

**MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 2009
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Myra Eskin, Society Hill Civic Association
Andrew Hohns
Brian Phillips, Interface Studio Architects
Lorna Katz Lawson
Charles Tonetti, Independence Hall National Historical Park
Doris Fanelli, Independence Hall National Historical Park
Amanda Jones, National Park Service
Ben Weinraub, Vintage High-Rises
Peter Lazor, Lazor Design
Michael Loonstyn
Yao Huang, YCH Architect

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro, Evans, and McCoubrey joined him.

1718-20 NORTH STREET

Owner: Don Doyle

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1926; Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Demolish garage, construct three-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a garage that is classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, and construct a three-story building in its place. The applicant has neither claimed nor provided the documentation to support a claim that the building cannot be adaptively reused or that its demolition is necessary in the public interest. Rear sections of the building have collapsed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections has cited the building for Unsafe conditions, but the applicant has not claimed that the Department is requiring the demolition of the building to abate the Unsafe conditions. Also, the documentation of the proposed building is incomplete. The architectural plans consist of existing and proposed front elevations only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Loonstyn and architect Yao Huang represented the application.

Mr. Huang distributed a letter from a structural engineer regarding the condition of the building. He stated that the engineer had declared the building unsafe. He also distributed a revised drawing of the proposed front façade that specified brick as the primary material. He noted that the front façade of the proposed building would have a garage entrance in the center, as does the extant building. Mr. Loonstyn stated that the front façade of the building is bowed. He noted for the record that he has restored several buildings in the Spring Garden area. He stated, however, that he does not want to restore this building. He would like to demolish it and construct a new building.

Ms. Pentz, the structural engineer on the Committee, asked the applicants if their engineer believes that the building cannot be repaired. She noted that the engineer's letter does not explicitly state whether it can be repaired. Mr. Loonstyn said it was unclear whether it could be repaired. Mr. Evans stated that the applicant must provide the Committee with conclusive documentation regarding the feasibility of repair. He asserted that the Committee could not recommend approval of the demolition without better documentation. Ms. Pentz agreed, stating that nothing in the engineer's letter asserts that the building cannot be repaired; it only says that it is currently unsafe.

Mr. Evans remarked that the Committee should not comment on the proposed design until the demolition question is resolved. Mr. Huang replied that the new design will replicate the three-bay rhythm of the historic building. The new front façade will be constructed of brick. Mr. Evans responded that the Committee should not consider the new design. He contended that garages are historically significant on smaller streets in the Spring Garden Historic District; this building should be retained, not demolished. He suggested that the existing building could be expanded to meet the owner's programmatic goals. Mr. Amburn, the chair of the Committee, agreed. He noted again that the engineer's letter does not claim that the building cannot be saved. He suggested that the application should be deemed incomplete.

Mr. Loonstyn disagreed with the staff's recommendation that the application is incomplete. He asked the staff and Committee to explain its position. Ms. Cote explained that the Commission can approve the demolition of a Contributing building in a historic district in three situations only. First, a demolition application may be approved if it is proven with a hardship application that the building cannot be feasibly or reasonably adaptively reused. Second, a demolition application may be approved if it is demonstrated that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. Third, a demolition application may be approved if the Department of Licenses & Inspections finds that the building is Imminently Dangerous and the applicant demonstrates that the Imminently Dangerous condition cannot be abated without the demolition. She stated that the applicant has not met any of these three conditions. The Committee members agreed and also observed that the application materials for the proposed building are also entirely deficient. They noted that the applicants submitted drawings of the existing and proposed front facades only. They noted that a site plan, drawings of all elevations, and interior and roof plans as well as material samples should have been submitted. Mr. Amburn stated that the Committee has no option but to agree with the staff recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

2300 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Carol and Rafael Lissack

Applicant: Carol and Rafael Lissack

History: c. 1875; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the installation of vinyl window on all elevations of this corner building. There are several window types across the front, side, and rear elevations. Generally, the correct window type is wood in a one-over-one configuration with the appropriate casing.

This work was done without the approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspection. The Bureau Revision of Taxes classifies this building as containing five or more apartment units. Therefore, the property would require a building permit for window replacement regardless of its historic designation status. Section A-301.2.1.22 of the Philadelphia Building Construction and Occupancy Code exempts the replacement of non-fire-resistance rated windows and doors in one- and two-family dwellings without structural change from the standard building permit requirement. However, it does not exempt this building, which has more than five units, from the requirement. Moreover, Section A-301.2.1 explicitly states that historically designated buildings are not exempted from any building permit requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Amburn recused owing to his former business relationship with the property owners.

Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Farnham asked Ms. Sell to clarify which windows were out of compliance on this building. He noted that the applicants applied to legalize two windows only. Ms. Sell explained that windows on the front, side, and rear of the building have been replaced without permits or approvals since the designation. Ms. Pentz asked about the types of windows that were removed illegally. Ms. Sell stated that some were the original wood windows; others were replacement windows. Mr. Evans remarked that this building and block are attributed to Frank Furness, one of the city's most important nineteenth-century architects. Owing to their architectural significance, they deserve great care. Ms. Pentz asked her fellow Committee members if they would recommend approval of the replacement windows if they were proposed before installation, rather than after the fact. All asserted that they would not recommend approval of them because they do not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Messrs. D'Alessandro and Evans concluded that the Committee has no choice but to recommend denial of the windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

231 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Andrew Hohns

Applicant: Brian Phillips

History: c. 1763, restored 1965

Designated: 4/30/1957, Significant in the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Construct rear addition – In Concept

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to construct a rear addition on a Colonial-era house in the Society Hill Historic District. This Georgian-Style house was constructed in 1763 and it is listed as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District. The addition would be built over the existing rear ell. The applicant proposes two alternatives. Alternative One presents a massing separated from the main block of the house. The addition would be accessed by a hatch at the rear of the gambrel roof over the main block. Alternative Two proposes to connect the addition to the rear slope of the gambrel roof. The addition would be of contemporary design and would have no resemblance to the Georgian Style of the subject property.

The staff conducted map research to better understand the age and evolution of the property. The map evidence shows that the rear ell may be original. A rear ell on this property is shown as early as 1858. Furthermore, the 1961 Washington Square East Redevelopment Guidelines for this particular property, which are found in the property file, mention a rear ell and the demolition of a wood shed at the rear of the ell. The staff conducted a site visit to investigate the existing conditions and gain a better understanding of the property. The rear ell is very old and perhaps original.

The proposed addition does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for an alteration to a Colonial-era building classified as a Significant resource in the district. The addition would alter the spatial relationship between the ell and the main block of the house. The existing ell, regardless of its age, presents a typical Philadelphia half-gable configuration and it is a complementary element to this property and to the district. Furthermore, both options would require alterations to the rear slope of the gambrel; this alteration is not supported by the Standards, as this element is considered a character-defining feature of the property. Lastly, the addition would be visible from Locust Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Andrew Hohns and architect Brian Phillips represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Committee about his recent visit to the site. He provided photographs of the rear ell and its context. He stated that the ell is very old and may be original.

Mr. Hohns asserted that he appreciates his historic house. He claimed that the rear ell is not original, but was built before 1856. He stated that the end section of the ell was demolished in 1963. He explained that the RDA reduced the depth of the lot from 80' to 70' in 1958. He noted that a Palladian window was installed at that time in the end of the ell. Mr. Evans corrected that it is not a Palladian window, but is instead a bay window. A Palladian window is tripartite with an arched center section. Mr. Hohns stated that the deck on the ell is in poor condition and must be removed to allow the roof to be repaired.

Mr. Hohns turned his attention to the design of the addition. He stated that the addition could be easily removed at a later point in time. He claimed that Society Hill is vibrant and modern; it has embraced modernity. He stated that his proposed design does not replicate the style or appearance of the Colonial architecture or the Redevelopment Era surroundings, but is of its time. He noted that the proposal is in concept. The submission does not propose any finishes or a final appearance, but proposes massing only. He claimed that, although the rear is visible from Locust Street, that view is incidental. Mr. Danta stated that the ell is clearly visible from Locust Street. Mr. Hohn concluded that the addition, which will enhance the dialogue between old and new, will enrich the neighborhood. He requested the Committee's feedback.

Mr. Phillips, the architect, stated that the addition was intended to "expand the vocabulary of the landscape." It is intended to be a nest that relates to the landscape. It would be pre-made off site and installed on the ell. He asked the Committee to comment on the possibility of constructing any addition on this ell.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to comment on the connection of the addition to the house. Mr. Hohns stated that the addition would be an interior deck. It would be accessed through a hatch in the roof. He stated that he would remove the existing condenser units and improve the view of the rear of the building. He stated that the addition would be conceived as a two-story nest. Mr. Hohns noted that the roof leaks and must be repaired.

Mr. Danta reminded the Committee that the application requests an approval in concept. He asked the Committee to focus on whether any addition would be appropriate at this rear ell.

Lorna Katz, a representative of the Society Hill Civic Association, explained that the applicants have not presented their design to the community's zoning and preservation committee yet. She requested that they seek the approval of the neighborhood before seeking City approvals.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance, asserted that the essence of the concept is inappropriate. He observed that the rear ell is significant, even if it is not original.

Mr. Hohns reported that he is a member of the board of the Society Hill Civic Association and serves on the board of the Ed Bacon Foundation with Mr. Gallery. He assured both parties that

he would seek their approvals before continuing with the project. He asserted that the Commission and interested parties should not seek to freeze Society Hill in time, but should promote its evolution and enhancement. He stated that he is merely seeking to beautify and improve Society Hill. He commented on the views and stated that he was seeking to be able to see the city skyline from his "nest." He asked the Committee to provide him with substantive feedback. He asked if any contemporary addition at the rear was possible.

Mr. Evans stated that he thought that a contemporary addition at the rear was possible. However, he cautioned the applicants to carefully consider scale and materials. He conceded that this house had evolved with additions and demolitions at the rear of the rear ell. He suggested an addition at the rear of the rear ell at ground level, but objected to an addition on the roof.

Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff recommendation of denial. He stated that the Standards for an addition are very clear; they do not allow for a very large addition on the ell. He stated that there was an inconsistency between the applicants' glowing descriptions of the proposed addition and the reality of the architectural drawings. He stated that it appeared that the owner was seeking an observation deck; he contended that such a tower, which would be taller than the ridgeline of the main block, was inappropriate. Mr. Hohns stated that his nest would not extend above the highest part of the roof.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the addition would be too large for the house. It was not in scale. She also objected to any modifications to the original gambrel roof of the main house.

Ms. Pentz stated that she does not believe that a rooftop addition is appropriate in this instance. She asserted that the rooflines of the main block and ell are important. She noted that the Commission has rejected proposals to modify dormers. She concluded that this building is intact and should be preserved.

Mr. Amburn claimed that there is room for an addition at the rear of this building, but not at this scale. He asserted that the scale and proportions of the proposed addition are entirely wrong for this building. He also objected to the cantilevering of the addition beyond the side wall of the ell.

Mr. Hohns asked the Committee to opine on two questions. First, would the Commission require the retention of the non-historic door and window in the rear of the rear ell; or could an addition be added at that location? Second, could the deck, which was constructed by former owner Norman Tissian, be modified? The Committee member agreed that the door and window were not historically significant and could therefore be modified; and the deck could be altered. Mr. Phillips observed that it would be difficult to obtain a zoning variance to cover more of the lot. He asked if a one-story addition on the ell would be acceptable. The Committee members agreed that they could not recommend approval of an addition on the ell. Mr. Hohns asked if the Committee would recommend approval of an exterior stair from the yard to the deck. The Committee members did not reject the suggestion, but asserted that they would need to review a design before providing meaningful comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

257 S. 16TH STREET

Owner: 257 South 16th Street, LP

Applicant: Peter Lazor

History: 1916, Frederick Webber, architect

Designated: Significant in the Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Replace existing canopies, install blade sign

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace two existing canopies with a single canopy that would span two bays. The canopy would be placed over the main entrance to the building. The applicant also proposes a blade sign along the Spruce Street elevation. The building does not have an entrance from the street along this elevation. The Commission has often followed the practice of approving canopies that respect individual bays. The proposed canopy would span across a pilaster to unify two separate bays.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the canopy, pursuant to the Storefront Guidelines; approval of the blade sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Designer Peter Lazor and property manager Ben Weinraub represented the application.

Mr. Danta distributed photographs of the building, which he took recently. He noted that the area around the canopy was not finished like the rest of the building, causing him to conclude that the area had been altered.

Mr. Lazor distributed current and historic photographs. He stated that the building was constructed in 1916. He stated that there is a history of canopies in this location. There have been at least four and they have all been different. He showed photographs of several canopies as well as of the traces of a gabled canopy. He noted that the gabled canopy did span the two bays and the pilaster between them. Mr. Evans postulated that the window adjacent to the door, which the canopy would cover, was once a door. Mr. Weinraub stated that the material at the base of the window does not match the surrounding material and was added later. He also explained that the lobby spans the width of the two bays, the door and window. Ms. Pentz asked if he planned to convert the window back to a door. Mr. Weinraub stated that he had no plan to restore the door.

Mr. Amburn objected to block the view of the central pier with the awning. The other Committee members agreed. Mr. Amburn suggested two canopies, one on either side of the pier. Mr. Lazor noted that that would diminish the space available for graphics. Mr. Weinraub added that he was seeking to provide more protection from the weather. The larger canopy would allow entrance and egress while others waited for cabs under the canopy. Mr. Amburn stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation. The other Committee members agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the architectural elements should be exposed, not covered. Mr. Weinraub stated that the typical view is not the straight-on view, but is the oblique view from the sidewalk. The split canopies would not protect that view of the pier.

Ms. Pentz asked about the signage. Mr. Weinraub explained that the temporary real estate sign would be removed. Mr. Amburn asked if the sign could be installed into a joint, rather than into the face of the stone. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the face was better because it could be easily repaired when the sign was removed.

Mr. Evans suggested that any new canopy design should respect the architectural lines of the façade. Mr. Lazor asked if the staff could approve an application that satisfied the Commission's review standards. Mr. Danta stated that the staff may be able to approve a revised design. He also reminded the applicants that the Committee is an advisory body only; the Commission will render a final decision on this application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the canopy, pursuant to the Storefront Guidelines; approval of the blade sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

1830 DIAMOND STREET

Applicant/Owner: Gary Jonas, Advanced Real Estate Concepts

History: c. 1889; Contributing to Diamond Street Historic District, 1985

Project: Legalize front door replacement

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission's staff has been working with this applicant on this rowhouse in the Diamond Street Historic District and recently approved the reconstruction of the front façade, which had been declared Imminently Dangerous. The approved plans specified a new door and windows and included the condition that the staff would review the door and window details prior to any installation. The applicant sought and received the approval of the window details, but not the door details. Without an approval of the details, the applicant installed a new doorway, which does not match the design of the historic doorway depicted in the approved plans. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation at the Commission's request. The applicant proposes the legalization of the door. He has provided photographs of other non-compliant doors in the historic district to bolster his case. However, several of the doors pictured are in violation and some will soon be replaced with correct doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

The Committee members discussed the doorway with Mr. Baron. They considered the other doorways depicted in the photographs submitted by the applicant and concluded that other inappropriate and potentially non-compliant doors cannot be used to justify this non-compliant door. The Committee members agreed with the staff recommendation that the doorway does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and should not be legalized.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

500-36 CHESTNUT STREET, INDEPENDENCE HALL

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: National Park Service

History: 1729-34, Edmund Wooley & Andrew Hamilton, architects; tower, 1753 and 1828 individually designated, 1956; World Heritage Site, 1979

Project: Reconstruct and restore tower, repair masonry, replace metalwork and roofing

OVERVIEW: This application requests approval for the rehabilitation of the tower of Independence Hall. Famed architect William Strickland reconstructed the tower in 1828. The City of Philadelphia owns Independence Hall, but authorized the federal government to maintain, curate, and interpret the building in 1950. The agreement dictates that "Any work of restoration or any major alterations or repairs to any of the buildings [including Independence Hall] shall not be undertaken until the plans for such work shall have been mutually agreed upon [by the Secretary of the Interior and the City of Philadelphia]." The Historical Commission has two tasks in this review. First, it must perform its regulatory responsibilities under §14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Second, it must advise the City on appropriate preservation methods for Independence Hall. Before the National Park Service may commence its work on the tower, it must have both the final approval of the Historical Commission and the agreement of the City of Philadelphia.

The wood-clad section of the tower, where the clock is located, is in poor condition and in need of repair. It was constructed using a novel technique. It has a wood frame clad with very thick horizontal boards stacked on top of one other and fastened together with iron rods running vertically through them. In several cases, water has penetrated the board panels and rusted the iron rods, causing them to expand and damage the boards. This project will address the water infiltration problems and the resulting damage. For Level 4 of the tower, the application proposes the repair of the existing siding in place and its treatment with borate to inhibit rot. For Level 5, the application proposes careful disassembly of the siding and its reconstruction with a mix of new material and, if possible, salvaged boards. At Level 6, the application proposes salvaging the four side panels of the tower as complete units for display and interpretation elsewhere; it proposes their replacement with new panels made of similar wood and stainless steel rods using historic construction methods. The Park Service constructed a mock-up of a side panel with the horizontal cladding and metal rods to test its repair and deconstruction and reconstruction methodologies. The applicant will present the results of the tests and the ensuing recommendations to the Architectural Committee and Commission. Section 01 35 91 in the specification describes the overall preservation philosophy guiding the project. The philosophy conforms to the Restoration Standards in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Also, the architectural drawings include many statements such as "it is the intent ... that as much of the existing material that is in sound condition be retained and reused."

The application also proposes minor stone trim repair and replacement; wood balustrade, sill, and other trim repair and replacement; window repair and potential replacement; and copper ornament repair. It proposes the replacement of wood shingle and metal roofs with lead-coated copper roofs. It proposes to spot repoint to match the surrounding mortar; the building has been pointed in myriad ways. The application also proposes to replace the weathervane rod and some glass on the faces of the clock. Stainless steel structural elements would be introduced to strengthen balustrades and other details; they would not be visible from the exterior. Interior stairs would be strengthened. The lightning protection system would be upgraded. All of the work except the recladding of the tower was previously approved by the Commission in April

2009. However, the proposed repair and replacement is presented in much greater detail in the current application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the results of the tests on the mock-up support the proposed methodology, with the staff to review details including samples of repair and replacement materials, pointing samples, and shop drawings replacement trim and window, pursuant to Restoration Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused owing to her firm's involvement in the project.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. National Park Service staff Amanda Jones, Doris Fanelli, and Charles Tonetti represented the application.

Using Powerpoint, Mr. Tonelli presented a detailed overview of the project. He explained that the Park Service replicated a section of the tower cladding with a mock-up to better understand how the unusual construction system functioned and could be dismantled. He displayed a sample of the cladding material, which was fabricated from old-growth lumber salvaged from a historically-designated building that was demolished for the construction of the Curtis Institute's new practice and dormitory building. He explained that carpenters tried several methods to dismantle the mock-up and learned several valuable lessons about working on the historic tower. He said that the Park Service would define techniques for dismantling the cladding of the tower to limit damage. He observed that individual boards of cladding cannot be removed and replaced because of the unique construction. He also noted that the rods cannot be removed and reinstalled. He noted that the Level 6 cladding will be removed and replaced in kind, with the exception that the iron rods will be replaced with stainless steel rods. There will be limited replacement at Level 5. The cladding at Level 4 will be retained and repaired. Mr. Tonetti stated that all of the wood trim will be removed and then reinstalled after the cladding is replaced and/or repaired. Mr. Tonetti explained that the project will be contracted for total replacement, but no material will be replaced unless necessary.

Mr. Tonetti presented an overview of the replacement and repair techniques and requirements for Levels 4, 5, and 6 that would be built into the contract. He stated that the contract documentation would be completed in January 2010, the contract awarded in May 2010, and the work begun in July 2010. The work would be completed in February 2012. The tower would be under scaffolding for only one Fourth of July. The scaffolding would have a scrim with an image of the tower.

Mr. Tonetti displayed a replica rod that had been artificially aged for the mock-up. He stated that all material removed from the tower would be retained in the Park's study collection. Mr. Tonetti stated that the cladding will be attached to the structure using screws, not the spikes that were originally used, to reduce the shocks to the tower. The Committee members asked about the source of the replacement cladding. Mr. Tonetti stated that it would be old-growth eastern white pine.

Mr. Evans congratulated Mr. Tonetti on the detail and specificity of the documents. He made a couple of suggestions for revisions to add clarity. On page 25 of 81, Mr. Evans suggested clarifying whether the roof will be replaced or repaired. On the same page, Ms. Gutterman suggested using lead wool instead of mortar for the flashing. On page 26, Mr. Evans suggested clarifying the height of the pole gutters. Mr. Tonetti stated that they would replicate the height of

the existing pole gutters. Mr. Evans suggested making the drawings and tables easier to read; Mr. Tonetti agreed and noted that the architect will improve readability.

Mr. Tonetti asked the staff to plan to review the details in an efficient manner. He explained that the schedule will require quick turn-around times for detail reviews. Mr. Baron offered to work with Mr. Tonetti to schedule the detail reviews. Mr. Tonetti suggested a weekly meeting during construction at the site with the Commission's staff. Mr. Baron agreed to meet regularly to prevent delays.

Mr. Tonetti and the Committee discussed the lightning protection system. The Committee agreed that the building must be protected to the highest standard. Ms. Fanelli stated that the grounding system would involve ground disturbances that would trigger a federal requirement for archaeological studies. Mr. Evans explained that he installed a system recently at Mother Bethel Church in which plates rather than grounding rods were used, avoiding significant disturbances to the earth. Mr. Tonetti assured the Committee that the historic fabric would be protected with the installation of the system.

Mr. Evans suggested revisions to the flashing on page 27. On page 34, he suggested additional details regarding the rods that would secure the cladding. On page 38, he suggested clarifications for the drawing conventions; the different cross-hatchings are difficult to distinguish from one another. He observed that the specifications detail epoxy repairs, but the drawings do not indicate where epoxy would be used. Mr. Tonetti stated that Dutchman repairs would be used primarily; the epoxy repairs would be limited. He noted that the Dutchman repairs would always be undertaken in the original material; for example, wood would replace wood and copper would replace copper. Mr. Evans pointed out that page 45 calls for replacement of glass in restoration glass; he asked how one would distinguish old glass from new restoration glass. Mr. Tonetti stated that the as-built drawings would call out the replacement glass. He is specifying restoration glass so that the new glass will have the same appearance as the original glass. Mr. Evans pointed out an illegible table on page 46. Mr. Evans asked for clarifications on the work to the clock faces. Mr. Tonetti stated that they are creating a more rigid frame to prevent glass breakage. The new structure will be placed behind the existing structure to avoid shadowing on the clock faces. Mr. Evans asked for clarifications on the weathervane spindle. Mr. Tonetti stated that the spindle would be replaced with a stainless steel spindle. He stated that maintenance and lightning protection concerns are driving the changes. He explained that it is very difficult to access and inspect the spindle and will be completely replaced to avoid the need for subsequent repairs or replacement. It would cost \$500,000 to rescaffold the tower in the future. The stainless steel spindle would be coated a black color. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the lighting replacement. Mr. Tonetti explained that the lighting that would be replaced is relatively new, perhaps four or five years old. He noted that some lighting details have not been worked out. Mr. Tonetti stated that all but the very top fixture are invisible from the ground.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including samples of repair and replacement materials, pointing samples, and shop drawings of replacement trim and windows, pursuant to Restoration Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:00 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 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

Restoration Standard 2: Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.

Restoration Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

Restoration Standard 4: Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.

Restoration Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.

Restoration Standard 6: Deteriorated features from the restoration period 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.

Restoration Standard 7: Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

Restoration Standard 8: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

Storefront Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings: Not Recommended - Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character defining features of the historic building.