

**THE MINUTES OF THE 551ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 JULY 2008
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn, AIA
Leslie Benoliel
Della Clark
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Robert Thomas, AIA

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Shirley Turpin, Tindley Temple
Thomas Clark, DAS Architects
Craig Mosmen, Couch Tomato
Robert Torres, Studio Torres
Louis Acciavatti
C. Neil Peterson, SEPTA
Peter Knight
Sophie Bryan, Councilman Green's Office
Seth Levi, Councilman Green's Office
Sandi Bivens Anderson, Tindley Temple
Monique DeLapenha
Rob Goldstein
Kimiko Doherty, PCPC
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Linda Carafiello
Melanie DuPree, Tindley Temple
Jean McCoubrey, Runyan & Associates
John P. Sarakra, Christ Ascension Lutheran Church
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Robert Snow, ALA
Lawrence Gilbert, Architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

John Johnstone
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Clark, Dillworth, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, Smyler, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 550TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 550th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 June 2008. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

Mr. Sherman summarized the need for a Committee on Legislation to vet the proposed interior amendment to the historic preservation ordinance.

Mr. Farnham suggested a timetable for the proposed committee. He stated that the committee would meet in late July and then report to the Commission at its meeting in August. He explained that the Commission must report to the City Planning Commission on the proposed amendment before the Planning Commission's meeting on 16 September. The Planning Commission would, in turn, make a recommendation to the City Council through the Mayor before its first meeting after the summer recess on 18 September. Mr. Farnham noted that the City Planning Commission has not scheduled a meeting for the month of August.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked two questions of clarification. He asked if the committee would hear public testimony during its deliberations. Ms. Smyler stated that she would propose a committee that would. He then asked if the committee would review the ordinance in its entirety or solely the proposed interiors amendment. Ms. Smyler stated that she would propose an ad hoc committee to review the interiors amendment, not a standing committee to review the entire ordinance. Mr. Dillworth asked for clarification. Mr. Sherman stated that the committee under consideration would be an ad hoc, not standing, committee.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to establish an ad hoc Committee on Legislation to review the proposed Interiors amendment to the historic preservation ordinance and make non-binding recommendations to the Commission. The Committee shall consist of Commissioners Amburn, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, Smyler, Thomas, and Wilds, who shall elect a chair. Three members shall constitute a quorum. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 27 JUNE 2008

Richardson Dilworth III, Chair

SHAWMONT TRAIN STATION

Owner: SEPTA

Nominator: Robert A. Goldstein and John Johnstone

Proposal: Designate building

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination should be amended to clarify the Strickland attribution and that Shawmont Station satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, G, H, I, and J, and that Shawmont Station should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the designation of the Shawmont Train Station, which stands near the Schuylkill River in the Roxborough section of the city. The station, which is no longer in operation, stands beside the R6 Regional Rail line, which was originally part of the Philadelphia, Germantown & Norristown Railroad. The line was run from Philadelphia to Norristown in the early 1830s. The station may be one of the oldest in the country. The nomination contends that Shawmont Station satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, E, G, H, and J. The Committee on Historic Designation suggested that Criterion I be included as well.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application. John Johnston and Robert Goldstein represented the nomination.

MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and to direct the staff to amend the nomination to clarify the Strickland attribution, to find that Shawmont Station satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, G, H, I, and J, to designate Shawmont Station as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion. Ms. Smyler withdrew her second and recused owing to her membership on SEPTA's board, the property owner. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion.

C. Neil Peterson, an attorney representing SEPTA, stated that his client does not believe that the Historical Commission has the legal authority to designate SEPTA properties. He also stated that the station could be rehabilitated through a long term lease between SEPTA and the City. He explained that the station is no longer used as a stop. He noted that SEPTA is concerned about the proximity of the station to the tracks and would like to move the building away from the tracks. However, he noted that SEPTA has no plan to do so at this time. He reiterated his earlier suggestion of a long term lease for this site, which would serve SEPTA and the interested parties.

Ms. Merriman asked the staff to comment on the Commission's involvement with SEPTA properties in the past. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission has designated numerous SEPTA properties including the Queen Lane, Tulpehocken, Upsal, Carpenter, Allen Lane, St. Martin, and Chestnut Hill West Stations on the R8 line, Graver's Lane Station on the R7 line, and Overbrook Farms Station on the R6 line. The Commission has reviewed several applications for rehabilitation projects for the stations. For example, the Commission recently reviewed and approved proposals to rehabilitate the Queen Lane and Allen Lane Stations without any disputes over jurisdiction. He stated that, as far as he knows, until now, SEPTA has never contested the Commission's jurisdiction over the stations. Mr. Peterson stated that SEPTA has recently contested the Commission's jurisdiction over track areas. Mr. Thomas

reported that he had chaired a committee of the Commission to review applications for the track area on Germantown Avenue. He then asked if an entity like the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust could lease and rehabilitate the station. Mr. Peterson stated that, if not leased to a municipality, the property must go through a competitive bidding process and then could be leased to the highest bidder. Mr. Peterson noted that the Cynwyd Station in Lower Merion Township had been recently leased to the municipality and that the township was undertaking a major restoration of the station for use as part of the biking and hiking trails. Mr. Thomas objected to the suggestion of moving the station away from the tracks and asserted that it could be made safe.

Mr. Peterson acknowledged that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has jurisdiction over SEPTA, but again asserted that the local Commission does not. Mr. Reuter stated that he was not aware of any state law exempting SEPTA from the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission has designated several track areas in streets as part of its historic street paving thematic district. The Commission has reviewed a few applications for track area paving projects, most recently Germantown and Chester Avenues. In 2005, the Commission denied a SEPTA proposal for the removal of historic street paving in the track area on the 4200 to 4800 blocks of Chester Avenue. Last year, SEPTA began the Chester Avenue project despite the Commission's denial. Ultimately, the City Solicitor settled a lawsuit with SEPTA, allowing the denied Chester Avenue project to proceed owing to safety concerns; however, the City did not concede that the Commission was without jurisdiction over the track area as part of that settlement. Mr. Reuter contended that the Commission's jurisdiction over track areas, or lack thereof, is not analogous to its jurisdiction over buildings. Mr. Peterson agreed that Mr. Farnham's representation of the resolution of the dispute over Chester Avenue was accurate. Nonetheless, he stated that SEPTA reserves the right to make the jurisdictional argument.

John Johnstone asserted that the station is much less dangerous than the bike path that crosses the tracks. He was opposed to moving the building. He submitted two maps, from 1843 and 1877.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the nomination and expressed his appreciation to Robert A. Goldstein and John Johnstone for preparing it.

ACTION: Acting on the motion of Ms. Merriman and Mr. Schaaf, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and to direct the staff to amend the nomination to clarify the Strickland attribution, to find that Shawmont Station satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, G, H, I, and J, to designate Shawmont Station as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

750-762 S. BROAD STREET, TINDLEY TEMPLE

Owner: Tindley Temple

Nominator: Tindley Leadership Committee

Proposal: Designate building

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that Tindley Temple United Methodist Church at 750-762 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, E, J, and H and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

OVERVIEW: Tindley Temple United Methodist Church at 750-762 S. Broad Street is a religious institution with a long legacy service in the South Philadelphia community. The Ballinger Company designed the church building in the Renaissance Early Church style and it was built in 1924. The church was founded by and named for Dr. Charles Albert Tindley, who is recognized as the "Father of Gospel Music." Among his many compositions is "We Shall Overcome," a hymn that was adopted by the Civil Rights Movement and other protest movements in the mid twentieth century. The nomination contends that Tindley Temple satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, E, H, and J.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the nomination. Sandi Bivens Anderson of Tindley Temple United Methodist Church represented the nomination.

Mr. Schaaf remarked that the church is very important historically. He stated that not only had its founder, Dr. Charles Albert Tindley, written the very significant hymn "We Shall Overcome," which is arguably the most important protest song of the twentieth century, but also Dr. Martin Luther King had spoken at the church. Sandi Bivens Anderson, who authored the nomination and represented the church, interrupted Mr. Schaaf and corrected that the church is very important, but Dr. King never spoke there. She also noted that Marian Anderson was not a member of the congregation as many think; however, she did sing at the church many times. She also confirmed that the founder did write "We Shall Overcome." Mr. Schaaf noted that the church still holds great historical significance.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the nomination and stated that the church is representative of the great achievements of Philadelphia's African-American community in the early twentieth century.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that Tindley Temple United Methodist Church at 750-762 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, E, J, and H, to designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2008

David Amburn, Chair

2535 S. 19TH STREET

Owner/Applicant: Matthew & Linda Carrafiello

History: 1909, John Windrim, architect, contributing to Girard Estate district

Project: demolish fence, install parking

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to add parking to this corner property. The owners propose to remove the existing hairpin fence and create a curb cut and parking space. The Commission has denied similar applications in the Girard Estate Historic District in the past.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Property owner Linda Carafiello represented the application.

Ms. Carrafiello rejected the Committee's suggestion that she and her husband seek a disabled parking space on the street to overcome her concerns about safety and her desire for convenience. Ms. Carrafiello adamantly rebuffed the suggestion, stating that neither she nor her husband would feign a disability to obtain a parking space. She also rejected the Committee's claim that her proposed driveway would eliminate a public parking space on the street. She asked for an explanation of the Standards cited in the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Baron read the cited Standards to Ms. Carrafiello.

Ms. Carrafiello asserted that only 20% of the hairpin fence would be removed to install the parking space. Ms. Leonard asked if the staff had recommended denial solely owing to the removal of the hairpin fence. Mr. Baron replied that the removal of the fence was only part of the reason for the denial. He stated that the primary reason for recommending denial was the adverse impact on the open, green character of the historic district. Mr. Dilworth asked how this driveway application differed from the other one on the agenda, for which the staff had recommended approval of one off-street parking space. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission had already approved one off-street parking space for the property involved in the other application. Mr. Farnham stated that there was a more important reason. He explained that the Statement of Significance of the Girard Estate Historic District specifically identifies the open green space as part of the district's significance. He elaborating, stating that Girard Estate is historically significant because it was an experimental proposal for an alternative form of development to the typical rowhouse form, which includes little or no green space. Mr. Farnham clarified that the other application proposes parking for a site in the Society Hill Historic District, which differs from the Girard Estate Historic District. The Society Hill District is not significant for its open space. Each application is reviewed on a case-by-case basis; not every site is identical. Ms. Carrafiello contended that her proposal would maintain the green space.

Mr. Schaaf asked the applicant if she had the approval of the Streets Department yet. Ms. Carrafiello stated that she had not yet submitted an application to the Streets Department; the Commission was her first stop in the regulatory process. She contended that turning an automobile from Shunk Street into the space would be possible. Ms. Carrafiello asserted that many of her neighbors have parking spaces. Ms. Smyler asked if the Commission had approved them. Mr. Baron responded that he knew of no off-street parking spaces approved by the Commission for Girard Estate. He posited that the parking spaces were either installed before the district was designated or were added illegally without the Commission's approval.

Mr. Reuter explained to the applicant and Commission that the designation of this property includes the building as well as its site and appurtenances. He noted that a recent appeal confirmed that the Commission has the legal authority to review changes to sites and appurtenances including the removal of fences and the installation of driveways.

Mr. Thomas asked if the applicant had considered one of the communal garages at Girard Estate. Ms. Carrafiello stated that none were available.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote 9 to 2. Messrs. Mattioni and Dilworth dissented.

102 RECTOR STREET

Owner/Applicant: Craig Mosmen

History: c.1840, altered c. 1905

Project: Demolish rear shed, construct three-story addition, replace front windows and door

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to expand the restaurant in this double house into the second and third stories. The rear shed would be demolished and a three-story addition would be attached at the rear. The rear addition would be taller than the existing building and would be minimally visible from the side, as this is a corner building. On the rear façade, windows would be closed and ductwork would be run up the rear wall. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to install a new door and single-light rectangular windows. The historic windows would have been two-over-two, segmental-arched sash.

The staff suggests that the rear addition should be revised to sit below the existing rear cornice and set back from the side wall, to allow the original building shape to be read. The additional height for the stair could be accomplished with a rear dormer.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused because his son represents the applicant in other matters. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney William O'Brien, restaurateur Craig Mosmen, and contractor David White represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien stated that five issues remain outstanding. He reported that his client will install the correct windows on the Rector Street façade. He reported that his client will also install more appropriate, lower skylights. He also noted that his client will reduce the height of the stair tower so that it connects with the slope of the existing roof. He also stated that the HVAC equipment will be moved to the one-story structure. He then remarked that his client is unable to reduce the width of the stair tower, allowing it to be set back from the side façade. He claimed that the width of the stair tower is necessary to satisfy the building code. He added that reducing the width would necessitate the reconfiguring the entire kitchen. He suggested that it could be faced in a different material to differentiate it from the historic building. Mr. O'Brien stated that the last issue is the rear ductwork for the ventilation. He asserted that the Commission already approved the existing ductwork. He contended that the additional ductwork would not be visible from any public right-of-way. He added that the ductwork cannot be reconfigured to be run inside. It would render a restroom unusable.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the architect is out of the country and will not return for several weeks. Ms. Merriman stated that she was not comfortable considering the application with the revisions outstanding and undocumented. She suggested that the Architectural Committee have an opportunity to review a revised application. Mr. Sherman suggested tabling the application. Other Commissioners suggested denying the application without prejudice and allowing the applicant to present the revised application to the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

715-717 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: WSC 717 Associates LP

Applicant: Anthony Ciocca

History: Paul Cret, architect, built 1923 for Integrity Trust Company

Project: façade alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided a bronze finish is substituted for the nickel, the canopy lighting is off-white and does not change color, the first-floor windows are double-hung two-over-two windows as shown in the 10 June 2008 drawing, the masonry door opening is not altered, and the flagpole does not penetrate the facade of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of this former bank turned jewelry store into a restaurant. The application proposes installing a new door and transom as well as first-floor windows based on an historic photograph. The windows are shown as a single-hung rather than double-hung. The step at the door would be cut down to allow handicap access to an interior ramp. A canopy would project from the doorway. Signs on the canopy would have pin-on lettering. Light pylons would stand away from the building and light the newly restored masonry. A thirty-foot-long banner would hang from the existing flagpole.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman and architect Thomas Clark represented the application.

Mr. Reuter asked the staff to confirm the address of the subject property, which appears in different forms on the numerous application documents. Mr. Feldman clarified that the Bureau of Revision of Taxes lists the address as 715-717 Chestnut street.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance observed that the ongoing restoration is excellent, but will be marred by the inappropriate canopy now proposed. He asserted that the canopy would be nothing more than a sign. He pointed out a historical photograph that depicts a handsome side panel with bronze lettering, which would be more in keeping with the historic building. Mr. Gallery stated that Jones, the restaurant across the street, has only subtle signage. He asserted that customers come for the food, service, and ambience, not the signage. He asked that, if the Commission elects to approve the canopy, then it should require an alteration to the design; it should require the lighted canopy, which would glow, to be opaque. He asserted that a glowing canopy would not be in character with the historic building. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Gallery, stating that the façade is very significant; a simple canopy with metal letters would be appropriate. Mr. Feldman described the history of the building, which had a non-historic marble cladding dating to the 1960s at the first-floor front façade. He reported that this \$7 to \$10 million

project includes the full restoration of the façade. He displayed samples of the canopy material, which is intended to provide a subtle lighting effect. He said that the canopy is intended to provide protection in inclement weather for patrons waiting on the valets. Mr. Sherman asked if the canopy installation would be reversible. Mr. Clark stated that the installation would be reversible. Mr. Feldman stated that the canopy will project 4'-6" over the sidewalk. He added that he consulted with the Streets Department. Mr. Clark explained that the canopy would not glow harshly; the LED lighting would provide a subtle lighting.

Mr. Baron pointed out that the application includes large rooftop mechanical units. Ms. Leonard asked the applicant about the location of the equipment. Mr. Clark stated that they would be located at the rear of the building on the roof and would not be visible from Chestnut Street.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided a bronze finish is substituted for the nickel, the canopy lighting is off-white and does not change color, the first-floor windows are double-hung two-over-two windows as shown in the 10 June 2008 drawing, the masonry door opening is not altered, and the flagpole does not penetrate the facade of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6. Ms. Clark seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

832-36 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Masada Custom Builders

Applicant: Isaac Ohayon

History: 1846-8, William Johnston, architect built for Central Presbyterian Church

Project: restore fence/create two car parking

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided planting beds are substituted for the planters, and the height of the fence lowered, and the fence has the same secondary posts throughout, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the reconstruction of the front fence based on historic photographs and the installation of gates and a two-car parking area. The front yard will be landscaped. The Commission approved a telescoping gate and single-car parking for the building in September 2006. The staff contends that the parking should be limited to a single car in front of the side addition, not the historic building. Two-car parking would require parking in front of the historic church building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Amburn recused owing to past involvement with this developer and property. Mr. Baron presented the application. Developer Isaac Ohayon represented the application.

Mr. Dilworth asked again about the difference between this application and the earlier parking application. Mr. Farnham replied that Girard Estate Historic District was designated, in part, because of its open green spaces; Society Hill Historic District was not.

Mr. Ohayon claimed that he is having difficulty selling this \$4 million rehabilitation because it does not have any parking. He stated that he is willing to recreate the original fence. Mr. Schaaf objected to the operation of the gate, which would open into the pedestrian pathway and would preclude circulation. He suggested that a telescoping gate would be preferable. Mr. Ohayan asserted that a telescoping gate would be dangerous. He stated that the proposed gate would only swing 4'-6" into the sidewalk and would stop immediately when touched.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the motion of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided planting beds are substituted for the planters, and the height of the fence lowered, and the fence has the same secondary posts throughout, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 5 to 5. Mses. Benoliel and Leonard and Messrs. Dilworth, Sherman, and Thomas dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the staff recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the parking is limited to a single vehicle at the western edge of the lot, in front of the side addition, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Benoliel seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 4. Mses. Merriman and Smyler and Messrs. Schaaf and Sherman dissented. Mr. Mattioni abstained.

2 RECTOR STREET

Owner: Main Street Properties LLC

Applicant: James C. Campbell, AIA

History: Designated: Manayunk Historic District 12/14/1983

Project: Deck, ADA ramp, signage, and widow alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the ramp is open and metal to expose the basement windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to PM-704.2.7.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a deck that will extend out over the tow path of the Manayunk Canal. A concrete ramp is proposed to run along the Rector Street façade to access the deck. It would occlude two basement openings. Also, two windows would be cut down on the canal façade for access from the restaurant to the deck. These doors would have transoms reflective of the original windows. Lastly, this application proposes to relocate the restaurant sign two bays closer to Main Street on the Rector Street façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas recused owing to his firm's involvement with the application. Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and business owner Sean Coyle represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked when the renovated establishment would open. Mr. Campbell replied that it would open as soon as possible. He added that he has been working with the Fairmount Park Commission for more than one year.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the ramp is open and metal to expose the basement windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to PM-704.2.7. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

8300 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Christ Ascension Lutheran Church

Applicant: Jean McCoubrey

History: church c.1870, parish house 1907, individually designated 8/2/1973

Project: Install ADA ramp

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the door to the church, owing to incompleteness; approval of the ramp for the parish house with the option of reusing the existing steps, provided the existing doors and hardware are used with push-button operation, the ramp is widened to allow for the door swing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut a door for ADA access at the rear of the church building. Also, a ramp is proposed for the parish house. This ramp will be clad in Wissahickon schist and will have a metal railing. Lastly, a single-leaf door that replicates the original double-leaf door of the parish house is proposed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Jean McCoubrey and Pastor John Saraka represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the door to the church, owing to incompleteness; approve the ramp for the parish house with the option of reusing the existing steps, provided the existing doors and hardware are used with push-button operation and the ramp is widened to allow for the door swing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Ms. Leonard asked if the steps will be removed. Mr. Amburn replied that the steps must be removed to build a new foundation, but should be retained on site. Ms. McCoubrey stated that the steps will be reused if possible. She reported that the landing and ramp will be concrete for cost reasons. She distributed a new plan for the door in the parish house. She explained that it is currently a double-leaf door; each leaf is only 22" wide. She stated that the daycare center in the parish house requires a wider entrance door. She is now proposing a single-leaf door that looks like a double-leaf door. Ms. McCoubrey stated that she has researched the possibility of an electronic closer on the double-leaf door. She concluded that such a system would not be feasible, owing to the Gothic arch shape of the door.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Ms. Smyler and Merriman withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the door to the church, owing to incompleteness; approve the ramp for the parish house with the option of reusing the existing steps, provided the existing doors and hardware are used with push-button operation and the ramp is widened to allow for the door swing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the historic strap hinges should be retained. Ms. McCoubrey countered that reinstalling the hinges would conflict visually with the operation of the door. Mr. Sherman advocated for the retention of the straps. Mr. Thomas explained that the Standards suggest the retention of hardware when a double-leaf door is converted to a single-leaf door. Ms. McCoubrey agreed to retain and reuse the hardware.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to deny the door for the church, owing to incompleteness; approve the ramp for the parish house, the conversion of the double-leaf to a single-leaf

door with the retention and reuse of the historic door hardware, and the removal of the steps with the option of reusing them, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

106-108 AND 110 GRAPE STREET

Owner: Daniel Neducsin; Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: 110 Grape Street is contributing, 106-108 Grape Street is an intrusion in the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District

Project: Demolish two buildings and construct a four-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: The structure at 106-108 Grape Street is an early twentieth-century, one-story brick garage with gabled parapet. It is listed as an intrusion in the National Register Historic District. The building at 110 Grape Street is a three-story row house, constructed in the 1830s, and is listed as contributing in the district. The house retains its cornice and storefront moldings at the first story, chimney, and original window frames and sills.

An earlier iteration of this application proposed the demolition of the two buildings and the construction of a four-story building. The building would have been constructed of brick with a center two-story bay and two-over-two windows. The first-story would have had commercial storefronts. In April 2008, the Commission denied the application, but approved in-concept the demolition of the non-contributing, three-bay garage at 106-108 Grape Street.

The applicant now proposes to demolish 106-108 and 110 Grape Street and to construct a four-story building. The building would be constructed of brick with a center two-story bay and 2-over-2 windows. The first story would have commercial storefronts. The fourth story would be setback about 5'-6" from the front façade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Architect Robert Torres represented the application. Ms. Sell introduced a letter of support from the Manayunk Development Corporation.

MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion.

Mr. Dilworth acknowledged he had not read the Manayunk Ordinance, but assumed that the historic district was created to preserve the historical nature of Manayunk. He asserted that Manayunk is a high-density, former industrial area built prior to the introduction of automobiles. He contended that the proposed development would fulfill the intent of the district more than a streetscape with four garage doors, even if one of the buildings is historic and contributing. He stated the proposal will increase density and street traffic and thereby fulfill the presumed objective of the district. Mr. Baron categorically rejected Mr. Dilworth's assumption that the goal of the historic district is to increase density and traffic. He stated that the goal is simple, to preserve historic fabric. One of the two buildings proposed for demolition is considered contributing in the district. It can not be demolished to increase density and traffic, which are outside the Commission's purview. He elaborated, explaining that the Manayunk district has

three distinct sections, the industrial buildings and warehouses along the water, the commercial spaces along Main Street, and residential area between Main Street and the railroad tracks. He stated that the house proposed for demolition dates to early nineteenth century and is typical of Manayunk's residential history. He concluded that the Commission has already denied a proposal to demolish this house, which could and should be restored. He added that the Commission has already agreed that the non-contributing garage could be demolished and the site redeveloped. Mr. Danta rejected Mr. Dilworth's suggestion as well, asserting that the Commission cannot allow the demolition of an historic building in exchange for a new building that would merely enhance the street traffic. Mr. Thomas agreed with Messrs. Baron and Danta and stated that the Commission is charged with preserving historic fabric. It cannot make that sort of trade-off. He observed that, if the applicant is claiming that retaining the contributing building is not feasible, then he should submit a hardship application to the Commission.

Mr. Torres reported that his project has the support of the Manayunk Development Corporation and the Manayunk Neighborhood Council. He stated that he has met with the community group on several occasions. He stated that the historic house is in poor condition. The upper floors are useless and the building is deteriorating. The ground floor is a garage. The basement is filled in with a concrete slab. The building is braced internally. The initial submission included a letter from a structural engineer describing the work necessary to rehabilitate the structure. He claimed that the house could not be reused easily.

Mr. Sherman asked if the applicant he had considered submitting a financial hardship application. Mr. Torres replied that he had not yet considered that option. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance contended that, unlike the City's historic preservation ordinance, the Manayunk Ordinance does not authorize the Commission to consider hardship when reviewing demolition applications. Therefore, the Commission cannot require the submission of a financial hardship application before considering the demolition request. Mr. Farnham adamantly disagreed. He informed the Commission that the Manayunk Ordinance requires owners to rehabilitate buildings whenever "possible." It leaves the determination of possibility to the Commission. It is completely within the discretion of the Commission to decide that the hardship process is the best means of gauging the possibility or feasibility of a rehabilitation. The mandate of the Committee on Financial Hardship is to determine whether rehabilitations are reasonable or feasible. The Manayunk Ordinance does not require a finding of hardship or public necessity for the Commission to approve a demolition, but, more importantly, it does not prohibit such tests. The Commission has great discretion in this area. Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Reuter to confirm his assertions. Mr. Reuter responded, saying that Mr. Gallery was correct in asserting that the Manayunk Ordinance does not, per se, require a hardship finding before a demolition can be approved. However, he agreed with Mr. Farnham that the Commission has the discretion to determine how best to evaluate demolition applications in the Manayunk district. The Commission would be within its discretion to forward this application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Baron noted for the record that the Commission does not have a financial hardship application before it for this project. Mr. Sherman noted that the Commission could deny the application, but leave the financial hardship option open if the applicant elected to pursue it. Mr. Mattioni suggested that, rather than sending the application to another committee, the Commission should decide the issue, perhaps with additional information provided by the staff. He suggested tabling the application and directing the staff to investigate the deteriorated conditions.

Mr. Gallery asserted that the word "demolition" does not appear in the Manayunk Ordinance; that Ordinance does not provide any criteria for the Commission to determine whether a building can be demolished. He stated that whether exterior features can or cannot be repaired is not

equivalent to financial hardship under the historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Gallery contended that the Manayunk Ordinance should be revised. He tried previously to have the Manayunk Ordinance amended, but was unsuccessful in convincing the Manayunk Development Corporation or Manayunk Neighborhood Council to agree to any revisions, so it was not changed. He asked that the record reflect that he contends that this design is out of character with Manayunk. Mr. Reuter replied that the Manayunk Ordinance does not mention hardship, but it does mention demolition. He stated that hardship and feasibility of repair are, essentially, commensurate. He asserted that the question is not whether something can be repaired—anything can be repaired at a price—but whether it is feasible or reasonable to repair it. He noted that there is a hardship under the historic preservation ordinance if a building cannot be reasonably adapted, i.e. it cannot be repaired in a feasible manner. He concluded that the possibility of repair is always an economic question. Providing the hardship path is a reasonable accommodation and a reasonable interpretation of the Manayunk Ordinance.

ACTION: By a vote of 9 to 2, the Commission adopted the motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and Mr. Schaaf to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Messrs. Mattioni and Dilworth dissented.

1534 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Monique DeLapenha

Applicant: Monique DeLapenha

History: 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize window installation and brick pointing

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows on the façade and destructive brick pointing on the west elevation. The April 2001 designation photograph shows two-over-two windows in all window openings but one. The appropriate windows are two-over-two, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash. The vinyl windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the applications. Property owner Monique DeLapenha represented the application.

The Commission agreed to discuss the applications for 1534, 1732, and 1734 Mt. Vernon Street together because the properties are owned by the same person and the issues raised by the applications are very similar. The Commission also agreed to act separately on each application.

Ms. DeLapenha, the property owner, stated that, when she purchased the properties, she obtained City Certifications, which did not indicate that there were any violations on the properties. She stated that she received the violations after purchasing the buildings even though some of the work was undertaken by the previous owners. Ms. DeLapenha displayed photographs of a neighboring building that has similar vinyl windows and claimed that she was being singled out for enforcement. She reported that she is an attorney and knows that the law should be applied consistently.

Mr. Sherman stated that the buildings are all in the Spring Garden Historic District, which was created in 2000. He asserted that the previous owners were notified of the designations and Commission's jurisdiction, but elected not to comply with the law. He contended that the Commission could not legalize illegal alterations merely because they were undertaken by former owners. He stated that new owners inherit the misdeeds of earlier owners.

Mr. Thomas stated that, in his work as an architect, he sees this situation frequently. He informed the Commission that the City Certification simply reports violations that were open at the time of the certification. It does not certify whether the property is free of non-compliant conditions, but only whether violations were outstanding or open at the time the certification was conducted. He stated that a City Certification does not immunize a property owner against the potential for later violations. He counseled that the property owner should have hired a qualified building inspector to inspect the property for non-compliance before she purchased it. Ms. DeLapenha replied that she did hire a building inspector, who found nothing. Mr. Thomas stated that she should seek compensation from the prior owners for the illegal work that they undertook. Ms. DeLapenha stated that it was too late to seek compensation from the prior owners. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission requests that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations as the Commission becomes aware of the illegal work.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated he was familiar with cases in which the Commission has denied illegal work undertaken by the current owner, but never when the work was undertaken by a former owner. Several Commissioners and staff members replied that the Commission has reviewed and denied numerous legalization applications when the work had been undertaken by former owners. They also noted that, in these cases, the current owner did perform some of the work in question.

Mr. Farnham stated that it was entirely unreasonable to think that a mere change in ownership would clear all illegal conditions created by a former owner. If a change in ownership alone was enough to clear all violations on a property, the City could never be able to enforce any violations. He noted that zoning and building code violations are not simply cleared when the property ownership changes. A City Certification indicates the violations that are on the books at the time of the certification, but it in no way absolves a new owner the requirement of compliance. Mr. Thomas noted that some municipalities like Yeadon undertake a complete inspection at the time of sale; however, Philadelphia does not. The buyer must either verify compliance or accept the risk that a building may be out of compliance. Mr. Sherman stated that the windows and other alteration undertaken without permits or the Commission's approval were clearly in violation.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1732 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Monique DeLapenha

Applicant: Monique DeLapenha

History: 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize window installation

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows on the façade. The February 2001 designation photograph shows one-over-one windows on the first story and four-over-four windows on the second and third stories. The appropriate windows are four-over-four, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash. The vinyl windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell noted that the application was discussed during the review of the 1534 Mt. Vernon Street application.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1734 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Monique DeLapenha

Applicant: Monique DeLapenha

History: 1859; Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000, contributing.

Project: Legalize window installation

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows in the bay on the façade. The February 2001 designation photograph shows one-over-one windows on the first story and two-story bay and four-over-four windows on the second and third stories. The appropriate windows are four-over-four, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash. The bay would have had one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash. The vinyl windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell noted that the application was discussed during the review of the 1534 Mt. Vernon Street application.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

610 ADDISON STREET

Owner: David Blunt and Mark Woodland

Applicant: Julia L. Scott

History: 1995, contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/99

Project: Enclose roof deck and alter window opening

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear addition and chimney modifications, but denial of the alteration to the front window, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an existing rear roof deck, raise the rear chimney height, and change the oculus on the front façade into a square window for emergency egress.

This building is one in a row of four identical post-modern twins constructed within the Society Hill Historic District. Currently, the chimney height is three stories. Enclosing the third-story deck would require the chimney height to be raised one story. 604-606 Addison Street currently have four-story chimneys, whereas 608-610 have three-story chimneys. Enclosing the rear deck would also require the alteration of the oculus window as a means of emergency egress.

The facades of this row were designed as mirroring twins. Altering the oculus would disrupt the congruency of the row and have an adverse effect on the streetscape.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Amburn recused owing to his relationship with the applicant. Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Commission noted that the applicant was not present. Ms. Sell explained that the applicant had considered withdrawing the application, but did not. She also noted that the applicant accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the rear addition and chimney modifications, but deny the alteration to the front window, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

100 LOMBARD STREET

Owner / Applicant: Anh Thai & Peter Knight

History: c. 1970, contributing to the Society Hill Historic District

Project: Install front door

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a front door in an original open vestibule. Most of the buildings in the row have security gates. The applicant proposes to remove his existing security gate and install a solid wood door with three glazed porthole windows at the plane of the security gate, not the plane of the original door.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Peter Knight represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal. Ms. Clark seconded the motion.

Mr. Schaaf stated that he likes the proposed door, but feels that it is inappropriate for this building. Mr. Thomas agreed that it is not in character with the building and therefore appears incongruous. Mr. Knight offered to redesign the door to appease the Commission. Several Commission members suggested that the applicant present a revised design for the door to the Commission. Mr. Knight offered to replace the panel with the three "portholes" with a single pane of glass. Several Commission members opined that that solution would be appropriate for the Modernist building.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Dilworth and Ms. Clark withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to table the application to the 8 August 2008 meeting of the Commission. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1837-55 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Tom McCreesh

History: c. 1890

Project: Install louvers

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear louver, but denial of the removal of the stained glass window and installation of a louver, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two louvers on the exterior of the Baptist Temple. One louver would be located at the rear of the building in an arched window opening. The other louver would be located on the side of the building, and would require the removal of an original rose window.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Several Commission members concluded that it would not be appropriate to remove the character-defining stained glass window.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the rear louver, but deny the removal of the stained glass window and installation of a louver, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1723 PORTER STREET

Owner: Louis & Maryann Acciavatti

Applicant: Liz Pisano

History: Built c. 1910, Girard Estate Historic District

Project: Legalize rear addition, and restore front façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the legalization of the rear addition, provided the front façade is fully restored, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a rear addition, provided the front façade is fully restored. The current owner purchased the property in 2003. In November 2003, he submitted an application to the Commission for the construction of a two-story rear addition. The Commission approved it. However, the rear addition was not built according to the approved plans; it was constructed taller than the historic building even though the plans showed it as the same height as the historic building. Violations were issued because the addition was taller than approved. The applicant then submitted an application seeking to legalize other revisions to the approved design of the rear addition, but not the change in height. The Commission approved the other revisions in August 2004. The applicant submitted yet another application, this time to legalize the change in height, in February 2006. The Commission denied that application. The applicant appealed the denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review and then the Court of Common Pleas, but lost both appeals. The owner now proposes to legalize the rear addition as constructed in exchange for the restoration of the front façade of the building. The façade restoration would be based on historic photographs and surviving fabric on the building. The rehabilitation has been stalled and the building has been vacant for several years; the best way to ensure the long-term preservation of the building is to promote the completion of the rehabilitation and the occupancy of the building. The public primarily experiences this building through its front façade; its restoration would enhance the historic district. The rear addition faces an alley that is the northern border of the historic district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner and contractor Louis Acciavatti and architect Lawrence Gilbert represented the proposal.

Mr. Gilbert explained that he did not prepare the original plans, which were inconsistent. He stated that he recently joined the project to plan the restoration of the front façade to its original condition. Mr. Amburn explained to the Commission that it had approved a rear addition for this property that was the same height as the historic building, but then the addition was constructed 11" taller than the historic building. Mr. Amburn explained that the plans prepared by an earlier architect and approved by the Commission had been inconsistent. In elevation, the plans showed an addition that was the same height as the historic building; however, a detail drawing showing only the addition dimensioned the height of the addition as 11" taller than the historic building. It was built according to the detail drawing. Mr. Acciavatti stated that he built the addition according to the dimensions on the detail drawing, not the overall elevation.

Mr. Reuter noted that the Commission had previously denied the legalization of the taller addition. He explained that the owner had appealed the Commission's denial and lost at both the Board of License & Inspection Review and Court of Common Pleas. Ms. Merriman asked why the Commission had not been apprised of this history. Mr. Danta stated that it was summarized in the overview in the Architectural Committee minute.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Reuter how the Commission could ensure that the addition would not be legalized until the front restoration was completed to the Commission's satisfaction. Mr.

Reuter explained that the restoration could be included as a condition of the legalization permit. Therefore, the addition could not be legalized and the permit closed until the condition, the restoration of the front, was satisfied. The Commission asked Mr. Acciavatti how long it would take him to complete the project. Mr. Acciavatti pledged that the project would be complete within one year. Mr. Danta stated that he would track the project to verify that it was completed in one year.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the legalization of the rear addition, provided the front façade is fully restored, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701-09 ARCH STREET

Owner / Applicant: 1701 Partners, LP

History: c. 1915, Ballinger & Perrot, architect/engineers

Project: Install storefronts

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of Option One, the structural glazed curtain wall with an applied rounded corner cap, with the staff to review the details.

OVERVIEW: This application presents two proposals for the installation of storefronts. The original storefronts are only known through photographs, and it is difficult to assess whether the existing remnants are original or date to the expansion of the building. The applicant proposes two alternatives. Option One would be a glazed curtain wall system that closely matches the historic dimensions, and is able to incorporate a recreated bronze trim piece molding. Option Two is a thicker square post aluminum storefront system that would recreate neither the dimensions nor trim of the historic remnants found on the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Preservation consultant Robert Powers and architect Robert Snow represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained to the Commission there was a typographical error in the original printing of the recommendation; the Architectural Committee had recommended Option One, a structurally glazed curtain wall within an applied rounded corner cap, with staff to review details, not Option Three. He stated that the applicant has submitted a revised drawing based on the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve Option Three, the structural glazed curtain wall with an applied rounded corner cap, with the staff to review the details. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Sherman and seconded by Mr. Schaaf, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn to executive session at 12:32 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

PM-704.2 Historic area standards: Standards within the designated historic area shall be as set forth in Sections PM-704.2.1 through PM-704.2.7 in addition to the requirements of Sections PM-704.1 through PM-704.1.4.2.

PM-704.2.1 Permit: No building or portion of the exterior thereof within the historic district shall hereafter be constructed, altered, repaired, demolished, or partially demolished unless a permit has first been obtained from the Department.

PM-704.2.2 Approval: All applications for such permits shall be forwarded by the Department to the Historical Commission for review and approval, before issuance of the permit. No permit

shall be issued unless the proposed work has been approved by the Historical Commission staff as preserving the historical character of the district.

PM-704.2.3 Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed. Deteriorated features shall be repaired where possible. Replacement material where necessary shall duplicate the original as closely as possible.

PM-704.2.4 Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.

PM-704.2.5 Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.

PM-704.2.6 Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.

PM-704.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.