

**THE MINUTES OF THE 580TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**10 DECEMBER 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Leslie Benoliel
Richard Dilworth, III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, LEED AP
Susan O.W. Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Fon Wang, UCI Architects, Inc
Ignatius Wang, UCI Architects, Inc
William L. Wilson, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Gabriel & Lydia Marabella
Clarence Fleming, First District AME
Rodney Jones, National Capital Resources, LLC
Emmanuel Kelly, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Thomas M. Holloman, TMH Associates, Inc.
Kenneth Johnson, TMH Associates, Inc.
Juliet Lee, BLTa
Agata Reister, Landmark Design
Malcolm Lazin
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Robert Pisani
Cuong Tran
Frank Lauletta, 538 N 19th St. LLC
Lloyd Birnbaum, 538 N 19th St. LLC
Dennis Weismer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Commissioners Benoliel, Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 579TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 579th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 November 2010. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 NOVEMBER 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham presented the Consent Agenda to the Commission. Mr. Danta suggested that the application for 307 Delancey Street should be removed from the Consent Agenda because a neighbor had voiced his opposition to the mosaic in a letter recently received by the Commission. The Commissioners agreed that the application for 307 Delancey Street should be moved from the Consent Agenda to the regular agenda.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for 1706 Panama Street. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

100 W. SCHOOL HOUSE LANE, PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF

Owner: Pennsylvania School for the Deaf

Applicant: Fon Wang, AIA, LEED AP

History: 1760; later additions in 1880 and 1904

Designation: individually designated, 6/26/1956

Project: In concept - Construct addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and New Addition Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct an addition to a school building on the campus of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf in Germantown. The original school building was constructed in the 1760s and then added to at the rear in 1880 and again in 1904. The original eighteenth-century structure is one of the most historically significant buildings in the city. The proposed addition would connect to the 1904 wing, not the eighteenth-century portion of the building. All three sections of the building are finished in Wissahickon Schist and both the 1880 and 1904 additions were designed in a Colonial Revival style to complement the original Georgian building.

The in-concept design proposes a one-story addition that would require the demolition of a large section of the ground floor of the 1904 rear façade. The Wissahickon stone removed from the demolition would be saved and reused as cladding stone on the new addition. The addition

would be articulated with large windows, a standing-seam roof, skylights, and a pediment central entranceway that evokes the pitched roofs found throughout the campus.

Before approving an addition to a building with such great significance, the Commission should determine whether this is the only feasible location to house the needed functions on the campus. If it can be built elsewhere, away from the historic buildings, it should be. If this is the only feasible location for an addition, then it should be designed to be compatible with the eighteenth-century building as well as its additions, which have acquired their own significance. The applicants should provide information about the campus and the long-term plans for it to allow the Commission to better understand the reasons for selecting this location for the addition. The applicants should also provide information about the programmatic needs. For example, what are the needs for additional cafeteria space.

The design of the proposed addition may not comply with the Standards. The proposed addition engulfs the historic 1904 wing, changing its massing and spatial relationships. The two rear corners of the 1904 wing, which now stand free, should be respected to preserve the historic massing and integrity of the complex. A connector between the historic 1904 wing and new addition or a setback at the eastern end of the new addition may help in the retention of the historic massing. The loss of historic stone from the façade of the 1904 wing should be minimized. The main façade of the proposed addition is not compatible with the 1904 wing in features, rhythm, scale, proportions, and massing. The openings in the proposed addition have a different rhythm, proportions, and scale than the openings in the historic building. The broad, tall entranceway proposed for the new addition competes with the historic building behind it.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Fon Wang represented the application.

Ms. Wang introduced the Commission to the project and site using maps and aerial photographs. She stated that three buildings on the campus had been designated as historic. She explained that the space in the new addition would be used for gatherings of the entire student body. There are no spaces on campus today that can accommodate the entire student body. Currently, the cafeteria is in the basement of the building in question. The school would like to move it to the first floor. The space would be used for many different purposes, especially as a general socializing space. The addition would include a teaching kitchen.

