

**THE MINUTES OF THE 405th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 May 1996**

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

Present

Wayne Spilove, Chairperson
Robert Barnett, Commissioner, Department of Licenses and
Inspections
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Arlene Matzkin
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing and Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie Wolf, Ph.D.

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Preservation Technician
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Specialist

Also, with affiliation and/or project

Paul Bonvicino, SuperFresh
Mark Olear, SuperFresh
Shelly Merhige, Council President Street's Office
Eugene Mayer, M2W2, Inc.
William Wheeler, M2W2, Inc.
Rev. Michael J. Fitzpatrick, Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Rev. Joseph C. Diekhaus, Chaplain of Convent of Divine Love
Msgr. James J. Graham, Judicial Vicar, Archdiocese of
Philadelphia
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Ted Stepkowski, N.E. Brick & Block Co., Convent of Divine Love
Edward Siravo, N.E. Brick & Block Co., Convent of Divine Love
Ralph Kelly, Esq., Convent of Divine Love
Carlo Pey, Market East
George Yu, George Yu Architects, Temple University
Bernard Nearey, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Judith Eden, CCRA
Bobbie Burke, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Benjamin F. Miller, Allison Rittenhouse Association
Jim Pavlock, 2200 Brandywine Street
Milton Marks, Preservation Alliance

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum
and called the 405th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia
Historical Commission to order at 10:05 A.M.

MINUTES of the 404rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Brownlee and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 404th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 10 April 1996, Wayne Spilove, Chair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE REPORT, 30 April 1996, Arlene Matzkin, Chair

Boathouses #2 & #3, Fairmount Rowing Assoc. & Quaker City Barge Club

Anthony Weber, Architect

PROPOSAL: Door replacement, skylights

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval as long as skylights are installed with a "flat dome"

Ms. Matzkin described the building as two separate boathouses, linked at the second floor with a 1946 concrete block addition. She explained that the owners had already purchased a french door with snap-in mullions for the link and planned to install a like door, not yet acquired, in the 1865 boathouse. The owners, working with staff, suggested a compromise: that the architectural committee approve the use of the purchased door for the link; in return, the Club would restore the wood, true muntin door in the 1865 portion of the building to its original arch shape.

Ms. Matzkin described the proposed skylights as low domes that were not very visible from the street.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which passed by a unanimous vote.

601 Walnut Street, Curtis Center Building

Marshall Stoltz, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with plaques to be attached with two screws drilled into epoxy filled holes

Ms. Matzkin described the proposed plaques for the Norman Rockwell museum and their placement on the building. Mr. Wilds asked why the Architectural Committee preferred screws instead of epoxy. Ms. Matzkin explained that epoxy covers the whole surface of the granite and must be ground off if the plaque is ever removed, whereas screws leave only small holes which can be filled.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed by a unanimous vote.

416 South Iseminger Street

Michele Hyll, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Windows/Chimney alteration, pointing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of new true thin muntin wood sash in the existing frames and chimney work without visible caps with details to be approved by staff

Ms. Matzkin explained that the applicant suggested using windows with applied muntins, but the Architectural Committee said that only true muntin windows were appropriate. She also stated that the Committee approved the chimney repair but without the submitted metal caps. Mr. Baron stated that the proposal also included patch pointing which the staff could oversee.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and with approval of the patch pointing by staff. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

104 Market Street

Stanley Tasey, Architect

PROPOSAL: Storefront alteration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

Ms. Matzkin stated that the Commission had already approved rebuilding the storefront, but the applicant must switch the door placement to accommodate a fire exit.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

100-118 South Broad Street, Land Title Building

William Enley, Engineer

PROPOSAL: Transom vent

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

Ms. Matzkin explained that the recessed door was not highly visible and was on a secondary facade.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which

passed by unanimous vote.

229 Race Street

Richard Maimon, Architect

PROPOSAL: Window alteration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval subject to staff approval of details and a pointing sample

Ms. Matzkin reported that the proposal was for the replacement of existing sash and that the staff would oversee the repointing.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

276 South 20th Street

William Clay, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Roofing, cleaning, repointing and cornice repair

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff review of samples and details. The new shingles should be grey to mimic slate.

Ms. Matzkin reported that the Committee approved the replacement of the asphalt shingles. Staff would approve the repointing, cleaning, and cornice repair.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1834-1838 Park Avenue, Shusterman Hall

Shawn Marren, George Yu Architects

PROPOSAL: South wall masonry and windows; ADA access, and roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of raising the grade and installing a new door pending the receipt of a detail that allows for retaining the visibility of some of the watertable coping and a vapor barrier to avoid damaging the floor joists. The Committee recommends approval of a new slate roof but not a substitute slate. The Committee expressed concern that the stone wall might create a false historic impression but agreed to reexamine the issue if the University restudies the design to avoid this appearance. Committee members recommend approval of the new window.

Ms. Matzkin described the three separate issues in the proposal. She stated that the Committee approved the regrading of the plaza for ADA access, with the retention of the visibility

of the watertable. The Committee also recommended approval of the replacement of the slate roof, but only with real slate. She emphasized the Committee's position that the roof was a major architectural element and should have real slate to replace the existing real slate. The third issue, the stucco wall which the applicant wants to face with stone, was still in discussion. The Committee stated that the wall should not give a false historic impression and perhaps should have different material from the other facades. The Committee approved a window for the wall.

George Yu, of George Yu Architects, asked if the Commission would approve a synthetic slate shingle if real slate proved cost-prohibitive and Temple lacked adequate money for either the stone on the south wall or the slate roof. Ms. Matzkin said that if that was the case the proposal should go before the Architectural Committee again with specifics.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion. The motion carried with ten votes; Mr. Sklaroff abstained by reason of recusal.

2204-2216 Green Street, Convent of Divine Love

Edward Siravo, Jr., Builder

PROPOSAL: Rebuild Brandywine Street wall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval pending receipt of a drawing with a modified design. It was noted that work should continue pouring the foundation for the new wall in the meantime.

Ms. Matzkin reported that the Convent of Divine Love proposed to replace a deteriorated wall cited as imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses and Inspections on Brandywine Street. The wall, which provides privacy for the cloistered convent, stretches 235 feet in length and rises 18 feet in height. The new wall would be constructed of split-face rock, but the design proposed by the contractor had a very linear quality that emphasized the wall's length. The Architectural Committee recommended that an architect prepare another design for the wall which emphasized vertical breaks in the wall, yet did not create more expense for the convent. An architect did draw a new design *pro bono* that featured a checkerboard pattern separated by "pilasters" of different colored block. Mr. Tyler reiterated that the height and the material were not issues in the decision. Also, the design developed by the architect was not the only reasonable solution.

Ralph Kelly, Esq., counsel for the convent, said that the contractor received this drawing on Monday, 6 May. He stated that the material and checkerboard pattern for the wall would be

visible on the back as well as the front. On the inside, the nuns use the wall as a backdrop for the Stations of the Cross for contemplative prayer. The nuns would like an aesthetically pleasing wall, but the checkerboard pattern interferes with this purpose.

Ted Stepkowski, the contractor, stated that the wall design proposed by the Architectural Committee would cost 15-20% more than the submitted plans owing to increased labor needed for the checkerboard pattern. Also, the design indicated a change in the height of the retaining wall component with the change in grade. Mr. Stepkowski stated that the nuns would like to keep the retaining wall level, regardless of grade. The proposed pattern also posed a problem in that an anti-graffiti coating was to be applied to the wall surface for the lower ten (10) feet and this changes the color of the block. This will cause the lower ten (10) feet to be much darker than the upper portion of the wall. Graffiti-proofing the entire wall was cost-prohibitive. He proposed a modified design that incorporated the checkerboard motif, but had horizontal bands at the 10-foot mark. This demarcation would incorporate the change in color as part of the design.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned the Commission's jurisdiction in the matter, because the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 stated that government can not place a substantial burden on a person's exercise of religion unless that burden furthers a compelling governmental interest and is the least restrictive means of achieving that interest. He believed that this issue did not demonstrate a compelling governmental interest. Mr. Tyler stated that while no compelling interest exists here, the project came under the jurisdiction of the Commission because the property appears on the Philadelphia Register. The need for and the dimensions of the wall have not come into question and the Committee was working with the convent to reach a satisfactory solution. Ms. Wolf stated that the cooperation between the Commission and the Order to devise a design solution should also strive to keep the streetscape comfortable for neighbors who have to look at this expansive wall. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated his question and stated that larger issues arose because it was a religious property and that the Commission needed the Law Department's advice. Mr. Spilove stated that the Commission would seek Law Department guidance on this issue, but for now the convent and the Commission were working together to seek an appropriate design that would please all parties involved.

Mr. James asked if the checkerboard design would interfere with the nuns' desire to pray outside and asked to hear from any neighbors present. A clergyman from the audience stated that the design would interfere with the devotional practices.

Mr. Wilds stated that the entire property is listed as historic, so the Commission has jurisdiction over the changes on the entire site.

James Pavlock, a neighbor at 2212 Brandywine Street, testified that the neighbors had spoken with the nuns about the design of the wall. He stated that while the nuns understood that the neighbors have concerns, he believed that they did not understand the true nature of the impact of the wall on the street. The convent plants trees and bushes against the inside of the wall which breaks the expanse visually. Also, the height of the wall is lower on the inside, because the grade there is higher. Mr. Pavlock explained that the outside of the wall has nothing to break the expanse and height visually.

Mr. Brownlee noted the good will exhibited and the respect shown for freedom of religion by all parties to the discussion. In the spirit of conciliation, he suggested referring the matter back to the *pro bono* architects, the Committee and the Order to work out the details.

Mr. Tyler observed that the discussion of the design submitted today, which possesses a more linear quality than the checkerboard plan, could provide the desired rhythm through the introduction of a color at the faux pilasters and would not interfere with the Stations of the Cross. This could form the basis for a solution.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion with the amendment that the Order will make the final decision on the design with the cooperation of the Architectural Committee and neighbors in an advisory capacity. This motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tyler asked if the Commission intended that the staff approve the final design without referral to Committee and Commission. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Barnett stated that further review by Committee or staff was not necessary.

2411 Spruce Street

Zvi Barzilay, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial

Ms. Matzkin reported that the applicant requested a postponement of a vote owing to his absence from the City today and his desire to be present when the Commission voted. She recommended that the Commission vote formally to defer its decision. This fulfills the Commission's obligation to act on a

application within 60 days of submission.

Mr. Barnett made a motion to defer a decision on this application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried by a unanimous vote.

1534 Pine Street

Dean Bianchini, Contractor

PROPOSAL: Brownstone repair

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with condition that staff approve test areas for color and form.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the Architectural Committee was not familiar with the proposed material, Mimic, for the brownstone repair; however, the contractor seemed highly qualified and had worked with the material in the past.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which the Commission adopted.

1900 Pine Street

Allan Baumholtz, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Widen openings and install new windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval contingent upon removal of the loose plastic signage on the side of the building.

Ms. Matzkin reported that the owner had installed new windows without a permit. The building had been greatly compromised over the years and the new windows are more appropriate than the previous ones. Upon inspection of the windows, staff discovered an inappropriate sign. The Committee recommended approval of the windows subject to removal of the sign. Mr. Barnett stated that such conditions are difficult to monitor by his inspectors. Ms. Wolf said that the removal of the sign would be a final act, and that inspectors for L&I would not need to know about the contingency. If the owner wants to install a new sign, then he would have to follow the proper procedures as if he never had a sign before. With this explanation, Mr. Barnett said that he would favor the condition.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the approving of these windows would set a precedent. Mr. Baron explained that because all of the other windows were already aluminum and the building has been so extensively altered, that in essence the new windows are in harmony with what has become a 20th century renovated building.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed

unanimously.

1714 Walnut Street

Kathryn Walker, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New storefront

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial as submitted. The Committee will review a new design that the applicant explained would be forthcoming.

Ms. Matzkin showed the proposed design for the storefront and stated that the Committee rejected the design for two reasons. First, Armand Carroll, a prolific Philadelphia architect in the 1940s, designed the Bauhaus modification which has its own significance and should not be compromised. Second, the new design would create something that never existed there and would have muddled the entire building with too many styles and time periods. Mr. Sklaroff asked if another proposal had been submitted. Ms. Matzkin said not yet.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1805-1809 Walnut Street, Allison Building

Thomas Howell, Architect

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations, awnings, signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with storefront details to match existing. The staff will review the shop drawings of this detail.

Ms. Matzkin reported that the owners wanted a single double-leaf doorway. The door and surround would have details that match the existing windows and door.

Mr. Spilove recused himself; Ms. Wolf assumed the chair.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. Wolf returned the chair to Mr. Spilove.

1811 Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Club

David Polatnick, Architect

PROPOSAL: New construction, loading dock, new doorway, and awnings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of new doorway and the tabling of consideration of all other matters until

receipt of sufficient information to review.

Ms. Matzkin reported that the Committee approved the proposed new doorway. This entails the removal of the steps and lowering the door to grade to achieve ADA access and infilling the space between the door head and the arched transom with a panel. The Committee had a problem with the center balloon awning and suggested a glass and metal canopy over the door. The applicant will return with more awning details. The rear of the building remained unresolved. The Committee and the architects discussed ideas for the treatment of the rear, including a cantilevered second story. The Committee recommended that all other parts of the proposal be tabled until the applicant furnished more information.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if other service areas existed on Sansom Street. Ms. Matzkin stated that there was a small one across the street which had a cantilevered second floor and entrances to a parking garage to the west.

Some confusion arose because the Committee believed that the Commission had previously approved the demolition of the rear of the building in concept. Although the Commission had heard a proposal to demolish the rear, it had voted to table the decision pending the submission of a more formal proposal. The Commission did approve the demolition of the rear in 1989 for a hotel tower, but that approval was for that proposal only. Since the present application comes from a another developer for a different scheme, the Commission must address the issue of demolition *de novo*.

Bernard Nearey, of 2200 St. James Place, representing a group of neighbors, asked the Commission once again not to vote for demolitions "in concept" until the submission and approval of a formal and complete development package.

Mr. Tyler said that at times an applicant needs direction at the policy level for complex and large projects. Approval "in concept" provides applicants guidance for acceptable design development.

Judith Eden, Executive Vice-President of CCRA, reiterated testimony from previous meetings. She stated that the Commission has no legal basis for advisory opinions and that demolition "in concept" lacks clarity and so should not be approved.

Ms. Wolf restated the Architectural Committee's recommendation of approval of the new door and the tabling of all other matters. This recommendation followed the advice of both Mr. Nearey and Ms. Eden.

Mr. Tyler asserted that not providing conceptual reviews or advisory opinions to applicants harmed the Commission and preservation. The staff and Commission should be able to offer advice and guidance to applicants so that the applicants understand what courses of action are appropriate. Mr. Brownlee supported Mr. Tyler by saying that the approval/denial of proposals was only a part of the purpose of the Commission and that the Commission should act in an advisory capacity.

Ms. Kaplan made a motion to approve the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion.

Milton Marks, from the Preservation Alliance, testified that the confusion that occurred over the Commission's earlier stance on the demolition of the rear of the Rittenhouse Club stemmed from the delay of the release of the minutes to the public. He stated that the public should have access to the packet that Commission members receive, including the minutes, and not have to wait until the minutes are approved. Mr. Spilove stated that the Preservation Alliance and other community groups attend the meetings so they know the information in the minutes firsthand. Mr. Brownlee stated that the confusion did not stem from the publication of the minutes. Mr. Tyler stated that the office cannot mail the minutes until the Commission has approved them. It was suggested that the staff offer access to the minutes in the office once they are mailed to the Commission members.

Hal Wheeler, developer of the site, testified that the new use of the building would be an up-scale gourmet food store oriented towards the Rittenhouse District residents. The proposed design cost over \$3,500,000 for an 11,000 square foot area and would be nothing less than top-notch. Loading will be on-site, and recycling and trash will be diligently watched. The building has been vacant for almost ten years and is in poor shape. The upper floors will be rehabilitated.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Commission is only concerned with design issues. The use of a building constitutes a zoning issue, not a preservation question. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Commission is also interested in stimulating economic revitalization through historic preservation.

Mark Olear, Director of Real Estate for SuperFresh Division of A&P in South Jersey and Philadelphia, testified that the project is very important to the company. He stated that the store will be tailored to the area and will be very different from any other SuperFresh in the city and surrounding area.

Shelly Merhige, of City Council President John Street's office, stated that President Street's office had received a number of calls from residents with questions about this project.

President Street is having a meeting that evening to give the public a forum for questions and comment. President Street also asked the Commission to table a vote until after the public meeting. Mr. Wilds noted that the recommendation of the Committee is only to approve the door for ADA access with all other issues to be tabled. Ms. Merhige stated that the recommendation is a problem for the community, and restated the request for a tabling of the vote.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to table the entire issue with the understanding that a proposal will be welcomed in the future. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried by a unanimous vote.

1428-30 Locust Street AKA 235 South 15th Street

Joseph Alteri, DAS Architects

PROPOSAL: Storefront alteration, awnings and signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of alterations to the storefront and installation of doors in the storefront contingent upon thinning down the members and increasing the glass area, approval of the tile work contingent upon staff approval of a design more in harmony with the light colored Classicism of the rest of the building. Method of attachment for lights, signs, awnings and grates to be reviewed at staff level.

Ms. Matzkin reported that the site is on a corner and will be a coffee shop called XANDO. The Committee approved the proposal except for the heavy wood casements and recommended metal ones.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The Report of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, April 1996, Richard Tyler.

Old Business

13 South 21st Street

Ivor Moore, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Legalization of existing sign

Mr. Tyler stated that the Memorandum by Mr. Barnett was distributed to all Commission members. Mr. Barnett said the language was consistent with the Art Commission's decisions on signs and is approved by Licenses and Inspections.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the sign for continued use, but any modification or change to the sign or any change of use of the property would require that the sign conform to the Zoning Code and go through the entire city review process. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

New Business

Mr. Baron stated that the Architectural Committee had not heard the following proposals.

244 South 3rd Street, Powell House

Dale Frens, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Repointing

The Powell House received a grant for repointing, but the money must be spent before the next Architectural Committee meeting. The organization submitted specifications for the work and the mortar mix meets preservation standards. Mr. Baron asked if the Commission could delegate review of the samples to the staff so that the project could proceed and not lose its funding.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion that the review be delegated to the staff. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Baron stated that the next two properties were part of an on-going project that uses funds to rehabilitate buildings suffering from demolition by neglect. The Department of Licenses and Inspections has received the money for the projects, but the funding will no longer be available by the next Commission meeting. The owners had received numerous violations with fifteen (15) days notice to do the work.

9-11 South 2nd Street

L&I Rehabilitation work

832-836 Lombard Street

L&I Rehabilitation work

For 9-11 South 2nd Street, the work includes a new roof, new downspouts, resetting bricks in the cornice, removing and resetting the grates, new wood 6/6 true muntin windows on the front facade, wood coverings on the upper rear windows, and pointing as needed. The 832-836 Lombard property will receive the same work except a falling chimney will be rebuilt and the cornice will be replaced. The work covers emergency stabilization.

Mr. Spilove stated that the money is from a fund established by Senator Fumo's office and if it is not used by a certain date it will be lost. Commissioner Barnett has been working with Councilman DeCicco to determine which properties will be repaired. Ms. Wolf asked if the city will try to recoup the money. Mr. Barnett stated that liens will be placed on the properties. If successful, the Commission, along with Preservation Alliance and other community groups, will try to raise money through private grants to continue the project on a larger basis. Mr. Barnett stated that they have been working with the budget office to get the money into a revolving fund for the project.

Mr. Baron stated that the approval is for the work to be done, whether by the city or the property owners.

Ms. Kaplan made a motion to approve the scope of work. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried by a unanimous vote.

5535 Ridge Avenue at Seville Street

Larry Persofsky, Applicant
Steve Serdzik, Owner
Three homes on rear partition of lot

Mr. Baron reported that the property is on a corner in Roxborough. The property appears on the Philadelphia Register. The historic house is surrounded by a stone wall, but the property extends beyond the wall. On the property that is outside the stone wall, the applicant wants to build three new single-family houses. The zoning for the construction has been approved. Mr. Baron visited the site and believes that the new construction will not impinge on the character or context of the historic house, because the stone wall clearly demarcates the garden of the historic house. The rowhouses that are proposed will be stuccoed, similar to the historic house. Ms. Kaplan questioned what was being asked of the Commission. Mr. Brownlee stated that the proposal asked for approval of the new construction. Ms. Wolf suggested the dedesignation of the rear lot on which the new construction will sit. Since the historic area is clearly marked by the wall, anything outside the wall could be dedesignated. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the new construction will be an alteration of an historic site, therefore the Commission should approve the alteration.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the construction of the rowhouses at the rear of the historically designated site. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Mr. Spilove stated that he was called the day before by Mr. Baron to put the item on the agenda, saying that the owner had

just been informed that the site was historic. Mr. Spilove does not want to approve something received at the last minute and asked for more information. Mr. Brownlee stated that his motion was based on the information of Mr. Baron which he believed was sufficient for the Commission to decide. He agreed that perhaps more information should be sought before the Commission votes. Ms. Wolf asked if once the Commission had approved new construction did it also have jurisdiction over its design. If the subdivision has a new address, then is it no longer part of the historic property. Mr. Tyler stated that the assignment of the new address does not necessarily dedesignate the property. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the Designation Committee should handle the proposal rather than the Architectural Committee. It was explained that this would take longer because of the need for a Designation Committee meeting. Mr. Brownlee added that when a property is designated, the legal boundaries of the property at that date determine the boundaries of the designated historic site.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal. Ms. Matzkin seconded the motion.

Mr. James stated that he believed it would be unwise to approve a proposal submitted at the eleventh hour. The Commission should review the proposal further before a vote. Ms. Kaplan stated that she was concerned about the process by which the proposal was submitted, and twenty-four hours was not enough time for the Commission to make a decision.

Mr. Barnett made a motion to table the proposal until the June Commission meeting. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Jones asked that the Commission formally review the process of demolition in concept so that the Commission members know the legal framework. Mr. Tyler reported that the new Rules and Regulations for the Commission are being written and reviewed and will be brought to the Ad-Hoc Committee of the Commission shortly. Mr. Sklaroff asked that the statute concerning religious institutions and properties should be examined by the legal department.

Mr. Barnett made a motion to thank the staff for the extra material for the individual proposals which were very helpful. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Wilds asked if the Academy of Music had returned with a proposal for the ADA ramp. Mr. Tyler stated that it had not, but other work was progressing.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina