

**THE MINUTES OF THE 589TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**9 SEPTEMBER 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Susan Jaffe
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA

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

ALSO PRESENT

Tully Speaker
Tom Malone
Robert Gilberg, Bourse Mall-Kaiserman Company
Eric Quirk, Harman Deutsch
Craig Deutsch, Harmon Deutsch
Anthony Campiss, Plan Philly
Allen Beekman, Park Towne Residents Association

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Jaffe, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Palantino, Quinn, Schaaf, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 588TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Jaffe moved to adopt the minutes of the 588th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 August 2011. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 1915 North Street, 2031 Green Street, and 8300 Germantown Avenue. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 1915 North Street, 2031 Green Street, and 8300 Germantown Avenue. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 1106

Project: Install roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Adam Shapiro

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzing, Borie & Medary, architects; alts, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock up demonstrates that the railings would not be visible.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of two decks on existing terraces. The terraces face Rittenhouse Square and are located at the southwest and northwest corners of the building. The terraces have generous parapet walls. The level of the living space to which the decks would connect is much higher than the level of the terraces. The architect proposes to install the decks to match the level of the apartment and step them down to meet the parapet. The north deck, however, would not be brought down enough to use the existing parapet as a railing. The design proposes the installation of metal railings in addition to the existing parapets at the north terrace. The proposed railing is described in the application as "clear vinyl coated stainless steel cable railing." The angles of visibility and the height of the terraces would make the railings inconspicuous. The public may see the railings, but at a great distance. The decks would not be conspicuous.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Craig Deutsch represented the application.

Mr. Deutsch presented photographs of the mock ups he had installed per the Architectural Committee recommendation. Mr. Deutsch noted that the Building Code requires a 42-inch high railing and that, in order to meet that requirement, he proposes a railing that would be minimally visible above the parapet. Mr. Deutsch demonstrated with the photographs of the mock ups that

only a small section of the railing would be visible from certain points on the square at very great distances.

He explained that the north deck railing would be more visible, yet still inconspicuous. He specified that the photographs were taken with a zoom lens and that the pedestrian would never be able to see the railings in such detail. Mr. Deutsch noted that the color of the railings as shown in the photographs was used for representational purposes only. He specified that the intent would be to use a natural brick color on the railings to make them blend with the walls and parapet. Mr. Deutsch explained that, on the south terrace, he is not proposing a railing against the parapet. He explained that he would locate the railing back on the terrace, away from the parapet, ensuring that it would not be visible from any point on the square.

Ms. Jaffe commented that she lives on the south side of the square and overlooks the southern terrace, where one of the decks would be located. She objected to the alteration and noted that many other high-rise residents would be able to see it as well. Mr. Deutsch assured her the view of the landscaped garden on the deck would be a great improvement over the current vacant terrace.

Mr. Dilworth stated that he was confused about the amount of public visibility of the railing at the north deck railing. He asked for a clarification of the visibility from the street. Mr. Deutsch explained that the railing would only be visible from the corner of Walnut Street and 18th Street, several hundred feet away. He reiterated that the railing would be brick colored to blend with the wall, which would make it very hard to see.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the application. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 0. Ms. Jaffe abstained.

ADDRESS: 1915 NORTH ST

Project: Demolish garage building and construct building with garage and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Burton

Applicant: Kevin J. O'Neill, KJO Design & Planning

History: after 1922, probably 1934

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, No Classification, 10/11/2000

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are not vinyl, the front door is wood, and any visible portions of the deck railing are metal, with the staff to review details including material choices and colors.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a single-story garage and the construction of a three-story house with a garage at 1915 North Street. The garage was constructed in 1934, when the Transportation Materials Company moved into the building at 1916 Fairmount Avenue.

The Commission may approve the demolition of a contributing property in a historic district only if it finds of the demolition is necessary in the public interest or if the forced retention of the building would constitute a financial hardship for the owner. Owing to inventory errors, the

property in question, 1915 North Street, was not classified in the district inventory. The inventory of the Spring Garden Historic District contains significant errors for this section of North Street. It lists properties at 1913-15 and 1917-19 North Street. However, at the time of designation and currently, what would have been 1913 North was and is the rear of 1914 Fairmount Avenue; 1915 North was and is a separate property; 1917 North was and is a separate property; and 1919 North did not and does not exist. The property in question is described as part of 1917-19 North Street even though it was and is a separate property at 1915 North. The description for 1917-19 North Street contains other errors as well; for example, in addition to the fact that 1919 does not exist, it calls out a storefront, but the rowhouse at 1917 did not and does not have a storefront. The property at 1917-19 North Street, into which the garage was wrongly lumped, is classified as contributing. 1915 North, the property where the garage actually stands, has no classification. The garage was constructed after the end of the district's period of significance and therefore has no historical significance. Therefore, the Commission may approve the demolition of the garage without a finding of necessity in the public interest or hardship, despite the missing classification. However, because the property was not undeveloped at the time of designation, the Commission has plenary jurisdiction over the construction.

The application proposes two alternative designs. Option A is more traditional with punched openings; Option B is more contemporary with larger openings. The staff prefers Option A because it is more compatible with the architecture, rhythms, proportions, scale, and materials of the streetscape. However, the staff recommends modifying Option A, adjusting the proportions of the garage door, and replacing the stylistically inappropriate six-panel door and six-over-one windows with a four-panel door and two-over-two windows. Also, the façade, door, window, lintel, sill, watertable, and cornice materials and details should be specified and appropriate. More information about the roof deck should also be provided.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2031 GREEN ST

Project: Construct elevator tower, addition, and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matthew Van Wollen

Applicant: Frank Reis, Walnut Tree Construction

History: 1859

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an elevator tower and a one-story addition with a patio and ramp in an open area along the rear ell. The open area was created when the building to the east was demolished many years ago. The east wall of 2031 Green Street is an exposed party wall. The wall is stuccoed with a white sand finish. The open space is now used for parking.

The elevator tower would stand three stories tall along the east party wall. Until recently, a non-historic stair tower stood in the location now proposed for the elevator tower. The stair tower

appears in March 2009 aerial photographs. At some point after March 2009, the stair tower was demolished without a building permit or the Commission's approval.

The new elevator tower would be clad in stucco to match the existing party wall. The one-story addition would be constructed behind the elevator shaft and would extend across the open area to the west wall of the neighboring property. The addition would also be clad in stucco to match the existing building. A rear patio would be constructed behind the addition. A ramp would be installed at the front of the addition. The addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. It would set back from the street and behind garage doors that run along the sidewalk. The elevator tower would be visible but inconspicuous over the garage doors.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E ML, UNIT A

Project: Legalize banners

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bourse Mall Associates, LP

Applicant: Robert E. Gilberg, Bourse Mall Associates, LP

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of four banners and brackets along the Independence Mall and 4th Street elevations of the Bourse building. The brackets are mounted to brownstone façade, between two fluted pilasters and over two bands of rustication, with several bolts. The banners are 24 feet tall and made of a vinyl material.

The applicant claims the brackets and several iterations of banners have been in place at this location since the 1980s. It appears that the Historical Commission did not approve the banners and brackets and the Department of Licenses & Inspections did not issue a permit for them. In December 2010, the Department issued a violation for the signage.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property manager Robert Gilberg represented the application.

Mr. Gilberg stated that he was unable to locate any building permits or Commission approvals for the banners. He explained that they have been affixed to the Bourse since the early 1980s. He stated that he hopes that the Commission finds the banners appropriate, especially in light of the fact that they have been in place for nearly three decades. He stated that he has contacted Independence National Historical Park about the banners, but the Park has neither issued a statement of support nor requested the banners' removal.

Mr. Gilberg asked the Commission to consider the challenges faced by the Bourse on the 4th and 5th Streets. He observed that it is difficult to inform passers that the building now houses shops and restaurants. It looks like a foreboding office building. He contended that the banners are appropriate to the building. He added that the building is not adjacent to Independence Hall.

Mr. Sherman reminded the Commission of the recent its review of a proposal for banners on the neighboring Lafayette Building. The Commission decided that the proposed banners were not appropriate on that building. Mr. Dilworth noted that the Commission determined that awnings and temporary banners were approved on the Lafayette Building. Mr. Sherman clarified that the temporary banners were approved to brand the building during the renovation and they would be removed once the work was complete. He added that the temporary banners were approved to be hung from fences used during construction.

Ms. Jaffe asked if there were other signs or awnings on the building. Mr. Gilberg responded that there is no other signage except for the carved brownstone bands that read "Philadelphia Bourse" over the entrances. He explained the awnings in window openings are royal blue without lettering. Ms. Jaffe asked if there were standards with signs near the 4th Street entrance. Mr. Gilberg stated that there are standards with banners on 4th Street that advertise food and shops. He added that they have been appropriately permitted.

Ms. Leonard asked Commission members if they recall the proposed height of the Hotel Monaco banners for the Lafayette Building. Mr. Schaaf said they were four stories high and much wider than those proposed in this application. Mr. Gilberg added that the Bourse is not as large as the Lafayette Building. Mr. Baron disagreed, pointing to a photograph of the two buildings. He added that a current photograph of the 5th Street side of the Bourse building shows that there are the independent kiosks with advertisements that stand in front of the building.

Mr. Sherman asked if the mounting holes for the brackets had been drilled directly into the masonry. Mr. Gilberg replied that they had been. Mr. Gilberg again claimed that the banners must have been permitted, but unfortunately he cannot locate those permits. He explained that he searched through the records at the Department of Licenses & Inspections, but found nothing.

Mr. Dilworth asked why this application is now presented to the Commission, many years after the installation. Mr. Gilberg replied they recently received a violation from the Department of Licenses & Inspections and must legalize the signage to clear the violation. Mr. Farnham reported that the Historical Commission had not requested this violation and was unaware that the banners had not been permitted in the 1980s, when they were first installed. The Department of Licenses & Inspections apparently performed an analysis of all signage at this location, perhaps while investigating the removal and subsequent request to reinstall the large "Bourse" sign on the roof. He continued that the Commission has a significant amount of information on the building and its permitting. The building has been designated since 1971 and the Commission has gathered volumes of permit applications and materials related to those applications. He stated that the staff has looked through all of the files and cannot find any evidence that the banners were permitted or approved by the Commission at the time of the major renovation in the 1980s. He explained that the failure to uncover a permit is surprising, given that the building was renovated as a tax credit project with extensive oversight by both the Commission and National Park Service through the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

Mr. Dilworth recalled the discussion of the Hotel Monaco banner proposal for the Lafayette Building and the claim that awnings were typical of a building of its period and type. He asked Mr. Farnham if banners would have also been a common feature on buildings such as the Bourse at the turn-of-the-century. Mr. Farnham responded that there are good photographs of

the building at the time of construction and, while there are awnings on the building, there are no banners. He contended banners like these proposed are an invention of the 1970s and 80s and are not seen prior to that time period. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that awnings were installed for sun control because there was no air conditioning. He acknowledged, however, that the building, which has been repurposed, must attract visitors to thrive. He stated that exterior signage helps maintain the financial health of the building. He opined that, if the Commission had reviewed this proposal prior to installation, it would likely have not approved it, pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, because of the drilling into the masonry. He explained that, at a minimum, the Commission would ask that the bolts be driven into masonry joints or other places where the holes left by their removal could be easily repaired. He explained that the removal of these brackets will require careful masonry restoration work. He added that, if the banners are removed, another form of signage, such as ground-mounted signs, would need to be developed. He suggested that the banners be permitted until the time they need to be replaced.

Ms. Sell noted that the fabric portions of the banners are changed every two to three years. She asked Mr. Thomas if he was suggesting that the banners and brackets should be removed at the time that the banner fabric needs replacement, or when the brackets themselves deteriorate to the point of replacement. Mr. Thomas responded that he had not decided; he asked the Commission to continue its discussion. Mr. Gilberg clarified that the lifetime of the fabric banners is three to five years. He added that the current banners have been up for only one to two years and will last another one or two years. Mr. Mattioni agreed that signage is needed for the economic viability of the building. He suggested that the Commission legalize the banners and brackets until that time that the brackets need replacing. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Gilberg how long the brackets have been in place. Mr. Gilberg stated that they are the original brackets from the 1980s. He stated that the brackets may have been repaired in the 1990s. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission members should articulate a definition of repair if they accept Mr. Mattioni's suggestion.

Ms. Jaffe stated that it is important to enumerate the number of banners and brackets currently on the building. Four banners, two per façade, and eight brackets, four per façade, were counted.

Mr. Palatino suggested that the applicant work with the Architectural Committee to develop a plan for brackets that the Commission could approve. Mr. Sherman agreed with Mr. Palatino's suggestion and elaborated that the applicant should be proactive and seek approvals for the replacement signage before the brackets reach the ends of their useful lives.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Thomas to clarify his suggestion for the Commission members. Mr. Thomas suggested that the brackets remain in place until the ends of their lives. He explained that a new solution could be proposed at that time. He added that there are several options for signage or there may be a new, more sympathetic technology available in the future.

Mr. Sherman asked the Commission members and staff if these banners were used as an example of precedent of banners on Independence Mall in the Lafayette discussions. Ms. Jones recalled that the Commission discussed other banners on the Mall during the Lafayette discussions. Mr. Sherman replied that he recalls that the answer was that the Commission does not approve banners on the facades of buildings along the Mall. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission should establish a consistent policy. He suggested that, when the fabric of the banners needs replacement, a new application should be submitted to the Commission for

review. He stated that the Commission should find a middle ground that is fair to the building owner and preservation.

Mr. Gilberg quoted Mr. Farnham from the Historical Commission minutes from 8 April 2011, who stated that “The Commission approved banners at the Public Ledger Building for the CCD Lights of Liberty organization, though not in locations as those proposed in this case.” Mr. Gilberg stated that, if banners were approved for the Public Ledger Building, then they should also be approved for the Bourse.

Mr. Mattioni opined that the brackets will not last forever and will eventually become disconnected from the building, owing to deterioration. He suggested putting a time limit on the duration that the banners and brackets can remain. Mr. Sherman stated that he would like to see a clear path for the applicant and building owner to move forward and to create certainty and clarity for all other building owners on Independence Mall.

Mr. Gilberg stated that, owing to the retail on the first floor, the building provided restrooms to the public as a service. He opined that, if the signage were removed, the public would not learn about services and amenities available in the Bourse. Mr. Schaaf stated that the Park Service recently installed restrooms at the corner of 5th and Chestnut Streets.

Mr. Thomas stated that the justification for allowing the banners to remain until the end of their life is that they were installed a long time ago without objection and their eventual removal will require an involved preservation masonry plan to repair the damage to the historic fabric. He opined that leaving the brackets in place for now is the least invasive method, from a purely preservation standpoint.

Mr. Baron contended that the advertising is necessary for the vitality of the building. He suggested that standards with attached banners could be installed into the non-historic plaza to provide the needed advertising without attaching to the building.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the building has been the subject of Commission’s review and inspections by the Department of Licenses & Inspections for many years. He stated that, if the banners were truly illegal, they would have been discovered years ago. He acknowledged that the record keeping at the Department of Licenses & Inspections is not the best and it is often difficult to track down old permits.

Mr. Sherman suggested legalization of the banners and brackets until the brackets need replacement and recommended the applicant explore options for standards mounted in the ground or sidewalk or a pedestal not attached to the building. He explained that once the brackets need to be replaced, their replacement will not be approved and it would be in the best interest of the owner to have a plan in place before the attachments need replacement. Mr. Gilberg asserted they will continue to maintain the brownstone of the building. Mr. Schaaf stated that the banners fail every two to three years, but brackets infrequently. He suggested legalizing the banners and brackets until the banners need replacement, at which time the brackets should be removed. Mr. Mattioni disagreed with Mr. Schaaf and opined that the Commission should not punish the owner for banners that have been in place for 30 years. He contended that, although a permit cannot be located, there is a chance that one may have existed and has been lost. He suggested that, if and when the brackets need to be repaired or replaced in a way that would require brownstone repair, all the brackets should be removed and the brownstone repaired. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Mattioni and asserted that, in his experience, the Department of Licenses & Inspections files are sometimes incomplete. If the paperwork could

be found, then the brackets could stay in perpetuity. He suggested a compromise: when the brackets fail, and they will, they must be removed. He added that it is easier to wait until the brackets deteriorate when they are easier to remove as opposed extracting them when they are placed firmly.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to legalize the banners and brackets until such time that one or more of the brackets deteriorate to the point of requiring removal and replacement. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Mses. Jaffe and Jones and Messrs. Schaaf and Quinn dissented.

ADDRESS: 8300 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Install ADA accessible entrance and ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christ Ascension Lutheran Church

Applicant: Jean McCoubrey, Runyan & Associates Architects

History: 1870; Christ Ascension Lutheran Church and Parish House; Charles M. Burns, architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of both Schemes A and B, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two schemes to create ADA access for the church. Scheme A proposes to cut a simple squared opening at the rear of the sanctuary. A concrete walk would lead from the driveway to the opening. Scheme B proposes to cut an opening in the side wall of the church. This would involve removing the lower portion of one stained glass window and leaving the top arch of the window to serve as a transom over the new door. A concrete ramp would curve from driveway and lead to the new entrance. The ramp sidewall would be clad in schist.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 110 QUEEN ST

Project: Install weatherproofing on façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Paterson

Applicant: Sarah Paterson

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to treat the side brick wall of this row house with a water-repellent chemical called Siloxane PD. The interior of the home is experiencing water damage. It has been the experience of the Commission that liquid water does not move through two

wythes of bricks. Most likely, the water infiltration is occurring at the roofing, flashing, barge board, or chimney. The applicant claims that the bricks are cracking and spalling. However, the photographs appear to indicate the expected condition of a 180-year-old wall. Cracking and spalling result from hard mortar joints. The appropriate solution for cracking and spalling is to cut out and re-point the wall.

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

The Commissioners discussed the application and agreed with Mr. Thomas and the Architectural Committee, who recommended that the proposed sealant was inappropriate and would not solve the water infiltration problems.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 7. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

ADDRESS: 2200 PARK TOWNE PLACE

Nominator: George Thomas, CivicVisions

Owner: AIMCO, Denver, Colorado

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a complex of Modernist apartment buildings to the National Register of Historic Places. The complex was constructed between 1957 and 1959. It contains seven buildings and structures, of which four are apartment towers. The nominator proposes to designate the complex under Criterion A for Community Planning & Development. The complex was developed as a residential enclave owing to its close proximity to the central business district and Fairmount Park. The use, spacing, massing, and design of Park Towne Place was influenced by the redevelopment proposals of two leading Philadelphia designers, Louis Kahn in 1947 and Edmund Bacon in 1950. The complex was ultimately designed collaboratively by John Hans Graham & Associates of Washington, DC and Milton M. Schwartz of Chicago. Collins, Simonds & Simonds served as landscape architects. Park Towne Place is a significant complex of Modernist buildings and structures that remain largely unaltered. The complex exemplifies pure ideals of mid twentieth-century Modernism in architectural design as well as town planning.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commission. Mr. Farnham explained the role of the Philadelphia Historical Commission when it reviews National Register nominations. The Commission must provide comments on nominations to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, which oversees the National Register in Pennsylvania. Mr. Reuter asked if the nomination should also contend that the complex satisfies Criterion C, the architecture criterion. Mr. Danta answered that that argument could be made. He explained, however, that the housing complex is more significant for its planning than its architectural design. He noted that "Community Planning & Development" criterion encompasses the architecture.

Alan Beekman represented the Park Towne Residents' Association. He stated that the owners of the building had not presented the nomination to the residents' association. He questioned the motives for the nomination, and what, if any, changes the nomination would bring to their

community. Mr. Farnham informed Mr. Beekman that the Historical Commission's task is to formulate non-binding comments on the technical aspects of the nomination for presentation to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission in Harrisburg. Owing to the Historical Commission's limited purview, the residents' concerns would better be addressed during the review of the nomination in Harrisburg.

Ms. Jaffe stated that Bernie Weinberg, a partner in the development of Park Towne Place, was her father-in-law. She noted that this development was a big project for him. She also stated that she and her husband, as well as her mother-in-law, lived in Park Towne Place until the early 1970s.

Tully Speaker of the Logan Neighborhood Association stated that the owners of the property had not presented the nomination to the neighborhood association.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to comment that the property satisfies Criterion A and merits listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

On the suggestion of Mr. Thomas, the Historical Commission resolved to wish architect Henry Magaziner a happy 100th birthday.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adjourn at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.