Responding to a request by the Architectural Committee, Ms. Wang showed a site plan of the campus with potential locations for the requisite space indicated on the plan. She demonstrated that the three other potential locations would have adverse impacts on historic resources, would create unsafe conditions owing to the proximity to traffic, and would require unsympathetic alterations to buildings. She showed photographs of the historic buildings and front lawn on School House Lane and stated that two of the possible locations would block the main views of these buildings and disrupt the lawns. As she showed photographs of the lawn with buildings, Mr. Schaaf asked her about the third possibility. She stated that she would discuss that site in a moment. Mr. Schaaf asked why the third site was not feasible. Ms. Wang turned her attention to the third site and explained that it would block the main driveway onto campus, which is used by the school buses and faculty and staff. Mr. Schaaf disagreed. Ms. Wang replied that the location was not large enough to accommodate the new facilities and an addition would disrupt the main entrance and two facades of a fine building. She contended that the proposed location is the best location for the new facility.

Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Wang to explain how the proposed site is related to the Early Childhood Center, which the school erected fairly recently on Coulter Street. He informed the Commissioners that the Commission had approved the demolition of an historic house to construct this facility. He asked Ms. Wang if the new facilities could be constructed along Coulter Street, near the Early Childhood Center. He also asked why the applicants' site plans only show part of the campus, not the entire campus. Ms. Wang responded that there is no room to build the proposed facility near the Early Childhood Center. She added that that facility is dedicated to young children. The proposed facility would be used by older children. The site plan provided only shows the part of the campus used by the older children. The proposed facility must be constructed in close proximity to the existing facilities for older children. She also noted that the school has a Professional Studies Center on the opposite side of School House Lane, which is not shown on the site plan. Mr. Wilds asked about the large open space on the site plan. Ms. Wang explained that it is the school's athletic field, which is used primarily for soccer. She explained that it cannot be reconfigured. It is already smaller than regulation size and cannot be used for league-sanctioned play. She stated that the school hopes to expand it to regulation size. Mr. Wilds and Ms. Hawkins asked about constructing on the existing parking facilities. They stated that the Commission needs information about the decision-making process that led to the decision to locate the addition at the rear of the historic building. Ms. Wang showed aerial photographs and explained that the parking areas cannot be reduced in size. The bus turn-around loop also cannot be moved. The loop would occupy more space, not less, if it were relocated farther away from the core of the campus. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Wilds stated that they did not find the presentation on the decisions regarding the location of the proposed facilities convincing. They suggested that the applicant should restudy the problem. Ms. Jaffe asked about the size of the proposed addition. Ms. Wang stated that it would be 5,000 sf. Returning to the line of questioning, Ms. Wang explained that the school has expended significant funds linking the buildings of the core campus, allowing students, many of whom have disabilities, to move from space to space without going outside. She stated that this new facility must also be linked to the core campus buildings. It cannot be constructed on the outer reaches of the campus because it would be inaccessible to the students. Ms. Hawkins stated that the bus loop is very large and should be reduced in size or relocated. Ms. Wang again stated that that was infeasible. Moving it would increase, not decrease the total paved area. She also explained that the school is operating with a limited budget. Locating the new facilities in an addition to an existing building rather than constructing an entirely new building would allow the school to reuse some existing facilities, saving it money. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants should not ask the Commission to redesign the proposal during a Commission meeting. Ms. Wang responded that she was not asking the Commission to redesign her proposal, but to consider it on its merits.

Mr. Dilworth asked the applicant if the public would be able to see the proposed addition from the public right-of-way. Ms. Wang responded that the addition would be nearly invisible from the public right-of-way. One may be able to briefly glimpse it from Greene Street, but it would be inconspicuous. Mr. Dilworth claimed that the Commission should treat this application as it would treat a minor rear deck or addition that was not visible to the public. Ms. Wang stated that they did not propose to construct this addition on the lawn facing School House Lane because that is the important public vista. Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Farnham why the staff did not consider the proposed construction to be equivalent to a rear addition. Mr. Farnham responded that the proposed construction is not simply equivalent to a rear addition; it is, in fact, a rear addition. Mr. Dilworth asked about the staff's position on the proposed addition. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff's objections to this proposal were primarily related to the design of the proposed addition itself and the ways it would connect to the older building, not to the location of the addition or the impact of the minor demolition on the 1904 addition. Mr. Farnham stated that it is

important to bear in mind the value of the historic fabric that would be impacted and its visibility from the public right-of-way. He stated that the proposed addition would connect to a 1904 addition that connects to an 1880 addition that connects to the original 1760s building. No eighteenth-century fabric would be directly impacted. Also, the primary views of the historic buildings from School House Lane would not be impacted. Mr. Wilds noted that this is an application in concept, not an application for final approval. Mr. Farnham agreed, and noted that the design details would be more germane to a review for final approval. Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had asked the applicant to provide the information that led to the decision to situate the new facilities at this location on the campus, but the staff generally agreed with the applicant that this was the best location for the new facilities. The Architectural Committee, on the other hand, disagreed with the staff and applicant and contended that there may be better locations on the campus for the new facilities. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff's primary objections related to the design of the façade of the addition facing the parking, especially the scale and proportions of the fenestration and to the way in which the addition seemed to envelope the 1904 addition, flowing around it at the corners. Mr. Farnham noted that the two additions to the historic building share the Colonial style of the historic building. The proposed addition deviates from that style. Mr. Baron stated that he disagreed with the claim that the addition would not be visible from the public right-of-way. He contended that it would be visible. Mr. Farnham disagreed with Mr. Baron. Mr. Mattioni asked for a clarification. He asked if there was a substantive objection to the location of the addition. He observed that two of the alternates discussed by the applicant today are much worse than the proposed location. He remarked that the third, near the driveway, would be feasible only if the new facilities were compatible with the facilities in the adjacent building. He stated that the proposed location, at the rear of the 1904 addition, appeared appropriate, if the addition could be redesigned to be more compatible with the historic building. Mr. Mattioni asked the staff members if they agreed with that assertion. Mr. Baron stated that the eighteenth-century building is very historically significant. Mr. Mattioni responded that he agreed that it is significant, but observed that Mr. Baron had not answered his question. Mr. Mattioni asserted that the Commission should work hard to preserve the important views of the significant buildings from School House Lane. He noted that this addition would not impact those views, but might only be minimally visible from Greene Street. Mr. Wilds asked the staff if it would have recommended approval in concept of the proposal if it preserved the corners of the 1904 addition. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff did request information supporting the decision to situate the addition at this location, but the staff believes that this is the best location for the addition on the campus given the myriad requirements and restrictions. He explained that the difference between the staff and the Architectural Committee was one of degree. The staff believes that this is probably the best location, but wants to see the proof. The Committee does not believe that this is the best location, and wants to see the proof contradicting that belief. The Committee was skeptical of the decision to locate the new facilities at this spot. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham if the staff based its conclusion about the location on the programmatic needs of the school or on the preservation of historic resources. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff's decision was predicated on many factors, both programmatic and preservation related. He stated that the school had made a convincing case that the facilities needed to be located in the core of the campus because the school wanted to reuse existing facilities, not duplicate facilities. It observed that many students suffer from disabilities that limit their mobility and therefore cogently argued for easily accessible facilities. Mr. Farnham observed that the staff knows this campus well. It has been involved in the review of numerous applications for it. The staff also knows the neighborhood. He observed that the loss of historic fabric would be relatively small. He noted that the addition would not disrupt the primary vistas of the historic campus. He finally contended that the 1904 addition, although connected to the eighteenth-century building, was not highly significant in and of itself. Mr. Mattioni asked if it would be feasible to add to the building along the driveway. Ms. Wang stated

that that building has ornate, exposed facades. The school decided that those facades should not be disturbed. Also, the interior layout was not conducive to an addition.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Farnham to explain the designation of the site. He asked if some buildings were designated and others not. Mr. Farnham explained that the three eighteenth-century buildings on the campus were designated in 1956. At that time and until the current ordinance went into effect in 1985, the Commission exercised jurisdiction over the three buildings only. Beginning in 1985, the new ordinance defined a “building” as a “structure, its site and appurtenances” and defined a “historic building” as a “building or complex of buildings and site.” Therefore, since 1985, the Commission has had the authority to regulate not only the three eighteenth-century buildings designated in 1956, but also the remainder of the campus and buildings. Mr. Farnham suggested, however, that the Commission could and should regulate the various buildings and sections of the campus according to their differing historical values.

Ms. Wang stated that the location for the addition was selected in part because it sits at the center of the middle and high school sections of the campus. She noted that the 1904 addition has no entrance at grade. The only entrance to it is a later addition, a stairway down to the basement, which was cut in at a later date. The new addition would connect to the historic addition at the point where the later basement entrance was added.

Mr. Dilworth asked the staff to define the bounds of an in-concept approval. Mr. Farnham responded that an in-concept approval is whatever the Commission wants it to be. He stated that an in-concept approval is much more difficult to define than a final approval. A final approval gives permission to undertake whatever work is depicted on the architectural drawings. An in-concept approval provides direction for an applicant, but does not necessarily define a particular set of alterations, additions, or demolitions. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission must define the parameters whenever it issues an approval in concept. The approval may relate to location only, or to massing, or materials. The Commission must state explicitly what an in-concept approval includes and excludes. Mr. Farnham informed the applicant that an in-concept approval is non-binding, but it is the Commission’s agreement with the applicant to not withhold final approval because the final application includes a feature, element, or aspect granted approval in concept. Mr. Dilworth asked if the staff’s objections to some of the design details were relevant for an in-concept review, or should be reserved for the final review. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission concentrate on the primary aspects of this proposal such as the location and massing of the addition. He conceded that the design details should be left for the final review, but contended that this review was an appropriate forum for providing design direction to the applicant.

