

**THE MINUTES OF THE 396th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 August 1995**

**Wayne Spilove, Chairperson
City Council Caucus Chamber, Room 401 City Hall**

Present _____ Wayne Spilove,

Chairperson

David Brownlee

Duane Bumb, Commerce Department

William Candelori

Joseph James, Department of Public Property

Barbara Kaplan, City Planning Commission

Arlene Matzkin

Stephen Mullin, Commerce Department

Susan Rabinovitch

Robert Vance

Scott Wilds, Office of Housing and Community Development

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer

Lori Plavin Salganicoff, Historic Preservation Specialist

Alex --?!

Also

Charles Fancher, PNI

Jay Flaherty, Dechert Price & Rhoads

E. C. Driscoll, Walnut Place Partners

Robert A. Kear, Architect

Marion Ruth Rogel, owner 2127 St. James Place

Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association

Milton Marks, Preservation Coalition

John Teets, R.A., New Covenant Church

Michael Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

Andrea D. Caputo, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

Van Strother, New Covenant Church

Thomas Hine, Philadelphia Inquirer

The 396th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission was called to order at 10:10am by Wayne Spilove, Chairperson, who recognized that a quorum of Commission members was present.

THE MINUTES of the 395th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 12 July 1995, Wayne Spilove, Chairperson, were approved by unanimous vote and adopted upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Dr. Brownlee.

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION meeting of 27 January 1995,
Dr. David Brownlee, Chairperson**

Dr. Brownlee reported the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation to designate the buildings under consideration, 400 N. Broad Street and 1334-36 Walnut Street, as historic. Mr. Baron presented descriptions of their significance accompanied by slides.

400 North Broad Street, Elverson Building

This building, designed by the Philadelphia architectural firm of Rankin Kellogg and Crane, was built in 1923-24. It meets five criteria for significance through its style, its status as a visual and engineering landmark, the history of the Inquirer, and its architect.

The Elverson Building is a fine example of a New York style skyscraper, influenced by Beaux Arts classicism and Art Deco theatricality. The New York zoning laws of 1916 requiring setbacks in skyscrapers also inspired the design. In the manner of the Chrysler Building in New York, the Elverson building became an emblem of its builder, the Inquirer. It was said at the time of its construction that the building was a visible expression of the newspaper, a composite of practicality and idealism.

As a visual landmark to its neighborhood, the building stands out in the skyline and acts as an anchor for a grouping of important buildings along North Broad Street. The building is also an engineering landmark for the extraordinary number of telephones in use at the time it was built, the fact that it made use of the train tracks that ran underneath to deliver newsprint paper, and the floating foundations under the press rooms that isolated the noise and vibration from the rest of the building.

The building is significant for its association with the Philadelphia Inquirer and was built by the son of the founder of the paper. Begun in 1829, it is the third oldest surviving daily in the United States. Finally, 400 N. Broad Street draws significance through its architect Rankin Kellogg and Crane, which built important government and large corporate buildings throughout the United States. Other buildings in Philadelphia built by the firm include the U.S. Marine Club at Washington and Broad Streets, the Provident Trust building at 17th and Chestnut, and the U.S. Post Office at 30th Street.

A motion was made by Mr. Mullin to accept the recommendation of the Designation Committee and designate 400 N. Broad Street as historic. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilds and passed by unanimous vote.

1334-1336 Walnut Street, Hotel Hamilton

Dr. Brownlee noted the Designation Committee's recommendation for approval of this designation, first reported at the 12 April 1995 meeting. This hearing continues the discussion begun at that meeting. A lengthy description was presented to the Commission at its 12 April 1995 meeting. Aided by slides, Mr. Baron briefly presented the five areas of significance that each support the designation of the building.

First, 1334-1336 Walnut Street was converted from a residence to a hotel in 1887-1888 by Addison Hutton, and now stands as perhaps the oldest surviving hotel building in Center City. Second, the residential hotel use of the building was a new type of building combining the services of a hotel with long term residential living. Many wealthy Philadelphians took advantage of this manner of living, and indeed both the owner, Edward T. Steel, and the architect lived at 1334-1336 Walnut Street. Third, the

building draws significance from its conversion from rowhouses to hotel with the addition of the top four floors and alterations to the facade. Fourth, Addison Hutton was an important Philadelphia architect who was adept at designing in a number of styles. Finally, the building is a good example of conservative Queen Anne Revival.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to adopt the recommendation of the Designation Committee and designate 1334-1336 Walnut Street as historic. Mr. Wilds seconded this motion.

Mr. Spilove invited opinions from the public. Mr. Sklaroff, attorney for the building's owner and a member of the Preservation Coalition's Advisory Committee, clarified for the record that he does not and has never represented the views of the Preservation Coalition on the designation of this building.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baron to point out alterations by Addison Hutton on the building, and was told that the addition and certain elements of the facade were likely the work of the architect. He then questioned the veracity and scholarship of the answers and asked for documentation. Although the nomination was prepared by Frederick Richards, Mr. Baron cited references to this work by this architect in 1888 issues of the "Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide" and knowledge of other works by the architect. Mr. Wilds objected to the hostile and trial-like tone of Mr. Sklaroff's questioning. Dr. Brownlee invited Mr. Sklaroff to present any facts he had found that could dispute or support the information presented by the nomination. Mr. Sklaroff responded by characterizing a Commission vote on the designation a miscarriage of justice if done on speculation and without factual knowledge. He stated that the Commission has the power to create a "cloud" on the title of a building through designation.

Discounting the evidence provided in the nomination and by Mr. Baron, Mr. Sklaroff challenged the attribution of the alterations and additions to Addison Hutton. Ms. Rabinovitch noted that this building benefited in the 1980s from the Historic Preservation Tax Credit, an investment incentive that is available only to buildings designated historic on the federal level; i.e. either listed on the National Register of Historic Places individually or as a building that contributes to an historic district. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the purpose of the federal tax credit program is to extend the life of a building, not to prevent its demolition. Mr. Tyler reiterated that a predicate for using the federal incentives is that the building is listed on the National Register, implying that it met designation criteria. Mr. Sklaroff argued that local designation would serve to preserve the building in perpetuity, perhaps beyond its useful life. Mr. Tyler stated that the issue before the Commission is not the effect of designation, but whether this building meets one or more of the criteria for designation prescribed by the Historic Preservation Ordinance. He described provisions in this ordinance that allow for the demolition of designated buildings. Mr. Sklaroff responded that certain procedures would have to be followed, thereby constituting a cloud on the title. He asserted that the building does not meet any of the designation criteria.

Dr. Brownlee asked Mr. Sklaroff if any information exists that casts doubt on the established historical record of this building. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it is not his burden to provide such information. Dr. Brownlee responded that the record, including documentation from the 1880s, should then be allowed to stand. Mr. Baron noted that the nomination was written by Frederick Richards and was reviewed by staff as well as the members of the Committee on Historic Designation, experts in their field.

Mr. Vance asked about the possibility of designation if Addison Hutton had not been the architect of the major alterations. Mr. Baron responded that any one of the five different areas of the building's significance would suffice for designation. He added that a strong record exists to support the attribution of Addison Hutton as architect of the alterations, including published documents contemporary to the

changes and an established record linking the owner to the architect. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the book written about the architect by Elizabeth Biddle Yarnell, the only book known to have been written about the architect, did not list the building among his works. He added that if Hutton was responsible for the alterations, the building should not be considered one of his works, just the alterations.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the building is not "true" to any particular style and is in his opinion a marginal building. Unlike the Elverson Building just designated, he asserted, this is not a landmark building. He added that it was not by mistake that 1334 Walnut Street was not one of the first five thousand buildings designated. He characterized designation of non-landmark buildings as spot zoning, adding that the standards are too broad and subjective. He added that the Designation Committee sometimes meets without input from the public and consists of persons who are more concerned with preservation than with the rights of property owners.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned the importance of the conversion from residence to hotel and the fact that it was a residential hotel in which wealthy people lived. He described the style of the building as being as much Neo-Colonial/Neo-Federal Revival as Queen Anne, and as not very good Queen Anne where that label applies. Ms. Rabinovitch noted that Mr. Sklaroff first pointed to the subjectivity of the criteria as a flaw in the system and then offered his own negative interpretation. She questioned the strength of his assertions measured against the documentation provided that was reviewed by professional historians. He replied that even experts can be wrong and pointed to his experience with his own Queen Anne house and the books he has read.

Mr. Sklaroff argued that designation is a powerful tool that should not be used lightly. He objected to the potentially lost development opportunities which the Planning Commission would "really like because it is zoned C5," and which the Historical Commission would have to break its rules to allow if the property has any economic return. Mr. Tyler noted that economic hardship was one test for allowing demolition and that another exists that considers the greater public interest. No rules would have to be broken to consider and perhaps allow demolition. Ms. Kaplan stated that the new C4 and C5 zoning regulations include significant limitations on the dimensions of new development to encourage appropriateness of scale. She added that the dimensions of the historic building are not inconsistent with these limitations.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced Robert Kear, an architect who worked on the building in 1985 but who could not, in Mr. Sklaroff's words, be described as an historical architect. He had been retained to complete the renovations on the facade. In the manner of lawyer with expert witness, Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Kear several questions. First was whether any elements exist, either interior or exterior, that "read" as residential hotel and whether any remnant of this use is visible inside of the building. Mr. Kear answered that nothing about the building identifies its use as residential hotel. Mr. Wilds reminded Mr. Sklaroff that in Philadelphia, designations of buildings as historic are not based on considerations of their interiors. Mr. Sklaroff asked whether the fact that the building does not read as a residential hotel holds no relevance. Mr. Wilds contested this, stating that the building does appear to be a residence or a small hotel and compared it to the Bond House, which happened to have been a designated building that the Commission allowed to be demolished.

Mr. Kear, asked by Mr. Sklaroff to comment on the architecture of the building, stated that little or no fenestration exists on the three sides of the building not on Walnut Street. He asserted that no integrity remains on these facades and that the discussion should therefore be reduced to the Walnut Street facade, in essence a stage set. A Commission staff member addressed this description, stating that the gambrel roof visible from all facades gives the building a strong residential feel, and that the stucco on the north facade (rear) addition is colored to match the brick of the rest of the building. Mr. Brownlee added that many buildings in this area were designed to emphasize the street facade. Mr. Kear disagreed with Mr.

Brownlee's comment.

Mr. Kear described 1334-36 Walnut Street as a good example of the "bastardization" that occurs when a building is added to at a time of changing styles. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Kear if the building measures up to "generally accepted architectural aesthetics" and whether it "has a coherence to it." Mr. Kear responded that the architect seems not to have carefully considered issues such as proper proportions, but instead designed an addition that met the required program. He stated that there is no coherence to the building. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the building is a work of architectural significance, if it reads as a residential hotel, and if this addition would be allowed if proposed to an Historical Commission in 1888. Mr. Kear answered that the building has no architectural significance, does not read as a residential hotel, and that it probably would not have been allowed by an Historical Commission interested in preserving the integrity of the original rowhouses.

Mr. Vance asked Mr. Kear whether the building should be designated if it is the oldest surviving hotel building in the city. Mr. Kear, who served as an architectural advisor for the Bucks County Conservancy several years ago, responded that this would not be sufficient grounds for designation but could not answer whether the same was true in Bucks County. When asked to elaborate, Mr. Kear asked whether a hypothetical oldest surviving outhouse would be worthy of designation. Ms. Rabinovitch stated that a hotel could not be compared to an outhouse. Mr. Vance declared that in his opinion the fact that the building is the oldest surviving hotel holds real significance.

Mr. Sklaroff objected to calling the building the "oldest surviving hotel" when in fact the nomination form refers to it as "perhaps the oldest surviving hotel." He characterized designation based on a "perhaps" as arbitrary. Dr. Brownlee spoke to the careful language typically utilized in historical descriptions such as these, stating that it is almost impossible to prove that something is an only or an oldest example without an exhaustive inventory of every building in the area. He added that conscientious historic research, drawing from many resources, did not identify an older existing hotel building but that the "perhaps" should always be present in such statements.

Mr. James asked Mr. Driscoll, an owner of the building, to describe the basis for his objection to the designation. Mr. Driscoll responded that although he has no intention of demolishing the building now, his primary interest is in keeping his options open. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated his arguments against the areas of significance. He added that in his opinion if one were to accept the descriptions of significance, the building would still only be interesting; it would not be a landmark worthy of designation as were the first five thousand buildings designated. Mr. Wilds noted that Mr. Sklaroff had offered that the Elverson Building is worthy of designation although it had not been among the first group to be designated. He submitted that the bulk of the first five thousand are likely consistent with 1334-36 Walnut Street and that only a few hundred of those are on the level of significance of Independence Hall.

Mr. Sklaroff urged that Commission members apply stricter standards to designation since this action results, in his opinion, in an encumbrance on individual property rights.

Mr. Tyler stated that the decision of *United Artists vs. City of Philadelphia I* was overturned by *United Artists vs. City of Philadelphia II*. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the question of spot zoning was left open in *United Artists II* in a footnote. Mr. Tyler described that these PA Supreme Court decisions resulted in the inability of the Commission to regulate interiors. He declared that history is organic and that historic architecture such as 1334-36 Walnut Street is a reflection of this -- a document of the evolution of uses and design in Philadelphia at that time. He argued against the assertion that a building is marginal simply because it is not a landmark on the level of Independence Hall. The involvement of Addison Hutton as the architect of alterations and additions rather than the original building, he asserted, does not detract

from the importance of his participation. He pointed to the PSFS Building at 7th and Walnut Streets, the result of the work of noted architects Sloan, Hutton, Furness, and Howe as an example of additions and alterations increasing the significance of an historic building. Mr. Tyler stated that the Commission is not concerned with fickle aesthetics, but with the recognition of examples of past designs, uses, and history. He reiterated his previous comment that the owner of an historic building is not precluded from demolishing the building.

Mr. Spilove asked for further discussion and thanked Mr. Sklaroff for his comments. Mr. Marks of the Preservation Coalition spoke in favor of the nomination to designate. He noted that designation had been determined not to be a "taking" in the *United Artists II* opinion of the PA Supreme Court. He added that in national studies, local designation has not been shown to lessen the value of properties, and stated that designation does not mean that future uses would be limited, but that the Historical Commission would gain the right to review proposed alterations.

Dr. Brownlee stated that this discussion has been very useful in focusing the judgement to be made. He added that he has attempted to represent to the Commission on behalf of the Committee what is believed to be the documentable facts of the case, but it is the Commission's work to judge the value of those facts. He offered his opinion that the facts support the designation of the building, and that such a vote would be consistent with previous such judgements.

As no further deliberation was forthcoming, Mr. Spilove called the motion to designate 1334-36 Walnut Street which had been offered and seconded.

All Commission members but one voted to accept the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and designate the building, thereby passing the motion. Mr. Candelori submitted the single vote against the designation.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE of 25 July 1995, Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson

400 NORTH BROAD STREET, ELVERSON BUILDING

Robert Powers, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Conceptual Approval, Rehabilitation

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Commission members voted to recommend conceptual approval of the proposal.

The Applicant seeks conceptual approval of the rehabilitation of the tower and printing plant of the Elverson Building. The proposal includes the replacement in kind of metal windows, demolition of a 1980s building connecting the tower to 440 North Broad Street, removal of vertical conveyors from the side of the building, and the glazing or dark panel infill of former loading bays. Masonry infilled windows would be opened and appropriately glazed, while surfaces and openings damaged by the removal of the connector building and a vertical conveyor will be restored. Painted surfaces, including the tower, would be repainted. The Applicants propose to keep the mechanical penthouse on top of the building and to add air conditioning units behind it.

A motion made by Mr. Wilds to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal in concept was seconded by Mr. Vance and passed by unanimous vote.

3609-25 CHESTNUT STREET, RALSTON HOUSE

Mike Scholnick, Scholnick Wheeling Associates

PROPOSAL: Conceptual Approval, New Building on Site

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend conceptual approval of the project.

This proposal calls for conceptual approval for the construction of a new 57-unit elderly housing project located to the west of the 19th century Ralston House. The building would rise to seven stories with a side wall facing Walnut Street.

Ms. Matzkin noted that the design proposed has not been developed much beyond the basic plan and general massing owing to the phased fee structure of this HUD project. Mr. Wilds added these projects are typically tightly funded and often result in utilitarian, concrete block buildings. He expressed support for the general design and commented on the difficulty in viewing the Ralson House which is set far back from Chestnut Street. Ms. Kaplan stated that the project is not yet fully funded although a zoning variance has been granted.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal in concept. This was seconded by Mr. Vance and passed by unanimous vote.

30 SOUTH 7TH STREET

Alexander Messinger, Architect

PROPOSAL: Restore Front

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Committee members voted to support the scheme of the proposal as presented with some minor change to the entry door to be worked through at Commission staff level.

The building was recently vacated owing to a severe fire. The owners seek to partially restore the ground floor and add advertising cases that mimic the original ground floor casement windows. The left-most double doors would be restored but fixed closed. The right-most doors would be replaced with a shorter single door topped by a transom. Placement of the window cases forward or flush with the plane of the historic doors has not yet been resolved, although Architectural Committee members expressed opinions in favor of the historic door setback.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, contingent upon review of final details by the Commission staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Candelori and passed by unanimous vote.

2127 ST. JAMES STREET

Marion Rogel, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Alterations and Demolition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Owing to lack of information, the Committee voted against making any recommendation to the Commission and to reopen the review at the 29 August 1995 Architectural Committee meeting. They requested that photographs of every facade where work is being

performed and scaled and complete architectural drawings be provided by the Applicant at least ten days before this meeting. Prior to this public meeting, members of staff and the Committee will meeting with Ms. Rogel at the house to observe existing conditions.

This application involves extensive work to a 1923 house in English Village begun without benefit of a building permit. After a large air-conditioner opening was cut through a front wall, work was stopped by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. An agreement was reached that the air-conditioner would be removed, the wall restored, and a permit issued for interior work only. This proposal covers the balance of the planned exterior work.

Ms. Rogel had been unable to submit requested photographs and correct and architecturally scaled drawings to the Architectural Committee, whose members voted to postpone review of this complex proposal until a clear presentation could be made.

Ms. Matzkin described that since the Architectural Committee meeting, she and Mr. Tyler had met Ms. Rogel on site. Dr. Brownlee asked whether Commission discussion was necessary since the proposal was to be sent back to Committee and had no recommendation to discuss. Mr. Tyler described the details of each proposed alteration, but discussion did not ensue as Mr. Wilds suggested waiting one month so that the Committee could be presented with a full proposal and offer a recommendation. Several Commission members agreed with the suggestion.

Ms. Rogel brought to the table the drawings previously reviewed by the Architectural Committee and began to describe the project. Mr. Spilove explained that the Commission could not properly discuss the proposal before correct drawings showing all of the work proposed were available. Mr. Spilove recommended that Ms. Rogel have a set of more understandable plans produced, and that she avail herself of the Commission's staff for further guidance and information. Ms. Rogel asked whether staff would assist in the production of the drawings. Mr. Spilove responded that the Commission staff would meet with her architect as often as necessary to offer guidance. The drawings are to be prepared in time for distribution to Committee members in advance of their 29 August 1995 meeting.

No vote was taken for this proposal.

122-124 SOUTH 18TH STREET

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect

PROPOSAL: Alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee voted to recommend approving the proposal in concept, and allowing the details to be worked out at staff level.

This proposal calls for restoring these two mansions to be used for commercial space. Some interior and minor exterior work has been approved at staff level. More significant exterior work was proposed for review by the Architectural Committee. Exterior ductwork and a fire escape are to be removed. The storefront, covered with a plywood treatment when a mezzanine was added to the building, would be revealed and a new storefront added to existing salvageable elements in the old masonry opening. Removal of the plywood from the transom revealed stained glass which the Applicant intends to repair where possible and replicate where missing.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal in concept, with details to be worked out at staff level. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilds and passed by unanimous vote.

7500 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

John Teets, Architect

PROPOSAL: New Building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal and asked that the architect work with staff on these details.

The New Covenant Church plans to demolish a deteriorating modern building and reuse the foundations to build a new building to hold a sanctuary, lecture rooms, and offices. The building would feature a steeply pitched roof whose materials and color have yet to be determined.

Mr. Wilds moved to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, with details to be discussed with the Commission staff. Dr. Brownlee seconded the motion, which was passed by unanimous vote.

940 SOUTH FRONT STREET

Sabrina Soong Architect

PROPOSAL: Demolition and New Addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Committee recommended approval of the project and that the final issues relating to reroofing and the restoration of the front facade cornice and dormer be handled at staff level.

The proposal calls for demolishing the visible 2-story rear el of a mid-18th century house. The owner proposes to re-roof and restore the cornice of the front portion of the house and to build a large new addition at the rear. Aside from the cornice and roof, no work on the front facade is planned at this time. The owner intends to eventually remove the permastone from the front facade.

Mr. Wilds expressed uneasiness with the removal of the 18th century rear el and questioned its visibility through the adjacent vacant lot. Although the stuccoed el sits at the side opposite the vacant lot, the addition proposed to replace it would extend the full width of the building. The el floods regularly and has structural problems. The visibility of the addition would be reduced by a gate across the vacant lot, slated to be used as a driveway.

A member of Commission staff explained that the project originally included the restoration of the front facade, making the demolition of the rear el somewhat more acceptable. The owner now claims to have insufficient funds to restore both the front and replace the rear el, and seeks only the el replacement to increase the square footage of the building threefold.

Dr. Brownlee conceded that the el appears to be an 18th century part of the building, but noted that it is minor and not very visible. Mr. Wilds asked that the floor plans of the rear el be documented if its demolition is approved.

Dr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Report of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal. A measured plan of the rear el shall be produced and approved prior to its demolition. The final issues relating to reroofing and the restoration of the front facade cornice and dormer shall be handled at staff level. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Baron presented the new lower-income row buildings proposed for the 1600 block of Diamond Street, within the Diamond Street Historic District. As this is new construction, the Commission may review and comment on the design for 45 days. The architect, Blackney Hayes Architects, has been working with Commission staff on the project. The project deadline precluded waiting for the next month's Architectural Committee meeting, so the design was distributed to Committee members and their opinions collected via telephone. Mr. Baron related that all of the Committee members contacted were in favor of approval. Some comments were made about the size of the first floor windows and the placement of the third floor windows, although there was no consensus in the comments.

Lower income housing designs often feature Neo-Colonial two story buildings set back from the street. Staff found this project to be acceptable as it rises to three stories, comes forward to the street, has stoops, and responds to the Victorian neighborhood with Neo-Victorian details. The entrance doors have blank panels to the right and above to recall the larger double doors of Victorian architecture. Mr. Wilds remembered that the original contract had been for a modular design but that it was recently changed to a stick construction.

Commission members commented on the fenestration and the location of the stoops. Mr. Tyler stated that staff could relate these comments back to the architect, but reminded Commission members that the architect is not bound by Commission recommendations. Mr. Wilds spoke in support of approving the project.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the project in concept that was seconded by Ms. Rabinovitch and passed by unanimous vote.

REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, July 1995, Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer. Commission members had no questions about the Report.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Plavin Salganicoff