelve-over twelve windows with half-inch putty glazed muntins, shutters, cedar shakes on the pent eave, a new door, and restoration of the front dormer to its original state. Mr. Tyler stated that the proposed work and above-ground archaeology meets the *Standards*.

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

Mr. Spilove returned, and received the gavel back from Ms. Wolf.

2032 Delancey Street

Mr. and Mrs. Jergins, Owners

Tom Natalini, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Repointing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review mortar sample.

Ms. Matzkin explained the proposal to repoint the facade using an acceptable mortar.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve a pointing sample. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned the necessity for every repointing and cleaning proposal to come before the Commission. Mr. Tyler explained that the guidelines followed by the Commission mandate jurisdiction. Ms. Matzkin stated that expected changes in the City Ordinance may relieve the Commission of these responsibilities, and relegate them to staff-level approval. Ms. Spina explained that the Commission has jurisdiction over the fabric of a property, and that repointing and cleaning can severely damage masonry if done incorrectly.

925 Chestnut Street

Jefferson University Hospital, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1898

PROPOSAL: Replace wood windows with aluminum windows
Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the flag, replacing the new signs in marble while leaving the historic signs visible below, but removing the gold leaf in the letters to minimize their impact and avoid confusion. The Committee also voted to approve the a mock-up of the proposed address numbers, with good photographs, and to delay the final decision until after further examination.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposal for new address numbers over the front door on Chestnut Street, and adding new plaques on either side of the door.

Mr. DeSilets, an architect for the project, explained that the design of the proposed numbers mimics on a larger scale those found on a clock within the building designed by Paul Cret, the building's architect. He added that he intends to install placards above the historic signage on either side of front door as a nod to the original use and name of the building.

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

Addenda

2201 Green Street

Siraik Zakarian, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Gate alterations

Mr. Tyler explained that the Commission had approved a swing gate several months ago, but that the applicant now proposes installing a gate that slides back behind the wall, using the same design. Mr. Wilds stated that sliding gates may necessitate changing the plane of the wall, because they sit behind the wall. Ms. Zakarian, the owner of the building, assured the Commission that the sliding gate will look the same as the approved swing gate. She added that the wall itself probably could not support the weight of a gate hinged directly to it anyway.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to approve the proposed gate alterations, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1536 Pine Street

Charles Turner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Repair brownstone

Mr. Tyler described the proposal to repair the brownstone facade using the stuccoing and painting method. He further explained that the applicant already commenced repairing the facade in this manner, and that he visited the site and found the work satisfactory.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to approve the brownstone repair, with staff to review and approve form and color.

925 Chestnut Street

Jefferson University Hospital, Owner

Robert DeSilets, Architect/Applicant

RECAP OF PROPOSED WORK

Christian Busch, one of the project's architects, addressed the Commission and offered to clarify issues regarding the proposed alterations. Ms. Kaplan explained that several Commission members went on a site visit with Mr. Baron, and asked for clarification of certain aspects of the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff believed that the plans did not do the scope of the work justice. He explained that Commission members expressed concerns over the proposed split-level driveway. Mr. Busch stated that the drive-through will be six inches higher than street level, which would require only a small incline, and that the down ramp would remain, but narrower.

Ms. Wischmann expressed concern over pedestrian safety with regards to the drive-through. Mr. Busch explained that pedestrian safety instigated designing the formal entrance on 10th Street to accommodate access without using the driveway.

Mr. Spilove asked that the architects coordinate a demonstration delineating all the aspects of the proposal for the Committee and Commission. He suggested setting up an informal meeting to review the material. It was decided to discuss the proposal at the next Commission meeting,

scheduled for 12 November 1997, and to place this proposal first on the meeting agenda.

Harry A. Batten Memorial Fund

Mr. Tyler requested reimbursement for the \$28.58 spent on the Committee lunches.

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

CLG National Register

Mr. Tyler described the nomination of Grace Church, Mt. Airy, for inclusion on the National Register. He explained the church's significance as a characteristic example of Late Victorian Gothic architecture, and its importance as an historic representation of the communities religious and demographic make-up. asked the Commission to recommend the nomination.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve recommending Grace Church for the National Register. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The Report of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, September 1997, Richard Tyler.

Mr. Tyler explained that the usual two-to-three-week interval between Committee and Commission meetings is shortened to one week at least one time each year, owing to the last tuesday falling on the 30th or 31st. He commended the staff for working extra hard during the difficult first week of October.

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob