

**THE MINUTES OF THE 554TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**10 OCTOBER 2008
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn, AIA
Leslie Benoliel
Della Clark
Richardson Dilworth, Ph.D.
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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

ALSO PRESENT

Lyle Suess, Reed Axelrod Architects
Mark Sellers, Awbury Arboretum
Gary Johnson, Awbury Arboretum
David White, Anderson White
Michael Cassano, The Couch Tomato Cafe
Dieter Forster
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
David Traub
Dale Frens, Frens & Frens Architects
John Darling-Wolf
Naomi Ohayon, Masada Custom Builders
Isaac Ohayon, Masada Custom Builders
Ryan Drummond, Cecil Baker & Partners Architects
Gary Martin, Wm. Proud Masonry
Newton H. Smith, Newton H. Smith, Architects
Emily Gilvery, Hudson Beach Glass
Ed Weiler, German Society
Martin Knappe, German Society

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Clark, Dilworth, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, and Wilds joined him. Daniel Quinn of the Department of Licenses & Inspections served as the designee for Commissioner Fran Burns.

MINUTES OF THE 553RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Ms. Merriman offered a correction to the draft minutes.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 553rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 August 2008, as corrected. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF THE HISTORIC DISTRICT PROGRAM

With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Farnham reported to the Commission on the backlog of nominated historic districts as well as the anticipated nominations for additional districts. He provided data on the changing numbers of applications reviewed annually and the projected workload to administer the proposed districts.

Mr. Farnham reported that the Commission has designated ten historic districts. It designated the first in 1986. It designated the most recent, Greenbelt Knoll, in 2006. Most districts were designated between 1995 and 2003; those include Rittenhouse Fittler, Society Hill, Girard Estates, Spring Garden, and Old City. The Commission has not designated a large district since 2003, when it created the Old City Historic District. Designated in 2006, Greenbelt Knoll includes only 20 properties. The Commission holds five nominations for districts that it has not processed. The oldest is Spruce Hill, which was submitted in 2002. It is very large, with nearly 2000 properties. The Overbrook Farms nomination was submitted in October 2004 and was determined to be preliminarily eligible in 2005. It is medium in size, with more than 500 properties. In February of 2005, the Historical Commission received a district nomination for a section of East Falls with Tudor Revival houses. It includes 210 properties and was determined to be preliminarily eligible in 2005. In July 2006, the Commission received a nomination for Parkside, which would encompass 162 properties. It would be a relatively small district, about the same size as the district proposed for East Falls. Parkside was determined to be preliminarily eligible in 2005. In September 2006, the Commission received a district nomination for Awbury Arboretum in Germantown; most of the buildings in the proposed district are already designated individually. In conclusion, the Commission has five district nominations awaiting action. Three of the proposed districts have been determined preliminarily eligible. Spruce Hill was deemed preliminarily eligible in the 1990s, but that determination is so outdated that it should be revisited. In addition to the five submitted nominations, the Commission is aware of three in process and anticipates their submissions in the near future. They are nominations for districts in Washington Square West, Tacony Disston (workers' housing and factory), and East Logan Street in Germantown. The five submitted and three anticipated districts would add 5,500 properties to the Register, which now includes 10,700 properties. Mr. Farnham displayed a map showing the geographical distribution of the districts. The majority of designated districts are in or adjacent to Center City. Two each are located in North and South Philadelphia. One is in the Northeast. The proposed and anticipated districts are distributed as follows: one in Center City, three in West Philadelphia, three in Northwest Philadelphia, and one in lower Northeast Philadelphia. Mr. Farnham cautioned the Commission that no notice letters have been sent to

property owners in any of the proposed districts informing them of a Commission review. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to discuss the merits of any of the districts.

Mr. Farnham displayed a graph showing the relative sizes of the nominated districts. Three are very small, together totaling only 14% of the total number of nominated properties. Mr. Farnham displayed several graphs depicting the Commission's workload. The workload rose very sharply between 1995 and 2003, during the period when the Commission created several large new historic districts. He noted that there has been a slight downturn in permit applications over the last year as the real estate market has softened. He noted that, even with this downturn, the Register has consistently produced 12.5 to 14 applications per 100 designated properties over recent years. He stated that this statistic allows the Commission to very accurately estimate the workload impact of designating new historic districts. Mr. Wilds note that a large new district would require an additional fulltime staff member to administer. Mr. Farnham agreed. He stated that Parkside would require three to four hours of staff time per week to administer. Spruce Hill would require a fulltime staff member. Ms. Merriman asked about the precision of the conclusions and the assumptions that they are based on. Mr. Farnham replied that he has estimated the maximum number of applications that a single staff member can process annually at 250. The analysis does not account for the properties already individually designated in a proposed district or the permitting differences between residential and commercial areas. He concluded that it provides a sense of the workload impact, but is not exact.

Mr. Sherman noted that the Commission should be cognizant of the expectations it might set by declaring its intention to process some of the nominations. Ms. Merriman cited the City's volatile budget situation and asked if the Commission had been asked to cut its costs. Mr. Farnham stated that when the Chair initiated this discussion about district designation one month ago, the Mayor had not yet announced that the City could face a significant revenue shortfall and would therefore need to cut costs. He cautioned the Commission that it should bear in mind the City's financial reality when making any decisions on the districts. He reported that the Commission was not required to trim its budget during the first round, but it may be required to during subsequent rounds of cutting. Mr. Sherman asserted that the Commission should move forward with the district designation program. He suggested that the Commission could amend its plans if its budget was trimmed in the future.

Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that she has a unique perspective. She is both a member of the Commission and, as the Commissioner of the Department of Public Property, is the administrator of the Historical Commission for budgeting and personnel matters. She observed that the Commission's budget is very small; it is almost entirely salaries. She noted that additional budget cuts could have a significant impact on the Commission's capacity. She stated that the Commission should not raise expectations if it will not be able to meet them in the future. She reported that her department's budget has already been cut by \$6 million. She contended that the time was not right for a major initiative. Mr. Wilds agreed that the Commission should be cautious during this unpredictable period. He did, however, suggest that the Commission should discuss the matter and be prepared to act once the economy improves. He advised the Commission that it would not be prudent to make any major policy decisions today. He noted that the Commission could not possibly undertake the task of administering any of the very large districts with its current staffing. He suggested that the Commission could plan to process some of the smaller district nominations in the near future, once the City's financial situation stabilized.

Mr. Dilworth noted that the Commission has an informal first-come-first-served policy for processing historic districts. He suggested that the Commission might revise or abandon that policy, given its staffing limitations. He opined that the Commission should process the smallest districts first.

Mr. Thomas offered two suggestions. First, the Commission could consider individually designating key buildings in proposed districts if it does not have the resources to designate the districts themselves. Second, it could streamline its application review processes, allowing it to process more applications with the current staff. He suggested that Camden, New Jersey may offer a model for a streamlined process. Mr. Mattioni noted that the Commission reviews many applications. He suggested that additional applications could be reviewed at the staff level. Mr. Schaaf suggested that the neighborhood conservation districts may provide a model for a streamlined process. He explained that requirements for alterations and new construction are defined very precisely, thereby simplifying the review process. Ms. Merriman reminded the Commission of the difficulties faced with reviews for Manayunk, which operates under its own, unique preservation rules. Mr. Thomas stated the amount of work required for reviews is not only proportional to the size of the district and number of structures, but to the complexity of the buildings in the district.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor for public comment.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance acknowledged the difficult financial situation, but stated that the fundamental issue is one of priority. The money is available to increase the Commission's staff and budget, but the administration has chosen to prioritize other programs and departments. He noted that the City recently pledged \$2 million to cultural institutions. Mr. Gallery opined that the City could have pledged \$1.9 million to the cultural institutions and the balance to the Commission. Mr. Gallery stated that Mr. Farnham's analysis shows that the smaller districts would have a minimal impact on the Commission's workload. He contended that, if the Commission designated them now, that small increase in workload would not be apparent until the spring of 2009. He reported that the Preservation Alliance invested \$12,000 for two interns to work on the district nominations over the summer. He urged the Commission to move ahead with Awbury, Parkside, and East Falls. If the Commission needs assistance to providing the notice to owners, the Alliance will commit \$10,000 in funds to hire a consultant and will also commit another \$12,000 for additional interns for next year. Mr. Gallery also suggested that the Commission consider schemes to streamline its processes, allowing the existing staff to process greater numbers of applications. He suggested amending the Rules & Regulations to grant additional approval authority to the staff.

John Cugini, who authored the East Falls nomination, observed that it was submitted four years ago. He commented that the Commission is running out of time to preserve the integrity of the district. He reported that he has expended a significant amount of time and energy building grass roots support for the district, but that effort may be for nothing. One area in the proposed district has already been so altered that it may no longer be eligible for designation. He implored the Commission to move forward and designate the district.

Mark Sellers, who represents Awbury Arboretum, stated that the arboretum is a very significant, intact, Victorian, 75-acre landscape in northwest Philadelphia. He noted that many of the individual structures are already individually designated, but the landscape is largely unprotected. A designation would protect the landscape. He observed that the Commission's own data shows that it could protect the integrity of the landscape in less time per week than it takes to drink a cup of coffee.

David Traub addressed the Commission regarding the demolitions of the buildings at 1900 and 1902 Arch Street. Mr. Sherman asked him to limit his comments to the matter at hand, the designation of historic districts. Mr. Traub distributed a letter from Rachel Munafo, who had prepared the nomination for 1900 and 1902 Arch Street. Mr. Sherman again advised him to limit his comments to the designation of historic districts. Mr. Traub replied that the buildings at 1900 and 1902 Arch Street would not have been demolished if the Logan Square neighborhood had been a historic district.

Mr. Mattioni stated that, although he was convinced at the beginning that no discussion of the districts would be fruitful in this financial climate, he now thinks that the Commission should move forward. After listening to the public, he believes that the Commission is succumbing to fear. He contended that the market will turn around. He suggested that the Commission move forward with confidence. Mr. Wilds suggested that the staff prepare a proposed schedule for processing the three smallest districts, Awbury, East Falls, and Parkside for review by the Commission at its next meeting. Mr. Mattioni stated that he was not suggesting a specific timetable, but was instead suggesting that the Commission prepare a plan for processing the smaller districts at that time when it becomes feasible. Mr. Sherman suggested they look beyond the short-term economic problems. Lyle Seuss, an architect, noted that the downturn in the real estate market may, in fact, free the staff to work on the nominations. Mr. Dilworth suggested that the Commission establish a rule for setting an order for designating the outstanding districts so that it does not appear that the Commission is favoring one over another. Ms. Merriman noted that, regardless of the order, someone will not be happy. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission could establish a rule guiding it to process the smaller districts first. He also noted that so many properties in Washington Square West lack integrity owing to alterations that it may not merit designation as a district.

Mr. Sherman asked the staff to prepare a draft plan for the designation of the three smallest historic districts for consideration by the Commission at its next meeting.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 SEPTEMBER 2008

David Amburn, Chair

2408 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Sara & Dieter Forster

Applicant: Lyle Suess

History: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/1995

Project: Cut new window openings and install Dryvit on party wall, replace windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new windows are appropriately spaced, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install Dryvit, a proprietary Exterior Insulation and Finishing System (EIFS), for extra insulation on the exposed party-wall of this nineteenth-century row house. On this same elevation the applicant proposes to create three new openings and install two-over-two wood windows. On the front façade along Delancey, the applicant proposes to replace six windows with two-over-two windows and install a new transom over the main entrance. No shop drawings have been submitted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Lyle Seuss represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Amburn to clarify the Architectural Committee's recommendation regarding the spacing between the windows proposed for the party wall. Mr. Amburn stated that the Committee considered the first-floor windows too close to one another and to the corner of the building. Mr. Thomas agreed with the Committee's judgment. Mr. Seuss presented revised plans reflecting the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds asked the architect if the windows on the side wall raised fire code issues. Mr. Seuss explained that 2406 and 2408 Delancey have been consolidated into one property.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the new windows are appropriately spaced, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

125 S. 22ND STREET

Owner: Teacher Associates LP

Applicant: Frens & Frens LLP

History: c. 1889, Hewitt Brothers; individually designated, 5/1982; significant to the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Partial restoration of front façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the full restoration of the façade is completed within one year of the start of the stabilization work, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes remedial work to the brownstone front façade of this significant building in the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District. The façade is in poor condition. The carvings in the brownstone are very elaborate, but the many of surfaces are extremely eroded. This application only proposes Phase I of a two phase brownstone repair project. The application proposes to remove loose, delaminating, and unsound brownstone from the façade. It also proposes to repair areas of the brownstone where water might collect using a cementitious material. It does not propose general repairs or restoration to the brownstone. The applicant proposes to make molds of some carved elements for a future restoration, but does not propose to use them to restore the brownstone as part of current project. The brownstone restoration using the molds would be undertaken in Phase II. No information about Phase II and no timetable for the phases have been provided. As part of Phase I, the application also proposes the replacement of the built-in gutter and the application of sealant around the windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Dale Frens represented the application.

Mr. Wilds stated that he is concerned that the stabilization of the façade is not linked to its restoration. Several Commissioners asked the applicant whether he could guarantee that his client would undertake the restoration of the façade within one year.

Mr. Frens described the building as needing triage; the façade is in very poor condition and large pieces of stone are falling onto the sidewalk below. He reported that a substantial investment was made in the interior in the early 1980s, but little money had been invested in the

exterior. He would like to abate the unsafe conditions and then stop the water infiltration. He noted that approximately nine molds of decorative stone features would be made at the time of the sounding of the façade, to allow the details of the façade to be replicated at a later date.

Mr. Baron stated that he visited the site and agrees that any dangerous stone should be removed. He noted that, if the restoration project is not completed within one year, the applicant could return to the Commission and request an extension. Mr. Baron also explained that the City could issue violations if the restoration is not undertaken within the time period.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the full restoration of the façade is completed within one year of the start of the stabilization work, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

320 ARCH STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting

Applicant: Ferns & Ferns LLP

History: c. 1810; individually designated 6/1956; significant in Old City Historic District, 12/2003

Project: Install ADA ramp

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA ramp on the west elevation of this historic meeting house. It would provide access to an interior space that is not currently accessible from the other ADA entrances to the building. A cover letter notes that interior ramps were considered to provide access from the accessible to inaccessible portions of the building, but they all proved infeasible. The short exterior ramp would run from grade to a historic entrance on the west facade. The existing King of Prussia marble landing at the entrance would be preserved beneath a new slab of marble. The ramp would be clad in schist and brick. It would partially block a basement window. Simple railings would be installed along the ramp and at the entrance landing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Dale Frens represented the application.

The Commission members agreed that the proposal was appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2215 GREEN STREET

Owner: H & W Apartments

Applicant: Larry Wind

History: c. 1886; individually designated, 2/28/1967; significant in Spring Garden Historic District 10/11/2000

Project: Install deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is metal, not vinyl and the applicant submits documentation verifying that the building can support the deck, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a deck with vinyl railings on the rear ell of this building. It would replace a wood deck that currently exists on the rear ell and is being removed to repair the roof.

No information has been provided regarding the roof plan, elevations, or supporting structure. There is also limited information regarding visibility from Green Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised application with the metal railing, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds asked whether the Commission should be requiring documentation related to structural aspects of designs. He suggested that the Commission should limit its review to preservation matters. He asked Mr. Quinn of the Department of Licenses & Inspections if the Department would review the application to ensure that the structural supports were adequate. Mr. Quinn stated that it would. Mr. Wilds conceded that it would not be gratuitous to place the structural documentation requirement on this applicant if the Department would require the information as well.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Leonard withdrew their motion to approve the revised application with the metal railing, with the staff to review details.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the railing is metal, not vinyl and the applicant submits documentation verifying that the building can support the deck, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

102 RECTOR STREET

Owner/Applicant: Craig Mosmen

History: c. 1840, altered c. 1905, Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983

Project: Demolish rear shed, construct three-story addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the design documented on sheet A-23, but denial of the windows, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: An earlier version of this application was presented to the Commission in July 2008. That application proposed to demolish a rear shed and construct a three-story, rear addition to expand a restaurant. The proposed rear addition would have been taller than the existing

building and minimally visible from the side, as this is a corner building. On the rear façade, windows would have been closed and ductwork run up the rear wall. On the front façade, the applicant proposed to install a new door and single-light rectangular windows. The historic windows were two-over-two, segmental-arched sash. The staff suggested that the rear addition should be revised to sit below the existing rear cornice and set back from the side wall, to allow the original building shape to be read from the public right-of-way. The Commission denied the July 2008 application; the applicant claimed he would make the suggested revisions.

The current application proposes a revised plan to demolish the rear shed and construct a three-story rear addition. The addition would be recessed one foot from the edge of the existing building and would cover the cornice. Ductwork is proposed to run up the rear wall. This application incorporates the Commission's suggestions offered during the review of the July 2008 application, with the exception of the ductwork. The windows shown on the current plan are incorrect, but the applicant has agreed to work with the staff to correct the design.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Contractor David White, architect John Darlington-Wolf, and business owner Craig Mosmen represented the application.

The Commission members agreed that the staff could approve replications of the historic windows. They also agreed that the alterations and additions at the rear were appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the design documented on sheet A-23, but deny the windows, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

524 N. MARSHALL STREET, AKA 611 SPRINGGARDEN STREET

Owner: German Society of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Martin Knappe

History: 1888, architect William Gette; individually designated 9/12/1974

Project: Modify basement windows and wells

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stone curbs are retained and the color of the cast stone sills matches the surrounding stone, with the staff to review details including the grill design.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for modifying the basement windows and window wells of this institutional building. The current basement window wells hold water and debris. The applicant proposes to remove the lower sash of the double hung windows, modify the top sash, and fill in the window wells up to grade to prevent water infiltration.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Martin Knappe, a member and officer of the German Society, represented the application.

The Commission members agreed that the alterations to the subterranean windows were acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the stone curbs are retained and the color of the cast stone sills matches the surrounding stone, with the staff to review details including the grill design. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

832-836 LOMBARD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Isaac Ohayon, Masada Custom Builders

History: 1846, William Johnston, architect, Central Presbyterian Church

Individually designated, 7/23/1963

Project: Exhume human remains, infill brick vault

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided copies of any documents produced during the investigation and relocation are deposited in the Historical Commission's archives, pursuant to Building Site Guideline of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards: Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to exhume the human remains of two bodies from this site on Lombard Street and re-inter them at a nearby cemetery. The brick vault would be left in place and infilled and covered with dirt. The building on the site was constructed in 1846 for the Central Presbyterian Church, an early and important African American congregation. The congregation relocated many years ago and, in recent years, the church building has stood vacant. A new property owner is converting the former church for residential use. During landscaping work in the small front yard, which was approved by the Commission, a construction crew discovered the tomb of the founder of the church and his wife when their crypt cover collapsed. Historic photographs show that the couple was buried beneath a large memorial obelisk that once stood in the small yard in front of this church. The obelisk was lost before designation.

The property owner, who is rehabilitating the building for residential use, has discussed the exhumation and re-interment of the remains with the congregation that once occupied the building as well the congregation at Old Pine Street Church, a nearby Presbyterian church. The parties have all agreed that the best resolution is to exhume the bodies from the now-profane site and re-inter them in the sacred burial ground at Old Pine Street Church. Although that cemetery has long been closed to new burials, the congregation has agreed to open it for this historically significant church leader and his wife and to mark the new burial plot with an appropriate marker.

Douglas Mooney, a professional archaeologist, the president of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, and a member of the Historical Commission's Committee on Designation, is overseeing the investigation of the crypt and the relocation of the remains.

The Commission individually designated this site in 1963, many years before it began to require nomination forms. Therefore, the reasons for the designation are not documented; nonetheless, the Commission has a vested interest in protecting archaeological resources at the site. The staff refers the application to the Architectural Committee and Commission because the Rules & Regulations do not authorize it to approve (or even contemplate) applications of this nature. The application highlights the Commission's dearth of policies on archaeological resources.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Amburn recused owing to his past involvement with this rehabilitation project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Developers Isaac and Naomi Ohayon of Masada Builders represented the application.

The Commission discussed the proposal and determined that the movement of the bodies and the documentation and preservation of the crypt satisfied the Standards.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided copies of any documents produced during the investigation and relocation are deposited in the Historical Commission's archives, pursuant to Building Site Guideline. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

218 S. 8TH STREET

Owner: Michael DePaulo

Applicant: William Proud

History: c. 1805, storefront c. 1890

Project: Install header beam at storefront

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the flawed documentation and pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the installation of a header beam to shore up the sagging beam over the storefront. The plans show the replacement of much of the wood storefront, however the details are incorrect or lacking. The new beam will reduce the size of the window opening but will allow for the retention and repair of the brick façade at the upper floors.

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

Mr. Mattioni asked if the applicant had combined the architectural and engineering drawings into one cohesive plan. Mr. Baron answered that the applicant had not responded to the Committee's request to combine the drawings into one consistent set. Mr. Wilds suggested that, if the Commission denied the current application, the applicant would be free to submit a revised application.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, owing to the flawed documentation and pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

26 S. STRAWBERRY STREET

Owner: Emily Kimelman

Applicant: Emily Kimelman-Gilvey

History: c. 1910; contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Replace front door and signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the paneled door with large panes and the signage with the 21' x 3' side banner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new front door in the non-historic storefront. Two options are proposed: French doors and a paneled door with large panes. This application also proposes two signs. A flag-pole with a hanging banner sign would be mounted at the second-floor window sill. A large banner sign would be mounted to the stucco, side party wall. Three optional sizes are proposed for the large banner. The banner would project over the neighboring property. The owner of that property supports the application.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Emily Kimelman-Gilvey, the property owner, represented the application.

The Commission members concluded that the recommended door and signage were appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the paneled door with large panes and the signage with the 21' x 3' side banner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn at 10:49 a.m. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

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

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.