

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
30 September 2003**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

James Straw, Kise, Straw & Kolodner
Philip Scott, Kise, Straw & Kolodner
Doug Heckrotte, Kise, Straw & Kolodner
Kate Cowing, Kise, Straw & Kolodner
Raymond Diebel, Northstar Advisors
Stephanie Craighead, Fairmount Park Commission
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Kenneth Baritz, Esq.
Todd Baritz, Esq.
Rick Snyderman, 301-303 Cherry Street
Joel Spivak, designer
Rich Thom
Joe Fratto, 45 N. 2nd Street
Jeffrey Peezick, 45 N. 2nd Street
Frank Mallas, Friday Architects
Alan Heilman, A. Heilman Contracting
Edward Hickerson, T-Mobile
Daniel Magno, Wesley Architects
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Jeff Carson, City Sign Company
Linda Carroll-Pitts, Free Library of Philadelphia
Mitch Partovi, Free Library of Philadelphia
Gary Knappick, Capital Programs Office
Aparna Agrawal, Capital Programs Office
Brett Stafford, Brinjac Engineering
Missy Maxwell, Susan Maxman's Office
Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects
David Curry, Germantown Cricket Club
Dennis McCarthy, 6901 Germantown Avenue
Robert Hotes, DPKA
Alfred R. Borden, Lighting Practice
Julie M. Panassow, Lighting Practice
Marc Morfei, Center City District
Robert Boyd, Carl Massara Architect

Vince Massara, Carl Massara Architect
 Sandra Williams, 307 Phillips Street
 Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
 Kris Kolo
 Wayne Davis
 George Acevedo
 Miguel Santiago, 1601 Mt. Vernon Street

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:40 a.m.

Memorial Hall

Time: 10:30am

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Architect/Applicant: James Straw of Kise, Straw & Kolodner for the Please Touch Museum

History: built in 1876 for the Centennial Exhibition by architect Hermann Schwartzmann

Project: Conceptual review of façade alterations and an addition

This application for review in concept proposes several façade alterations as well as an addition to Memorial Hall. The most significant aspects of this proposal include new windows and doors for the corner pavilions and main or south façade, and the construction of an addition for a carousel on the east façade.

SOUTH ARCADE WINDOWS

The ten openings, five in each arcade, between the central entrance and corner pavilions in the main or south elevation (drawings Sk e1) would be reglazed. Originally, the arcade openings were open not glazed. The arcades were glazed in 1921 and the extant steel windows date to 1921. At that time, concrete infill was added to reduce the size of the window openings. The pane configuration of the 1921 windows was based on the configuration of the original windows in the north or rear façade.

The applicant has submitted three schemes for the reglazing of the arcades. In Scheme A, the 1921 windows and concrete infill would be removed and large frameless glass panels would be installed. The large glass panels would ostensibly replicate the open arcades of the pre-1921 building. In Scheme B, the 1921 windows would be replaced with identical windows. The concrete infill would be preserved. In Scheme C, the concrete infill would be removed and the 1921 windows would be replaced with windows of the same configuration.

Federal tax credits will be sought for this project. The State Historic Preservation Office contends that any window scheme other than Scheme B would jeopardize the tax credit application. The SHPO references Standard 4 and asserts that the 1921 windows and concrete infill have achieved their own historic significance.

CENTRAL ENTRANCE DOORS

Originally, bronze doors stood in the central entrance openings in the south façade. When the building was open, the doors were pulled back out of sight, giving the front façade an open appearance. In 1885, after the Centennial Exhibition, the bronze doors were replaced with wood panels and paneled wood doors. In 1921, when the arcade openings were glazed, fenestration was added to the upper panels. The 1885 wood doors and panels with the 1921 glazing are extant.

The applicant has submitted four schemes for the three central entrance openings (drawings Sk e1). In Scheme A, the wood panels and doors would be removed and large frameless glass panels and doors installed. The large glass panels and doors would ostensibly replicate the openness of the pre-1921 building. In Scheme B, the wood doors would be replaced with frameless glass panels and doors; the

upper, fenestrated wood panels would be retained. In Scheme C, the wood panels and doors would be replaced with wood folding doors replicating the appearance of the wood panels and doors; a system of frameless glass panels and doors would be installed behind the folding doors. When the museum is open, the doors would be pulled back out of sight, giving the front façade an open appearance. In Revised Scheme C, the wood panels and doors would be replaced with a replication of the 1876 bronze and iron doors; a system of frameless glass panels and doors would be installed behind the bronze doors. When the museum is open, the doors would be pulled back out of sight, giving the front façade an open appearance.

The SHPO contends that the 1885 wood panels and doors with their 1921 alterations have achieved their own historic significance as defined by Standard 4 and therefore must be retained.

CORNER PAVILION WINDOWS

The eight tall windows in the four corner pavilions, which date to the renovation undertaken in the 1950s and 1960s, would be removed and replaced with new windows replicating the 1876 windows.

The SHPO contends that the extant corner windows are not significant and therefore may be replaced.

CAROUSEL ADDITION

A large addition would be constructed at the east façade (drawings Sk c2 and Sk c3). Lawn and a driveway currently occupies the addition site. The addition would house an antique carousel at the 1st-story level and service facilities below grade. It would be constructed of steel and glass and connect to Memorial Hall below the decorative belt courses and frieze running across the central section of the east façade. Three historic blind arches in the east façade would be opened, allowing circulation from Memorial Hall. A garage opening would be added below grade in the east façade; it would be shrouded by the addition. Two doorways would be added at grade to the east façade, but would be obscured by the addition. An access road would run north from the addition to the Kelly Pool parking lot. A cooling tower screened by a fence would be located at the northeast corner of the addition.

ASSORTED ALTERATIONS

On the south façade (drawings Sk e1) in the eastern arcade, a non-historic stairway and doors would be removed and the façade and balustrade restored. On the east facade (drawings Sk e2), a non-historic stairway and doors would be removed and the façade restored. On the north facade (drawings Sk e3), a non-historic ramp and three non-historic doors would be removed and the façade restored. On the west facade (drawings Sk e4), two non-historic stairways and doors would be removed and the façade restored. Two emergency exits would be added at grade. Several skylights would be restored.

ALTERATIONS TO THE GROUNDS

Several alterations would be made to the grounds (drawing LSK-1). A school bus drop-off road would be added to the north. A large parking lot would be added to the west. At the south, the north branch of the Concourse would be closed to traffic and the plaza between the branches of the Concourse restored. Drop-off lots flanking the main entrance would be constructed. The land on either side of the main entrance steps would be regraded, allowing sidewalks to be built up to the main entrance and obviating the need for ramps. This change in grade is not represented on the south elevation drawing (drawing Sk e1), but will undoubtedly alter the appearance of the building on the landscape.

Staff Recommendation: The staff was split on the south arcade windows. One staff member recommends Scheme A, two recommend Scheme C, and one contends that additional study should be undertaken. No recommendation on the central entrance doors until further information is provided. Approval of the corner pavilion windows. The staff asserts that, unlike the Engine House at the Fairmount Waterworks, Memorial Hall, which is very large, can accommodate a relatively small addition if designed properly. Two recommend refining the proposed addition design and two recommend reducing the size of the addition, but all agree that an appropriate addition is acceptable. Approval of the removal of non-historic

features and related restoration. Approval of new emergency exits. Denial of the drop-off lots. Denial of the regrading for sidewalks up to the main entrance. Approval of other landscape restoration and alteration. Pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, restoration Standard 4, and the Building Site.

James Straw, Philip Scott, Doug Heckrotte, and Kate Cowing of Kise, Straw & Kolodner and Raymond Diebel of Northstar Advisors represented the application. Stephanie Craighead and Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission also attended. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Straw then walked the Committee through the plans for rehabilitating Memorial Hall as the Please Touch Museum. He discussed all aspects of the interior and exterior renovations and additions. He presented a new proposal for the main doors that would replicate the original 1876 bronze and iron doors; the new proposal was also labeled Scheme C, but is referred to here as Revised Scheme C.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance, who served as the chair of an advisory committee that counseled the architects and Please Touch Museum on the Memorial Hall project, made a statement. He asserted that it was a mistake for the Historical Commission staff to decline his invitation to participate on the committee. He also asked that the Commission staff work, as they had on the Naval Home project, to broker a compromise between the Commission, SHPO, and NPS for the Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credit. He stated that it was his committee's preference that the corner pavilion windows be restored to their 1876 appearance, that the arcade windows be restored to their 1921 configuration minus the concrete infill, that the original bronze doors be replicated, that the addition to the east be approved but the design refined, and that the site plan be revised.

Mr. Baron of the staff noted that the applicant had not submitted an elevation depicting the front façade with the grading for the sidewalks up to main entrance. He contended that the regrading would significantly alter the relationship of the building to the landscape. The building, he asserted, is already rather squat and would be lowered visually by this alteration. The staff noted that eagles and other statuary, which is long lost, pulled the building upward. Mr. Straw replied that his design team would prepare alternatives for bringing visitors up to the level of the main entrance. Mr. Baron suggested that a stone-faced ramp that would merge visually with the base of the building might provide a better alternative than mounding earth up against the building. Mr. Straw presented historic postcards demonstrating that the regrading would approximate the historic landscaping.

The Committee members discussed the complex proposal with the applicants. They agreed that, unlike the Engine House at the Fairmount Waterworks, Memorial Hall could accommodate an addition. They also agreed that the east façade was the most appropriate location for the addition; situated to the east, it would necessitate the fewest disruptions to historic fabric. Some Committee members thought that the addition design should be simplified, differentiating new construction from the historic fabric; others deemed the submitted design satisfactory. Committee members then discussed the windows for the arcade. They did not believe that the frameless glass would successfully replicate the original openings. They preferred the windows proposed in Scheme C and Revised Scheme C, which calls for the replication of the configuration but not the details of the 1921 windows. Unlike the SHPO, they asserted that the concrete infill should be removed, not replicated or restored. They did not believe that it had achieved the level of significance stipulated by Standard 4 to warrant preservation. For the doors, the Committee preferred the replication of the 1876 bronze and iron doors, Revised Scheme C, even though their inclusion would necessitate the removal of the extant 1885 wood doors and panels. The Committee also agreed that the removal of assorted non-historic stairs, doors, and ramps and the restoration of facades and windows was acceptable. Finally, for the facades, they decided that the addition of the two emergency exits at the west was necessary. Mr. Straw stated that the exits would be masked with landscaping.

The Committee turned its attention to the grounds. Mr. Straw presented a new plan for the grounds not yet seen by the Committee or staff. The decorative paving was not included on the new plan. The closing of the north branch of the Concourse in front of Memorial Hall troubled some Committee members. They asked for more information. Mr. Straw stated that a traffic-engineering consultant had recently been retained to study traffic flow and parking. The consultant's findings were not yet available. Committee members asked that the findings be presented at a later meeting. The regrading and sidewalks up to the main entrance also concerned the Committee. Committee members suggested that the applicants study additional alternatives. For the drop-off lots, they preferred the updated plan to the submitted plan. It better replicated the original terrace that encircled the building. They suggested that the drop-off lots be paved with the same material already in place at the walk leading to the main steps. They found the other design elements including the parking lot, school bus drive, and plaza restoration acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommends approval in concept of the following: the main-façade doors and windows stipulated in Revised Scheme C, i.e. the replicated 1876 bronze and iron doors and new windows based on the 1921 configuration, but without the infill; the restoration of the corner pavilion windows to their 1876 appearance; the location, size, connection, and overall appearance but not the exterior details of the carousel addition; the removal of non-historic stairs, doors, and ramps and the restoration of associated areas; the two emergency exits near grade on the west façade; the redesigned drop-off lots flanking the main entrance, provided the paving matches the central walkway; the school bus drop-off road and main parking lot; and the restoration of the plaza between the branches of the Concourse. The Committee recommends that further study be undertaken and alternative plans be submitted before decisions are rendered on the regrading for sidewalks up to the main entrance and the closing of the north branch of the Concourse.

Philadelphia Museum of Art

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Richard Tustin, Capital Programs Office, Applicant

Built: 1919-28, Horace Trumbauer, Clarence Zantzinger & Charles Borie, architects

Proposal: Lighting and security cameras

This application is for new lighting fixtures and security cameras around the museum. The present light fixtures, approved by the Commission and installed in 1998, are copies of the lights that historically stood around the museum and Logan Circle. The proposal calls for replacing many of the fixtures with new ones that have lights and security cameras, as well as adding poles with just security cameras. The cameras have plastic housing and sit on arms attached to the poles. The proposed poles have the same detailing as the existing light fixtures, but with an extra neck to hold the armature for the camera. The proposed cameras will measure 10 inches by 13 inches (not counting the armatures) and have housing the same color as the poles.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The cameras should not be attached to existing lights since this will distort the historic pole configuration and detract the visual impact of the historic lights. The poles on which the cameras stand should not replicate the historic light design, but have a simple design.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Gary Knappick and Aparna Agrawal of the Capital Programs Office, Brett Stafford of Brinjac Engineering, and Missy Maxwell of Susan Maxman's Office attended the meeting. Mr. Knappick explained that the City is undertaking a comprehensive security project that includes the Art Museum, its new Perelman Building, the Rodin Museum and two of the historic houses in Fairmount Park.

Missy Maxwell, consultant for the project, explained that the some of the lights around the museum are made of fiberglass and some of cast-iron. The fiberglass does not withstand the elements so they are in

the process of replacing all of the fixtures with the more durable material. Seven existing lights will be replaced with new light fixtures that also have security cameras. The other cameras will be installed on new poles that will match the design of the lights.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted.

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sandra Horrocks, Applicant

Built: 1912-27, Horace Trumbauer, architect

Proposal: Two illuminated signs

The library returns with a revised signage application. The proposal calls for two signs, one at the corner of 20th and Vine Streets and the other at 19th & Vine Streets. Both will have lexan-faced metal signs with painted aluminum tube supports. The facing of the signs will be white with blue and lettering, surrounding a three-line LED screen. The eastern sign will be approximately 8-½ feet tall and equally wide. It will sit at the steps that lead down to the eastern side. The western sign stands approximately 12 feet tall, equally wide, and will be placed between the western steps and the building itself.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would look favorably on illuminated sign boxes.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Jeff Carson of City Sign Company, Linda Carroll-Pitts, Director of Public Relations, and Mitch Partovi, Engineer Specialist for the library, attended the meeting. Mr. Carson explained that the library offers numerous programs that change daily so it requires a sign that can be updated frequently. He believes that the proposed sign is in keeping with others on the Parkway. He noted that William Burke of the Art Commission told him that the Art Commission will concur with whatever decision the Historical Commission makes. Ms. Carroll-Pitts said that the library is losing custodial staff, who have been changing the current sign, and they need signage that does not require a large amount of manpower to maintain. She also has an extremely limited budget for advertising the library's programs so these signs offer the greatest exposure to vehicles and pedestrians around the area. Mr. Carson noted that the sign on the 20th Street side has been moved so it does not obscure the ornate base of the flagpole.

The Committee discussed the design of the signs and asked that they be changed in several ways: the posts should be made smaller and have bollard caps, and the facing should be a cream color to match the stone of the building. Committee members noted that all wiring should be underground. Mr. Carson agreed and noted that there will be two electrical connections for each sign, one for the background light and one for the LED screen.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the signs, on the condition that the posts have a smaller diameter and bollard caps and the facing is changed to a color that matches the stone of the building, with staff to review details.

1007-13 Chestnut Street, Victory Building Annex

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Architect/Applicant

Built: 1901, Roos & Booraem, architects

Proposal: Rear facade alterations

The rear elevation of this building has suffered many unkind alterations. The bays between the cast-iron columns have concrete infill and metal doors, and the transoms are currently open. The application calls for retaining the infill and applying fresh stucco. The flush, metal doors would be replaced with the same.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant should research the historical configuration for these storefronts and restore the detailing. At the very least, the areas between the bays should have glazing rather than stuccoed infill.

Jonathan Broh, architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Spina presented the project and noted that the tenant submitted plans to the Commission staff showing glazing in the openings rather than infill. Mr. Broh said that the tenant actually prefers having infill rather than glass. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested using spandrel glass. Mr. McCoubrey also suggested metal panels. The Committee said that the storefront has the typical configuration of lower panels, storefront openings and transoms above. The transoms should definitely have glass rather than infill. Since the framing of the storefront is metal, staff and Committee members agreed that the lower panels probably were metal as well. The Committee also agreed that the storefront openings, while they had glass originally, could have metal panels as infill. The Committee also discussed the design of the doors. They asked Mr. Broh to investigate the possibility of having paneled metal doors rather than flush metal doors.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of restoring the cast-iron piers, glass in the transoms, metal panels in the storefront openings and below, and paneled or flush metal doors, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.]

411 Manheim Street aka 5140 Morris Street, Germantown Cricket Club

Germantown Cricket Club, Owner

David Curry, Applicant

Built: 1890-91, McKim, Mead & White, architects; 1902-07, wings added, McKim, Mead & White, architects

Proposal: Legalize step alterations

The limestone steps leading to the porch had worn considerably, so the club asked a contractor to replace them with a new set. Staff approved legalizing the step replacement since they matched the originals. However, the club did not want to dispose of the original steps and the mason moved them to the side of the porch. So now the steps lead to nowhere because the original railing blocks entrance to the porch. The club would like to erect a sign that commemorates the original steps.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the location of the original steps, pursuant to Standard 3. Keeping the original fabric is admirable, but the new location gives the false impression that this was the original location of the steps. The steps could be used as a form of sculpture and should be relocated to another site on the campus.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. David Curry, president of the club, explained that many members revered the old steps because they helped create the wear on them. He showed the Committee a draft of the text for the commemorative plaque. Committee members acknowledged the staff's concern that the

relocation of the original steps gives a false historical impression, but thought that the plaque could explain the situation.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the step relocation and commemorative plaque, with staff to review details.

6901 Germantown Avenue

Dennis McCarthy, Owner/Applicant

Built: c.1798; c. 1860, front porch added

Proposal: Legalize side porch enclosure and rear shed

This proposal calls for the legalization of changes to the property. First, without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner partially erected a small shed at the rear of the property, which is also visible from East Gorgas Lane. The gable-roofed shed will be oriented towards the parking lot so its back will face Gorgas Lane. The shed will have painted clapboard siding, double-leaf doors that face the parking lot and charcoal grey, asphalt shingles on the roof. Second, the owner infilled an original side porch, which is highly visible from Gorgas Lane. The infill includes two, four-over-four windows and painted clapboard siding.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rear shed with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and Standard 10. Denial of the porch infill, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Dennis McCarthy attended the meeting. Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that the property now has a chain-link fence so the alterations to the property are highly visible from Gorgas Lane. Mr. McCarthy said that he did not realize the work required a building permit. The shed is necessary to hold sale signs and other equipment. He enclosed the side porch to have more storage space, noting that the basement has a low ceiling and cannot be used easily.

Committee members said that since the shed is freestanding they did not object to it. However, they could not approve enclosing an original porch. Mr. McCoubrey suggested excavating the basement a foot or two to make it usable space.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the shed, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.] and 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.] and denial of enclosing the porch pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.] and Standard 9.

224 Market Street

Scott Stein, Owner/Applicant

History: built c. 1920

Project: Storefront alterations

This application proposes the renovation of the two outer bays of the four-bay storefront at 224 Market Street. The pre-designation aluminum windows in the two inner bays will be replaced in the future.

At its February 2003 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of a proposal for this storefront. The application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting. In July and August 2003, the Committee and Commission reviewed and denied a second proposal for this storefront. After that denial, the applicant illegally installed aluminum doors in the outer bays, removed and discarded a historic marble step in the east bay, and added emergency lights. In response to the illegal work, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a Stop Work/Cease Operations Order. The current proposal results from a series of negotiations with the staff following the cessation of all work at the site.

The proposal stipulates the replacement of the illegal aluminum doors with single-leaf wood doors that mimic the historic double-leaf doors. It also stipulates the restoration of the original transoms above the doors and the fluted pilasters flanking the doors. A marble step like that removed from the east doorway will be installed in the west doorway. The storefront cornice, which is now covered with plywood, will be uncovered and repaired or replaced.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the wood and pressed metal portions of the storefront are painted, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Storefronts Guideline.

Before Mr. Farnham could present the proposal to the Architectural Committee, Kenneth Baritz and Todd Baritz, attorneys for the owners of the business at 224 Market Street, stated that they had recently been retained and needed more time to prepare for the Commission's review of the application. The staff stated that it could grant a 30-day continuance, allowing the application to be reviewed at the 28 October 2003 Committee meeting and the 14 November 2003 Commission meeting. The owners' attorneys further stated that their clients might want to amend their application. The staff replied that, if the owners did decide to revise their application, they or their representative must withdraw the current application and submit a new application. The staff also reminded the owners' attorneys that, for inclusion of a revised design on the next Commission agenda, they must submit a revised application by 5:00pm on 14 October 2003. The attorneys requested a 30-day continuance, which the staff will grant upon receipt of a formal continuance request letter.

301-303 Cherry Street

Rick Snyderman, owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant/Designer

History: built c. 1860, attributed to architect Steven Button

Project: Legalize penthouse, approve roof deck and rear window

This application proposes the completion of the construction of a penthouse and deck on the roof of the building at 301-303 Cherry Street. It also proposes the replacement of a window at the rear façade. The penthouse construction was begun without a permit. The partially completed penthouse is visible from N. 3rd and Cherry Streets. The window is not visible from any public right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the rear window. Denial of the rooftop additions, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Rick Snyderman, the owner, and Joel Spivak, his designer, attended the meeting representing the application. Mr. Farnham presented photographs of the unpermitted construction, some taken by the owner, some by the staff, and some by an anonymous complainant, all of which demonstrated that the penthouse was visible from both 3rd and Cherry Streets. The owner asserted that the penthouse was only minimally visible. The designer clarified the site lines with a copy of the Sanborn map for the area. Richard Thom, an interested party, disputed the owner and designer's claim and contended that penthouse was clearly visible from the public right-of-way. Committee members discussed the legalization application; they agreed that they would not have

recommended approval of it had it come to them as a proposal and that they certainly would not recommend approval of it in retrospect. They noted with dismay the growing number of legalization applications, especially for rooftop structures.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and unanimously voted to recommend approval of the rear window, but denial of the rooftop additions, pursuant to 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.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs ... 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.].

45 N. 2nd Street

Joe Fratto, owner

Jeffrey Peezick, applicant

History: built in 1852 by architect John Riddell; cast iron by Tiffany & Bottom Eagle Ironworks

Project: Legalize roof deck

This application proposes the legalization of a roof deck recently constructed without a building permit at 45 N. 2nd Street. The deck sits on, not behind, the parapet wall. The railing is constructed of heavy wood members. The building at 45 N. 2nd Street is much taller than the building to the north. The deck is highly visible from the north and minimally visible from the south.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the legalization application. Jeffrey Peezick and Joe Fratto attended the meeting. Mr. Fratto insisted that other decks in the area are visible. He added that his deck is set back 36 feet behind the front façade. The staff explained that much of the district has only recently come under the Commission's jurisdiction, but that the staff could investigate the legality of other visible decks. Because this building is so much taller than the neighboring buildings, the deck is highly visible despite the large set back. The Committee contended that it would be possible to hide the deck entirely behind the five-foot parapet. Mr. Fratto said that it would be very costly to dismantle the deck and relocate it. Committee members contended that Mr. Fratto accepted the risk of a costly relocation when he constructed the deck without first obtaining a building permit. Mr. Fratto expressed concern about the structural issues of attaching to the inside of the parapet wall. Committee members suggested that Mr. Fratto investigate lowering the deck intact to a new position behind the parapet. Mr. Fratto offered to move the railing inboard several feet. The Committee members decided that moving the railing to any position would not reduce its visibility. They decided that, with the deck mounted on the parapet walls, no modification would render it invisible from the street. They noted the similarities to the previous review, 301-303 Cherry Street, and they agreed that they would not have recommended approval of this proposal had it come to them before construction and that they certainly would not recommend approval of it in retrospect. They again noted with dismay the growing number of legalization applications, especially for rooftop structures.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to 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.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs ... 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.].

1721 Wallace Street

Fred Duling, owner

Frank Mallas, Friday Architects, applicant

History: vacant lot at time of designation

Project: 45-day review-and-comment on new construction

This application proposes the construction of an infill building on a vacant lot in the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot was vacant at the time of designation; therefore, the Commission jurisdiction consists solely of review-and-comment for a 45-day period. The application proposes to construct a new rowhouse with three apartments. The front façade would be compatible with the adjoining rowhouses. A stairtower and two decks with 5-foot wood fences, including one on the main section of the building, would be placed on the roof of the building.

Staff Recommendation: The staff did not reach a consensus on a recommendation. Two staff members recommend approval as proposed. Two staff members contend that the design should be more contemporary, not as historic, to avoid confusion between old and new buildings in the Spring Garden Historic District. They also noted that the proposed building is not a true reconstruction, but an admixture of elements borrowed from neighboring buildings. One staff member also asserts that the front deck should be pulled back to the rear ell and the deck fence should be replaced with a more transparent railing.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and explained that the Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review and comment. Fred Mallas attended the meeting for the developer Fred Duling. The Committee, applicant, and staff discussed the historicist nature of the design. The Committee agreed that the building would not be mistaken for an historic building despite its historic details. The applicant insisted the front roof deck would not be visible. Committee members noted that the top of the deck fence could be shortened.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval.

2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street

Victor Keen and Jeanne Ruddy, owners

Alan Heilman, contractor, applicant

History: built c. 1875

Project: Rooftop addition and deck

This application proposes the addition of a sun room and roof deck at the 4th-story level of the rowhouse at 2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street. The west façade of this property is visible owing to the garden at 2029 Mt. Vernon Street.

The Historical Commission approved several alterations at the rear of this property in 1975. The sun room would replace a non-historic clerestory added at that time. The sun room would open onto a roof deck on the main block of the row house. The drawings are inadequate and contradictory and the application may be deemed incomplete.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 The staff contends that any new rooftop structures including a roof deck should be added to the rear ell, not the main body of the rowhouse. It also asserts that no new construction should stand taller than the clerestory added in 1975, which already

breaks the historic roofline.

Mr. Farnham presented the project. Mr. Heilman attended on behalf of Jeanne Ruddy and Victor Keen. He explained that he did not think that the addition would be visible from Mt. Vernon Street. The staff contended that the proposed addition and deck would be visible from Mt. Vernon Street across the open side yard. Committee members asserted that the drawings were insufficient. They attempted with great difficulty to understand the proposal. Once they understood the design, they accepted the rooftop addition, provided that it was restricted to the width of the rear ell. They asserted that the portion of the addition extending out to the west wall of the main block of the building should be deleted from the design. The applicant explained that the owners may want to invite handicapped persons to the roof deck and would therefore need the elevator to access the deck. The Committee advised the applicant to address the issue at the Commission meeting. The Committee accepted the roof deck on the main body of the building, provided that if it had no public visibility. They told the applicant to produce the side and front elevation drawings with sight-line studies and a mock up to show the lack of visibility.

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the rooftop addition and roof deck, provided that the addition does not extend to the west wall of the main block of the building, but is limited to the width of the rear ell, and provided that the addition and deck is not visible from Mt. Vernon Street.

2001 Spring Garden Street

Greater Canaan Church of God, owner

Edward Hickerson, T-Mobile, applicant

History: built in 1863-1865, originally the Spring Garden Methodist Church

Project: Install telecommunications equipment

This application proposes the installation of telecommunications equipment in the church building. The church is listed as "significant" in the inventory of the Spring Garden Historic District. Antennas would be installed in the steeple, out of sight. Eight arched openings in the steeple are currently boarded with plywood and tarpaper. The boarding would be removed and fiberglass louver panels simulating the original wood louver panels would be installed. Three equipment cabinets screened by a 6-foot wood stockade fence would be installed in the alley along the western side of the building. A cable chase or waveguide would be installed on the west façade and would be painted to match the façade. The fence and cable chase would be visible down the alley from Spring Garden Street. A meter and cabinet would be mounted on the north wall of the church. They would be visible down an alley from 20th Street. Details of the connection of the waveguide to the stone façade and of the cable entry into the building have not been, but should be, provided.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the installation of the cable chase does not damage the stone façade, that the cable chase is painted to match the stone facade, that the fence is simplified to a flat, not stockade, fence, and that the fiberglass shutter panels match the original wood shutter panels, with staff to review details including shop drawings of the fiberglass shutters, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Ed Hickerson represented the project. He explained that the company would clean out the pigeon droppings from the steeple and restore the missing wood steeple louvers with fiberglass copies. The Committee and Mr. Hickerson discussed the louver design. They agreed that the louver panels could be backed by a black panel to keep birds from entering the steeple. Mr. Hickerson clarified that the cables would cut through the soffit of the building cornice with a detail to be approved by the staff. The Committee suggested that the fence be modified from a stockade design to a simple vertical board design.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided that the installation of the cable chase does not damage the stone façade, that the cable chase is painted to match the stone facade, that the fence is simplified to a flat, not stockade, fence, and that the fiberglass shutter panels match the original wood shutter panels, with staff to review details including shop drawings of the fiberglass shutters, pursuant to 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.]; and 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.]

1601 Mt. Vernon Street

Miguel Santiago, Owner

George Acevedo, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850, Home of Robert Purvis

PROPOSAL: New storefront alterations, side and 3-story rear addition

The application involves converting this empty corner rowhouse into an apartment building. The building at one point had a corner store cut into it. The storefront fabric appears c. 1960. The façade bears remnants of the marble door surround and lintels of the original rowhouse. The original cornice was removed and a parapet wall built in its place. On the rear, the building has received stucco and a one story addition c. 1900.

The applicant in spite of meeting with staff, seeks to create a condition that does not restore the building to its original state, but rather creates a false historical appearance.

On the first floor, the plans call for creating a new faux-Victorian storefront that has no historical basis. The plans also show removing a piece of the parapet but not restoring it to the original cornice condition. The applicant would remove the paint and then repaint the building. Original windows would be closed and new ones opened. The rear addition would be demolished and a new large addition attached to the side rear.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6. The staff thinks that, at a minimum, the front main block of this structure should be restored to its original residential configuration with correct cornice, windows, door surround, and other features.

Mr. Baron presented the application. An inquiry was made as to whether Mr. Rivera should recuse himself from the project. Mr. Rivera communicated that Mr. Acevedo is not a member of his firm, but an occasional consultant.

George Acevedo and Miguel Santiago, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Acevedo said that the building has been vacant for some 12 years and it has sustained structural damage. The one-story addition has a collapsed roof. He commented that his research produced the existence of a small store on the ground floor with a rear two garage. He said that he intends to retain the façade. He believes that the primary issue is the absence of any historic fabric, with the exception of the lintel. After a site visit by Mr. Baron, Mr. Acevedo revised his design for the windows and the cornice, which has very little evidence remaining for its reproduction. Mr. Acevedo said that he is willing to comply with the Committee's recommendation with the exception of the storefront. He surveyed the neighborhood for an appropriate storefront design and presented photographs of area storefronts comparable to his proposed design. Mr. Baron said that the applicant has the option to retain the existing condition; however, he

conveyed concern about the proposed design mimicking historic features. Ms. Pentz inquired about the very large windows. Mr. Acevedo responded that the large windows are acceptable to the owner who will reside on the ground floor. Mr. Baron opined that the residential look is more appropriate historically; it acknowledges the significance of Robert Purvis. Mr. Acevedo thought that solid panel windows with openings above are compatible to the neighboring storefronts. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that a simply designed storefront would be more appropriate, because it would not to mimic historic storefronts unrelated to this property. Mr. Santiago believes that the proposed design is respectful to Robert Purvis' distinguished character. Ms. Pentz said that the roofline appears raised, and asked the applicant if he proposed to lower the roofline. Mr. Avecedo said that the raised appearance is because the front slope of the roof supports the parapet wall, which hides the real slope of the roof. Mr. Baron noted that the neighboring building is greatly in need of stabilization. Committee members thought that a restoration to residential was the most appropriate treatment for the Purvis house. Mr. Avecedo insisted that, owing to the inconsistency of the floor levels, the residential restoration would be problematic.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project as proposed pursuant to 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.] and 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 work 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].

The Architectural Committee suggests that the applicant resubmit a revised design incorporating with the following items:

1. *If the front block of the building is not restored to its residential appearance, the applicant should retain and simplify the proposed storefront and include wood panels and transoms;*
2. *modify the cornice design;*
3. *install 2/2 windows on the front façade;*
4. *install 6/6 windows on the side facades;*
5. *cut new window on the 3rd floor to match the existing;*
6. *simplify the paneled windows on the side; they should match the storefront;*
7. *demolish the 1-story addition and construct a 3-story addition;*
8. *add a setback glass covering for the deck stairs;*
9. *add the decks with cutting of windows into doors and the elimination of an existing window, which should have a recess or reveal;*
10. *submit a site plan;*
11. *remove the 3-car garage.*

1621 Spruce Street

1621 Real Estate Investors, Incorporated, Owner

Jon B. Hollander, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: New windows, two wood roof decks, one rear metal balcony

The application involves the installation of decks on the rear of this row-house apartment structure. The decks will have some visibility from Latimer Street through the garden of the Daughters of the Revolution building. Several windows will need to be cut down to form door entries onto the decks. The first floor deck will cantilever out and wrap the north west corner of the building. The applicant also seeks the legalization of vinyl windows installed on the north façade and rear ell.

Staff recommendation: Approval of all decks except the first floor per Standard 9 The first floor deck should project off the north façade, but not wrap the corner. The deck should be supported in such a way

that it does not weaken the wall.

Mr. Baron explained the application and noted that Mr. Farnham of the staff made a site visit to determine visibility. Mr. Farnham communicated that owing to the foliage, the proposed alterations would have limited visibility. The Committee expressed concern about the structural elements of the deck construction.

Wayne Davis attended the meeting and said that the point loads with the existing joist run side to side, dictating the deck's design. He explained that the reason for the wrapping of the deck is to allow for the cutting of the window to access the deck. The rear wall cannot be used because it holds the plumbing and cabinets for the kitchen.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject a structural analysis, pursuant to 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 work 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].

329 South 17th Street

Mark Travis, Owner

Kris Kolo, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865, rear ell altered c. 1890

PROPOSAL: 4th floor addition on rear ell with roof deck, demolish rear garage, new garden wall with roll-down gate

Mr. Baron presented the application, which calls for constructing a one-story addition on top of the three-story rear ell. The addition will serve as a family room for the three-bedroom owners unit. This addition has high visibility because of a parking lot that exists to the south of the building. The addition does not connect to the mansard of the main block of the building because the units do not connect and the mansard will be restored. A rear brick wall will be demolished and rebuilt to accommodate parking.

Staff recommendation: The staff recommends approval of the parking area but split on its recommendation for the rooftop addition per Standard 9.

Kris Kolo, the architect, attended the meeting. He noted that the rear ell has undergone many alterations and that it currently has a flat roof. Mr. Baron asked if the proposed addition would be set back. Mr. Kolo responded that the new addition would be a mansard type, which would rise 8 feet above the existing masonry. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about visibility. Mr. Kolo said that it would be visible from Pine Street owing to an existing parking lot. Noting the other garages on the back, Committee members did not object to the expanded garage at the rear.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to 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 work 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].

57-63 N. 3rd Street

Cambridge Real Estate Associates, owner

Daniel Magno, Wesley Architects, applicant

History: 63 N. 3rd Street built in 1852 by architect John Riddell

Project: Legalize sidewalk areaway

This application proposes the legalization of an areaway cut into the Arch Street sidewalk along the important building at 63 N. 3rd Street. The building along with others to the south recently underwent an extensive, meticulous restoration. The sidewalk consists of very large granite slabs extending from the building's edge to the curb line. The slabs were installed when the building was constructed and they cover basement vaults beneath the sidewalk.

Owing to an inadequate 2-phase electrical distribution network in Old City, the electric company requires the installation of transformers to convert to 3-phase in large-scale redevelopment projects. The owner had planned to install the required transformers through an existing areaway, but PECO was unable to accommodate that plan. Instead, PECO required that a new areaway be constructed. Without Commission approval, a contractor cut a 4-foot by 6-foot hole that extends across two of the significant granite slabs. A metal grate now covers the hole.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 9 and the Mechanical Systems Guideline. Although the staff officially recommends denial because this work fails to satisfy the Secretary of Interior's Standards, it urges that the Committee recommend approval. Owing to the dearth of options for rectifying the illegal work and the high quality of the remainder of the restoration, the staff contends that legalization is the best alternative.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and explained the unusual recommendation. He stated the staff did not want to set a precedent by recommending the legalization of the mutilation of this significant historic fabric. He also stated that legalization was, nonetheless, the best alternative, given PECO's unwavering requirements. Richard Wesley and Daniel Magno, both from Wesley Architects, represented the project. They noted their meticulous rehabilitation of this property and their regret that the sidewalks had been damaged. They stated that similar damage will occur throughout the Old City neighborhood until PECO upgrades its electrical distribution network from 2-phase to 3-phase power. They presented memos to the Committee that had been sent to the contractors before work began asking them to safeguard the important sidewalks. They also noted the tremendous cost of installing the transformer at the property, about \$75,000. They added that the owner is beginning a new project to the east of this building and will be required to install a second \$75,000 transformer despite the fact that the first transformer could supply power to both buildings. They asserted that PECO must change its policies in Old City.

The Architectural Committee members discussed the application and agreed that legalization was the only alternative given PECO's policy in Old City.

The Architectural Committee therefore voted unanimously to recommend approval of the legalization.

208 Spruce Street

Carl Massara, Owner

Robert Boyd, Applicant

DATE: 1758, façade c.1870

PROPOSAL: Legalize skylight, new rear balcony

Mr. Baron presented the application, which involves legalizing a skylight and adding a balcony on a modern rear addition.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9.

Robert Boyd and Vince Massara attended the meeting. Mr. Massara noted that he would like to stucco the partially visible rear wall of the house to give it a uniform appearance. Mr. Baron pointed out that this was not part of the submitted application and that as an original visible wall it should not be stuccoed. He pointed out that the new windows in the rear wall had not received approval. Committee members addressed the application to raise the party wall with cinderblock. It was noted in photographs provided by a neighbor, Mr. Shaffer, that, in spite of Mr. Massara's claim, this work had already been partially finished with block installed atop the previous metal capping. Mr. Massara claimed that the wall was raised owing to rafter replacement.

Sandra Williams, 307 Phillips Street, expressed concern about work being done without a permit. Additionally, she believes that the integrity of the building is being compromised with the addition of the skylight and the 10-inch curb surrounding it. Mr. Massara commented that the 10 inch curb supports the skylight and is a protection against water infiltration.

Rebecca Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that her greatest concern with the project is the visible HVAC unit on the roof. Mr. Baron explained that violations had been issued and that the visible HVAC unit, which was installed illegally, has now received a permit to be relocated to minimize visibility.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the balcony, but denial of the skylight and the wall in its present condition. It recommended that the applicant rebuild the wall to its present height, provided the original flashing, which is now embedded in the wall is removed, and a stucco finish is added to both sides, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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 work shall be differentiated from the old to protect the integrity of the property and its environment].

1300 Market Street, 1319-25 Market Street, 21 North Juniper Street

1300 Market Street, Philadelphia Center Realty, Owner

1319-25 Market Street, G. Holdings Corporation, Owner

21 North Juniper Street, CNL Hospitality, Owner

Robert Hotes, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Wanamaker Building, built 1902-10, architect Daniel Burnham

1319-25 Market Street, One East Penn Square, Market Street National Bank, built 1930, architect, Ritter and Shay

21 North Juniper Street, City Hall Annex, built 1927, architect, Philip Johnson

This proposal calls for lighting City Hall by installing large banks of lights on a number of landmark buildings including, Wanamakers, One East Penn Square and City Hall Annex. These lights will be highly visible, will create glare for pedestrians and will cast the other landmark buildings into shadow.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9, The Staff recommends that City Hall be uplit from lampposts and downlit from lights that sit back hidden from view on neighboring buildings.

Mr. Baron presented the application and said that it is important the landmark buildings, which would be fitted with the light fixtures are not diminished. He also asked that the applicant present letters from the building owners granting the applicant permission to apply on their behalf.

Robert Hotes, the architect, Alfred R. Borden and Julie M. Panassow of the Lighting Practice, and Marc Morfei of the Center City District attended the meeting. Mr. Morfei said that the earlier lighting design for City Hall was never carried out owing to its high cost. He commented that surrounding property

owners expressed concern about the lack of light around City Hall, which they perceive as threatening rather than inviting as a pedestrian experience. Mr. Morfei stated that the building owners along with other private organizations with fund the project. He noted that the existing lighting is being removed as part of the cleaning of City Hall.

Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern with the impact of the lighting on the prominent buildings, which would house the light fixtures. Mr. Borden said that a goal of the project is to avoid adding light fixtures to the street, but to give a moonlit glow off the building, with different beam patterns to light statues on City Hall. He also said that if upward lighting were installed, then the sculpture on City Hall would appear distorted. Mr. Borden cited St Paul's in London, which is lit in a similar manner to this proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro thought that more information regarding the impact on the other buildings should be submitted. Mr. Borden said that brightness and glare as perceived from the street would be minimized, particularly with the type of louvers being used. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the focus of the lighting should be twofold: a general wash of the building and the highlighting of the sculptures. Mr. Baron suggested adding to and using the existing streetlight poles as well as the existing lights on City Hall itself rather than solely using down lighting from the surrounding buildings. Mr. Borden said that a symmetrical layout is needed and that the poles cannot sustain the weight of the lights. Ms. Panassow noted the proposed light on the Marriott Courtyard would be aimed to the side. Mr. Hotes conveyed that the lights would not be attached to the decorative elements of the surrounding buildings but to the parapets. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the lights' impact on the buildings at night. Mr. Borden responded that the lights' appearance would be similar to the streetlights. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the lights could be adjusted, since City Hall is a white color rather than the dark gray before cleaning. Mr. Borden said that he designed the lighting for the Waterworks and that the proposed lighting is low level and fairly dim with the ability for adjustments. Committee members believed that the lighting on the Marriott Residence Inn should be set back.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the applicant working with the staff for adjustment of brightness, placement, and other details pursuant to 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 work 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].

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary