

**THE MINUTES OF THE 581ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**14 JANUARY 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Leslie Benoliel
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, LEED AP
Susan O.W. Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Wade Jackman, AMCD Walnut Street Associates, LP
John Laning, JC's Renovation
Mark Focht, Parks and Recreation Commission
Therese Stuhlman, Parks and Recreation Commission
Audrey Johnson Thornton, American Women's Heritage Society
Jarmeen James, American Women's Heritage Society
Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Benoliel, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 580TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 580th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 December 2010. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 DECEMBER 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

2312 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: AMCD Walnut Street Associates

Applicants: John C. Lanning, Wade Jackman

History: c.1875

Designation: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Proposal: Legalize deck, sliding door, and window

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck as submitted, but approval of a deck pulled back eight feet from the south façade of the rear ell, with the door surrounds painted if conspicuous from the public right-of-way and the rear brick cornice correctly repaired and repointed, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the construction of a deck, the enlarging of a window opening for sliding doors, and the installation of the doors and a window at this rowhouse. The deck is located on the rear ell. The doors and window are located at the top floor of the rear of the main block. The roof of the ell had, apparently, been used as a deck. It had a metal railing, but no deck structure or access door. This deck, along with others on rear ells on this block, faces Fidler Square. The railings are minimally visible from the square. Although the doors and window appear to be vinyl with unusual capping and are not compatible with the historic building, it is likely that they are not visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property manager Wade Jackman and contractor John Laning represented the application.

Mr. Jackman stated that he would stain the deck a dark color to make it less visible. However, he does not want to reduce the size of the deck. Mr. Wilds asked him if he obtained a building permit before undertaking the work. Mr. Jackman replied that he did not. Mr. Wilds asked him how long the deck is currently. He replied that it is 31 feet long. Mr. Wilds stated that he supported the Architectural Committee recommendation, which would require a reduction of eight feet in length.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the legalization of the deck, but approve a deck pulled back eight feet from the south façade of the rear ell, provided the door and window surrounds are painted and the rear brick cornice is repaired and repointed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2000 BELMONT MANSION DRIVE, BELMONT MANSION

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

History: first sections built c. 1742, 3rd floor added in 1850, rear additions constructed in 1888, 1956, and 1996, rehabilitated in 2006

Designation: Individually designated, 6/26/1956

Proposal: Construct additions, install vestibule and gates, alter paving

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, and 10 and the Site and Setting Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes enhancing the banquet facilities at the Belmont Mansion in Fairmount Park. It proposes constructing an addition and freestanding building, adding a link between two buildings, adding gates, and altering paving and landscaping. The City owns the highly significant historic house in Fairmount Park. It is currently managed by the American Women's Heritage Society and operated as a banquet and event facility and the Underground Railroad Museum. The building is one of the country's most significant early mansions. Although many preservationists advocated for removing the third floor, which was added later and suffered from structural defects, the building was rehabilitated with the third floor to its mid nineteenth-century appearance about five years ago. The mansion is currently fully restored.

A concrete pad was installed to the south of the mansion several years ago to support a tent that is used for catered events like weddings and corporate affairs. The concrete pad and tent would be removed and a new freestanding pavilion would be constructed to the south of the house. It would be set back slightly from the current location of the concrete pad to allow better views of the house.

A second structure would be built at the rear of the large outbuilding that stands to the southwest of the house. The outbuilding was constructed in several campaigns from the eighteenth century to the 1980s. The proposed addition would house a banquet room, kitchen, and storage. It would be much larger than any of the extant sections of the outbuilding.

The application proposes a glazed vestibule that would connect the main house to the even older cottage building and its additions. It would connect to the house under a corner of the porch and extend out from the porch to the rear building. Although there had been a non-historic vestibule at this location at one time, it was removed as part of the recent restoration of the mansion.

The application also proposes a series of changes to the grounds including repaving the parking area, adding a gate with pillars at the driveway, adding a pedestrian gate and walkway to additional parking to the north, and replacing sidewalk paving.

The architectural plans provided with the application lack detailed information, especially regarding the vestibule, which would attach to eighteenth-century buildings. The drawings do not provide adequate information about materials, colors, textures, profiles, etc. of the new construction or the impact of that construction on the historic buildings.

The proposed construction of a freestanding pavilion for a banquet facility on the lawn of this highly significant historic house does not meet historic preservation standards. Any new construction should be located at the rear of the site, where it would be inconspicuous to the viewing public. New construction should not disturb important historic settings.

Although the application proposes significant earth disturbing activities for foundations for the new construction, it does not address the question of archaeology. The historical significance of this site warrants archaeological protections. Before any earth is disturbed, a Phase 1A archaeology study should be undertaken to determine the potential impact to archaeological resources. If the study indicates that important resources will be impacted, then additional archaeological investigations should be undertaken.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused, owing to his business relationship with the leaseholder. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Leaseholder Audrey Johnson Thornton, architect Joseph Jancuska, and Mark Focht and Theresa Stuhlman of Fairmount Park represented the application.

Mr. Focht introduced himself and distributed additional information to the Commission members. He introduced Ms. Johnson Thornton as the founder and president of the American Women's Heritage Society and stated that the Society and the Park have been partners at the site since 1988. He stated that the site has a complex history. Myriad structures have existed at the site over time. He distributed a series of site plans showing that the site has changed many times over its 250-year history. He stated that the site has been used as a food and beverage service facility for much of its history. The first building, the cottage, was built in the 1740s. The main house was built in the 1750s and its dependencies in 1765. In the 1870s, several structures were added to the site for the Centennial including a massive building. The dining pavilion stood from 1871 to 1941. Other pavilions including a music pavilion were added later. The Park completed a \$2 million restoration of the cottage complex in 1998. The cottage restoration was intended to alleviate usage pressure on the house and provide spaces for the Society to generate revenue with catered events. In 2007, the Park completed the \$3.2 million restoration of the main house. In 2008, the City entered into a 10-year lease agreement with the Society. The Society is responsible for the maintenance and interpretation of the site.

Mr. Wilds noted that the recent work on the house was intended to restore it to its 1850 appearance. He asked if that restoration work was part of a larger master plan that included this banquet facility. He noted that the historic dining facilities, which have been offered as a precedent for this new construction, were not extant in 1850, the time to which the house was restored. He asked if a master plan has been prepared for this site. Mr. Focht stated that there is no master plan for this site. Mr. Wilds then asserted that the current proposal has never been reviewed or approved by the Commission, even as a long-range plan; it is new. Mr. Focht stated that, although there is no master plan for the site, the expansion of the banquet facilities has been on the agenda for many years. The two major renovations were predicated on an eventual expansion of the banquet facilities. Mr. Focht noted that the landscaping and drainage aspects of this project were part of the recent renovation plan, but were not funded.

Mr. Focht discussed a WPA-era map of the site showing the very large dining hall at the west, about where the new addition is proposed. It was demolished in 1941. He then discussed documents detailing the very large dining pavilion with tower that was constructed to the south of the house for the Centennial. It stood from 1876 to about 1899. He then presented documents regarding the barbell-shaped music pavilion, which once stood to the south of the house. He also showed images of the connector vestibule, which was added in the twentieth century and then removed with the recent restoration.

Ms. Hawkins stated that there are four major components of the project to discuss: the connector between the mansion and the back buildings, the pavilion on the lawn, the large addition at the rear, and the site improvements.

Mr. Jancuska, the architect, introduced himself. He discussed the evolution of the project. He spoke about the freestanding pavilion first. He stated that it would have temporary heat and air conditioning, not a permanent HVAC system. He stated that he reduced the size of the freestanding pavilion and moved it back, away from the mansion and the house, after meeting with Park and Commission staff members. He explained that it is now located as far away from the house and the street as possible. He reported that he originally proposed to expand the center section of the rear additions or cottage complex, where the banquet facilities are currently located, but the Park and Commission staffs suggested a rear addition instead. He reported that he reduced the height of the addition with the flat, not pitched, roof. He claimed that he complied with all of the suggestions of the Park and Commission staffs. He asserted that the vestibule connector is necessary to shield visitors from inclement weather. He stated that he simplified the design of the vestibule connector. Mr. Wilds asked if the connector could have been located at the rear, not the side, of the building. Mr. Jancuska explained that he located it at the side to take advantage of an existing door opening. Mr. Wilds asked if the connector would fit below the porch roof. Mr. Jancuska replied that it would fit below the porch roof, which would not be altered. Mr. Wilds asked how it would connect to the rear building. Mr. Jancuska stated that there is an existing doorway in the rear building. The vestibule would link gently to the two historic buildings, which would not be altered. The vestibule would link the two sections of the museum, the cottage complex and the main house.

Mr. Wilds asked if large events would use both the new rear addition and the new pavilion. Mr. Jancuska stated that events would not be spread across the two facilities. Mr. Wilds expressed skepticism about that claim. Mr. Jancuska stated that the pavilion would have electricity, but not permanent heating or air conditioning. Mr. Jancuska stated that the most important aspect of the pavilion is its views of the city skyline. Mr. Wilds asked him if the views would be compromised if the pavilion were set back farther from the street. Mr. Jancuska responded that there are underground utility lines in that area, which they cannot build on. Mr. Focht agreed. Mr. Wilds asked about the significance of the fence, which runs around the entire site. Mr. Jancuska explained that he must work within the fence. Ms. Stuhlman stated that the fence represents the boundary of the leased area. The American Women's Heritage Society must work within the fence. Mr. Focht stated that the fence is also important from a security perspective.

Mr. Wilds observed that the project appears to have evolved in a very incremental, disjointed way, without a master plan. He stated that the Park and lease holder have devised this plan "bit by bit." He asserted that Belmont Mansion is a very significant historic building and should be treated as such. He suggested that the banquet facilities would overshadow the historic house. He also criticized the architectural plans that have been provided. He claimed that they were difficult to read and did not provide a complete image of the new building and additions. He suggested that computer renderings would be helpful. He also stated that the application lacks sufficient photographs. Mr. Jancuska rejected Mr. Wilds' claims. He asserted that the architectural plans are adequate. They show the new construction in the context of the existing buildings. Mr. Wilds again asserted that the documentation provided by the applicants was not adequate to judge the project. He observed that the existing buildings are very complex and the limited plans provided do not account for those complexities. Mr. Jancuska stated that he could have provided three-dimensional models, but they were not requested by the staff. He again claimed that his documents were adequate. Mr. Wilds replied that the provided drawings may be adequate for an approval in concept, but not for a final approval. Ms. Hawkins added that the

drawings are internally inconsistent. The elevations do not correspond to the plans. She observed that the Architectural Committee advised Mr. Jancuska that he should correct his plans before submission to the Historical Commission. However, he did not. Mr. Wilds stated that he did not consider the application to be "ripe." Mr. Jancuska contended that the Commission members should be able to read his drawings. Mr. Wilds responded that he found it impossible to fully understand the impact of the new construction on the historic complex from the application documents. Mr. Jancuska asked why the Commissioners were unable to "get an idea" of the proposal from the drawings. Mr. Wilds responded that the Commission needs more than an "idea" to grant final approval. He informed Mr. Jancuska that the Commission has an intimate knowledge of this site. It has reviewed numerous applications for the site. He reminded the applicants that the Commission was fully involved in the recent restorations. He concluded that this is a very important site and the Commission should not be pushed into making a quick decision with inadequate documentation.

Ms. Johnson Thornton stated that she had obtained a large grant from Governor Rendell to undertake this project. She asserted that the Commission had an obligation to explain to her how and why her application was incomplete. She stated that her organization needs the extra revenue the larger banquet facility will generate to fund the care and maintenance of the historic site.

Mr. Sherman asserted that the new construction was not compatible with the existing historic buildings. Mr. Jancuska disagreed and claimed that the historic buildings already have disjointed elevations with sundry rooflines. Mr. Jancuska contended that his design reflects the recommendations of the staff. Question Mr. Jancuska, Mr. Wilds observed that the staff had recommending denial of the application. Mr. Farnham clarified that one staff member met once with Mr. Jancuska nearly one year ago and offered suggestions for improving the proposal. The staff as a whole did not review and approve of it.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the design of the pavilion is not conducive to taking advantage of the views. It should be lighter and glassier, perhaps supported by interior columns not exterior load-bearing walls. Mr. Jancuska responded that the design was driven by the choice of a wood folding door. Mr. Wilds asked him to explain his statement. He added that he is very frustrated by Mr. Jancuska, who is not being completely forthright with the Commission. Mr. Schaaf suggested that the brick piers of the pavilion should be removed and the building made more transparent. Ms. Hawkins added that a solid building blocks views of the historic house. From a preservation perspective, the public views of the house are much more important than the private views from the pavilion. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee agreed with Mr. Schaaf and recommended that the pavilion should be as light and transparent as possible and should be relocated back as far as possible from the historic house and street. She also stated that she found the vestibule inappropriate. Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Focht why the vestibule was removed during the recent restoration if it was needed. Mr. Focht explained that it was not decided to locate the museum orientation in the rear addition until after the restoration was complete. Now, visitors to the museum must venture outside when moving from the orientation center to the museum itself. In inclement weather, the transition is unpleasant and the historic house suffers.

Mr. Jancuska stated that he would like direction on the major design issues. He noted that he cannot move the pavilion back away from the street owing to the utilities and terrain. Ms. Merriman stated that, historically, the pavilions to the south of the house were set back behind the house and were largely transparent. She stated that any new pavilion should follow these guidelines. Mr. Jancuska stated that he had already met those requirements. Ms. Merriman

responded that he needed to work harder to reduce the impact on the views of the historic house. Ms. Merriman also noted that she does not have enough information to reach a decision about the rear addition. Mr. Jancuska claimed that he had provided sufficient information.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Jancuska why he had decided against installing permanent HVAC equipment in the pavilion. He responded that they are imagining the pavilion windows to be open when in use. The temporary HVAC system will be used only when necessary. Mr. Focht stated that the building would be bulkier if it had a permanent HVAC system. It would need a taller ceiling and thicker walls to hide the ducting and other equipment. The pavilion will be light and open and only used seven or eight months per year. The decision not to install extra utilities was perceived as a historic preservation decision. The pavilion is intended to echo the light, open pavilions that stood on the site in the past. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Schaaf stated that the design had not met the intention. They asserted that the pavilion as designed was too heavy and solid. They suggested removing the brick piers, adding glass, and generally lightening the exterior. Mr. Jancuska contended that he had already made it light and transparent. Ms. Merriman and Hawkins and Messrs. Schaaf and Wilds disagreed. Mr. Focht stated that the pavilion can be redesigned to be more open and transparent. Mr. Sherman stated that the banquet hall should be redesigned as well. Mr. Focht conceded that it could be redesigned. Mr. Focht then asked the Commission to decide whether the proposed concept is appropriate. He asked if any pavilion and rear banquet hall addition would be acceptable to the Commission. If the pavilion and rear banquet hall addition are acceptable, then he will have the architect concentrate on redesigning them; if no pavilion or rear banquet hall addition is acceptable, then there is no reason to redesign them. Ms. Hawkins responded that the project appears to be suffering from more significant problems than roof lines or cladding; for example, the bathroom facilities are not adequate to serve the numbers of people that the banquet rooms will hold. She also opined that, after this project, this will not be a historic house with a banquet facility attached, but it will instead be a banquet facility with a historic house attached. Mr. Focht stated that that question about the overall appropriateness is one that he would like to have answered at this meeting. He suggested that banquet facilities are appropriate here because the site has been used for food service for more than one hundred years. Mr. Wilds pointed out that everyone agreed at the time of the recent restoration that the point of significance of this site was 1850. The house was restored to 1850. However, there was no restaurant or banquet hall at this site in 1850. Mr. Wilds concluded that Mr. Focht's argument about precedent is flawed because the house was restored to a point that predates any food service.

Mr. Wilds stated that he considered the vestibule connector acceptable. He stated that a significantly revised pavilion might be approved. He also contended that a significantly revised banquet addition might also be approved. Mr. Sherman stated that any pavilion should be lighter, more transparent, and less dense. The roof lines should be improved.

Mr. Wilds asked about the state's review owing to the RCAP funding. Mr. Focht stated that they had not yet applied to the state because they want to have the Historical Commission approval in hand before entering into the state process. He assured the Commission that an archaeologist would be retained for the project during the construction phase.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that this situation reminds him of the Water Works case. In that case, an appropriate decision was not reached until the Commission examined the circumstances and the possible solutions very carefully across several reviews. He observed that Mr. Wilds' point about the period of significance was apt. Mr. Gallery suggested that the vestibule connector is not necessary. He remarked that it should be reconsidered. He also objected to the current pavilion design. He agreed with the

Commissioners who recommended that it should be lighter and less transparent and also relocated to avoid interrupting views of the house. Moreover, he advised that the claims to the necessity of the pavilion should be scrutinized; the extant tent may be sufficient. He stated that the banquet addition is a big, awkward box. He contended that the design could be much improved. He concluded that he agrees with Mr. Wilds that there may be an acceptable solution to the facility's needs, but the proposed solution is not appropriate. Mr. Focht rejected Mr. Gallery's claim that the vestibule is not needed. He stated that the vestibule will, in fact, protect the mansion; visitors will not need to bring coats and umbrellas into the historic space, sparing the mansion dirt and water. He also noted that the new structure at Glen Foerd, which is used for catered events and which Mr. Gallery referenced, is much more permanent than the structure currently being proposed.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, and 10 and the Site and Setting Guidelines. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Focht asked if the Commission could indicate on the record that it would support additional facilities for banquets at this site, even if it did not necessarily support this proposal. He asked the Commission to provide direction to the Architectural Committee to ensure that it conducts an appropriate review and does not reopen questions that have already been concluded by the Commission. Ms. Schlotterbeck observed that the Committee offered clear comments at its last review of this project, but the applicants ignored those comments. She indicated that she would vote in favor of Mr. Wilds' motion to deny the application. Mr. Focht stated that he needs to know whether the Commission is opposed in principle to each of the major components of the project, or if it is merely opposed to some aspects of the current design. Mr. Sherman responded that, in his opinion, the Commission was not opposed in principle to the major components of the project, but was opposed to some aspects of the designs of those components. Mr. Wilds added that the chair of the Architectural Committee will convey the Commission's position on the project to the Committee, ensuring that it conducts an appropriate review.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the design of the banquet addition needs improvement. He opined that it looks like "a branch bank in Hatboro." It is "lugubrious." It should be "richer."

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to adopt the motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and Ms. Hawkins to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, and 10 and the Site and Setting Guidelines.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

762 MARTIN STREET, MARIAN ANDERSON HOUSE

Owner: Blanche Burton-Lyles

Nominator: Lindsay Allen, CHRS, Inc.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes listing the Marian Anderson House, 762 Martin Street, on to the National Register of Historic Places. The house is significant for its association with Marian Anderson, a famous African-American contralto and civil rights activist. The nominator contends that the house satisfies Criterion B for its association with a person of significance in our past. The Philadelphia Historical Commission designated the Marian Anderson house as

historic and listed it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places on 4 April 2004. The Philadelphia Historical Commission staff reviewed the nomination and concurs that the proposed house meets Criterion B and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to make such a recommendation to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the National Register nomination to the Commission. Mr. Wilds stated that he was pleased to find that the nomination recounted the controversy surrounding the decision of the Daughters of the American Revolution to prohibit Marian Anderson from singing at Constitution Hall owing to her race. She instead sang to a very large live and radio audience at the Washington Monument. Ms. Merriman noted that the City of Philadelphia would be announcing the recipient of the annual Marian Anderson Award later that day. She refused to divulge the name of the winner despite several requests from Commissioners.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board that 762 Martin Street, the Marian Anderson House, should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places as stipulated in the nomination. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

750-62 S. BROAD STREET, TINDLEY TEMPLE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Owner: Tindley Temple ME Church

Nominator: Emily T. Cooperman, ARCH Preservation Consulting

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes listing 750-62 S. Broad Street, Tindley Temple United Methodist Church, on the National Register of Historic Places. The church is significant for its association with the Reverend Charles Albert Tindley, an important figure in African-American religious history and gospel music. He led the congregation that built the church building until his death in 1933. This church and its congregation also played a significant role in the history of the African-American community of Philadelphia. The nominator contends that the church satisfies Criterion B for its association with a person of significance in our past. The Philadelphia Historical Commission designated Tindley Temple United Methodist Church as historic and listed it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places on 7 July 2008. The Philadelphia Historical Commission staff has reviewed the National Register nomination and concurs that the church meets Criterion B and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to make such a recommendation to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the National Register nomination to the Commission. Mr. Wilds asked if the site should be listed for Criterion C, for architectural significance, as well as Criterion B. Mr. Danta agreed that the building is an excellent example of Romanesque Revival architecture and probably qualifies under Criterion C. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance agreed that the building could qualify under Criterion C. However, he asked the Commission to recommend approval of listing on the National Register under the current nomination to avoid delaying the designation process.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board that 750-62 S. Broad Street, Tindley Temple United Methodist Church, should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places as stipulated in the nomination. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Sherman announced that Ms. Benoliel was resigning from the Commission and that Mr. Wilds was retiring from his position at the Office of Housing & Community Development and relinquishing his seat on the Commission. The Commissioners, staff, and public thanked Ms. Benoliel and Mr. Wilds for their service. Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Wilds may be the longest serving Commissioner ever. He joined the Commission in October 1987.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn at 10:55 a.m. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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 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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space, for example removing a lawn and walkway and installing a parking lot.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Surveying and documenting areas where the terrain will be altered to determine the potential impact to important landscape features or archaeological resources.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Planning and carrying out any necessary investigation using professional archaeologists and modern archaeological methods when preservation in place is not feasible.

Setting Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens, and yards, adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.