Mr. Thomas observed that the core campus is entirely interconnected. He asserted that it would not make sense to ask the students who occupy the core campus to walk 800 feet to have lunch, or even to go outside at all to get to the cafeteria. He contended that the new facility should be physically linked to the existing complex of interconnected buildings. Mr. Thomas then noted that he grew up in Germantown and knows this campus well. He stated that he firmly believes that it is possible to construct a one-story addition off the back of the 1904 addition that would meet historic preservation standards. He stated that the connection between the new and old addition, the materials, and the fenestration must all be chosen and designed wisely. Mr. Thomas remarked that he would like additional information about the interior plan of the interconnected complex so that he can determine whether the appropriate decisions were made for the design of the addition. Mr. Thomas stated that the photographs supplied by the staff are inadequate. He stated that they predate some of the most recent changes and therefore do not

provide a complete picture. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicant also provide cost analyses of the addition and a separate building.

Mr. Schaaf asked if there are other examples of one-story shed additions on the campus. He stated that he agreed that new facilities would best be located within the core campus. He observed that the 1880 and 1904 additions are both very closely related in style to the original 1760 building. The stylistic continuity should inform the design of the new addition. Ms. Wang answered Mr. Schaaf's question, stating that there are no historic one-story additions, but there are one-story additions. Mr. Thomas suggested that Ms. Wang look at additions to local eighteenth-century buildings for design cues. He contended that the design of the addition should be stylistically similar to the historic building and its additions.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he had originally opposed the project, but now supported it after visiting the campus and speaking with the architects. He explained that the goal of the project is to create a central gathering space between the two student areas, which are located at the two ends of the core campus. He noted that the proposed location of the addition is in that central location. He also noted that the teaching kitchen is a critical component of the project. Mr. Gallery stated that the two potential locations on the front lawn of the school were unacceptable. He stated that the third alternate location, along the driveway, held more promise, but also had disadvantages. He also observed that the school bus turn-around could not be successfully relocated. He stated that the proposed addition would have the least adverse impact on the historic site. He stated that he preferred the proposed location and massing. He stated that he considered the design of the proposed addition to be inappropriate, but the location and massing to be appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve in concept the location and massing of the proposed addition. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 12 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

2220 MADISON SQUARE

Owner/Applicant: Dennis Weismer

History: c. 1850

Designation: individually designated, 9/28/1971

Project: Legalize alterations to front facade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations to the front façade of this property on Madison Square. The Commission approved rear alterations for this building, but the scope of the approval was exceeded. The applicant claims in his letter that he did not replace the vinyl windows on the front façade; they were present when he purchased the property. The brick pointing is inappropriate and the mixture appears to be very high in Portland cement. The front door is also inappropriate and it does not replicate the original appearance of the original mid nineteenth-century door.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Dennis Weismer represented the application.

Mr. Weismer stated that, although he redevelops real estate, he has never worked on a building designated as historic before undertaking this project. He explained that he knew that the

building was designated as historic and assumed that the best approach was to ensure that any alterations were as “innocuous” as possible. Mr. Weismer contended that the vinyl windows were in place when he purchased the building. He asserted that he did not replace the windows. He claimed that there are many replacement windows on the block including vinyl windows. He conceded that he did replace the door. He explained that he looked at other doors on the block and tried to replicate one of the more plain doors. He stated that there are a variety of doors on the block. He reported that there are only five, six, or seven doors with the original design on the block.

Mr. Wilds noted that Mr. Weismer had been issued a building permit for other work to this house. He also noted that, to receive that permit, Mr. Weismer had to seek and receive the Historical Commission’s approval. He asked Mr. Weismer if the receipt of that building permit had apprised him of the Historical Commission’s review authority and process. Mr. Weismer stated that it had. Mr. Wilds then asked him why he replaced the door and pointed the brick without the Commission’s approval if he was fully aware of the Commission’s process. Mr. Wilds pointed out that Mr. Weismer is in the real estate business and should be aware of the City’s permitting processes. Mr. Weismer explained that his contractor was responsible for the permits. Mr. Wilds replied that, as the property owner, Mr. Weismer was ultimately responsible of ensuring that work was done in accordance to the law. Mr. Weismer agreed.

Mr. Wilds asked if the illegal pointing, which is very hard and will ultimately damage the façade, could be removed without additional damage to the brick. Mr. Weismer asserted that it would damage the brick to remove the pointing. He again claimed that he did not replace the windows. He agreed to replace the door.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the windows. Mr. Danta replied that the building was designated in 1971 and would not have had vinyl windows at the time of designation. Mr. Danta explained that, at the time Mr. Weismer applied to the Commission for approval of work to the rear of the building, the vinyl windows were in place in the front façade. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Weismer when he purchased the property. Mr. Weismer replied that he purchased it in August 2008. Ms. Hawkins asked when the Commission’s staff approved the work to the rear. Mr. Danta stated that it was approved in July 2009. Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Weismer if he had had the building inspected at the time of purchase. Mr. Weismer stated that he did not have a home inspection. He added that he has no photographs dating from the time of the sale. He again stated that he did not replace the windows. Mr. Danta explained that the vinyl windows were discovered at the same time as the door and pointing, but may have been installed earlier. He observed that the windows postdate designation and were not approved by the Commission; therefore, they are illegal.

Mr. Wilds observed that the current photographs show that a real estate “For Sale” sign hangs on the property. He asked Mr. Weismer if the property is being marketed for sale. Mr. Weismer stated that it is. Mr. Wilds asked him if it is an investment property. Mr. Weismer stated that it is.

Mr. Thomas explained to the applicant that the very hard mortar will cause the brick to deteriorate because it will not allow the brick to expand and contract. He stated that the brick will spall and fall off within 10 or 15 years, leaving a honeycomb of very hard mortar. He stated that a soft lime mortar is designed to allow the brick to expand and contract without damaging the brick. He also observed that it would damage the brick now to cut out the hard mortar. Either way, the brick will be damaged once the hard mortar is installed. He concluded that this defect should be disclosed to the buyer. He added that a Commission legalization of the mortar should not be construed as an endorsement of the mortar. Ms. Hawkins stated that, if the pointing is

legalized, the Commission should be very clear that it does not consider this pointing to be appropriate. She stated that removing the mortar would certainly damage the brick more quickly than leaving the mortar in place. However, leaving the hard mortar in place will eventually damage the brick. She observed that legalizing such mortar is not the Commission's standard practice.

Mr. Weismer again lobbied for the legalization of the windows, which were in place when he bought the property. Mr. Wilds responded that the staff would have noted the illegality of the windows if Mr. Weismer had requested an inspection during his due diligence period. The Commissioners concluded that a mere change in ownership does not and should not automatically legalize all illegal work to a historic building.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the legalization of the windows and door, pursuant to Standard 6, but approve the legalization of the pointing. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

307 DELANCEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Malcolm Lazin

History: 1973, Adolf De Roy Mark, architect

Designation: Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize mosaic on garden wall

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of a mosaic that was installed without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The mosaic is located on a garden wall along an alley that runs perpendicularly away from Delancey Street. The mosaic is visible to pedestrians on the sidewalk, but is not visible when looking head on at the front of the house. The house was constructed in 1973 as part of the redevelopment of the area and is classified as Contributing to the district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Malcolm Lazin represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Commissioners that he had distributed a letter from a neighbor opposing the legalization at the start of today's meeting.

Mr. Lazin provided a brief history of his house, which was constructed in 1973. He explained that the wall on which the mosaic was installed was faced in stucco. He asserted that the wall was ugly prior to the creation of the mosaic. The wall was cracked and some of it had collapsed. He noted that Three Bears Park is nearby. He stated that he was the president of the Society Hill Civic Association. He stated that he spoke with his neighbors before installing the mural. He stated that he is a fan of Isaiah Zagar, the artist who created the mosaic. Mr. Lazin reported that he commissioned the artist, telling him to create a mosaic that would have an "Alice in Wonderland effect" on children going to and from Three Bears Park. Mr. Lazin stated that he held a celebration of the completion of the mosaic with the artist and his wife as well as the neighbors. He remarked that, at that time, he thought that his neighbors were happy with the mosaic. He stated that people stop to admire the mosaic. He explained that the inspector of the Department of Licenses & Inspections was apologetic when he issued the citation. He asserted that the Society Hill Civic Association and Friends of Three Bears Park do not object to the mosaic. He

stated that the only objector is his letter-writing neighbor, with whom he is not acquainted. Mr. Lazin pointed out that Suzanne Pentz of the Architectural Committee contended that the Commission would someday deem Mr. Zagar's work to be of historical importance. Mr. Lazin agreed with Ms. Pentz's statement. Mr. Lazin stated that the mural is not highly visible from the public right-of-way. He asserted that it has "no material impact" on the street. He stated that he believes the mural adds to the character of the block.

Mr. Wilds asked whether the wall on which the mosaic is applied is original to the house. Mr. Lazin answered that the garden wall is original. Mr. Wilds stated that this house is a very interesting Redevelopment Era design and is listed as a Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the very old house next door has a stucco party wall. He asked Mr. Lazin if he thought it would be appropriate to install a mosaic on that wall. Mr. Lazin responded that it would not be appropriate. He stated that a mosaic on that wall would be obviously visible from the street. He added that he did not place the mosaic on the front façade of the property, but on a side wall that runs perpendicular to the street and is not highly visible to the public. Mr. Wilds asked if the mosaic, in its current location, is visible from the public-right-of-way. Mr. Lazin answered that the pedestrian would have to walk into the side alley to see it. Mr. Wilds asserted that the party wall on the neighboring old house was stuccoed as a later alteration while the garden wall on which the mosaic was applied is original to the design of his historic house. Mr. Lazin stated that the stucco on the neighboring party wall was applied at the time his property was constructed in 1973 and it is not original to the construction of the neighboring house. Mr. Wilds agreed and clarified that the stucco was applied because the eighteenth-century house that stood where Mr. Lazin's house now stands was demolished to make way for the construction of his house and the party wall had to be treated with stucco. Mr. Wilds summarized his point by stating that the mosaic was installed on a wall that is integral to the original design of a Contributing historic resource. He also noted that the applicant finds it more permissible to alter this original feature of the property rather than place the mosaic on a former party wall, which the Commission has approved in the past.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the alley onto which the mural faces is publicly accessible or gated. Mr. Lazin answered that the alley is gated and it is used by the neighbors for trash cans. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that similar murals had been approved by the Commission and gave the New Century Guild on Locust Street as an example. Mr. Wilds disagreed with the example and stated that this mosaic was applied to an original design feature of the property and not to a party wall that was exposed owing to an adjacent demolition. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. Wilds. She stated that she could not think of any other similar mosaics within the boundaries of the Society Hill Historic District. She also stated that, given the location and street setting of the mosaic, she deemed it a much more significant intervention than in other locations in the city. Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Hawkins about the Architectural Committee thinking during its meeting. Ms. Hawkins answered that she had not been present for the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. Dilworth suggested that it is likely the Commission would have approved an alteration to this garden wall because of its location and materials. He questioned whether the mosaic did not fall within the threshold of an acceptable alteration.

Mr. Lazin stated that he is a preservationist. He stated that the Society Hill Civic Association and Friends of the Three Bears Park appear not to be opposed to the mosaic; he noted that neither organization was represented at the Architectural Committee meeting. He said that the opposition is limited to one neighbor.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of Society Hill Civic Association approached the Commission and stated that she did not attend the Architectural Committee meeting. Ms. Katz-Lawson noted that she had sent surveys to the affected neighbors and had received two responses: one adamantly opposed and one unopposed. Ms. Katz-Lawson stated that Mr. Lazin was well aware of the Civic Association's process, given his past involvement with the organization. She stated that, if Mr. Lazin had presented his proposal to the community, then all of the affected neighbors would have had a chance to discuss the project before it was implemented. Ms. Katz-Lawson noted that the neighbor who adamantly opposes the mural was unhappy that the mural was visible from all three floors of his house. Ms. Katz-Lawson stated that she could not officially speak on behalf of the Association because it did not conduct a formal review. Ms. Katz-Lawson asked the Commission how they would treat such an alteration in light of the fact that the Rules & Regulations clearly state that murals shall not be attached to historic fabric. She stated that a clarification from the Commission would be helpful to guide future applicants.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the wall on which the mosaic was applied is historic fabric. She voiced her frustration with the applicant's disregard of the Historical Commission's review process.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he wanted the record to reflect that he had not spoken in favor of the mosaic at the Architectural Committee meeting. He clarified that the fact that the mosaic was applied to stucco rather than brick made a difference to him, but that did not mean that he was in support of the mosaic. He stated that Mr. Wilds had made a valid distinction when he considered the stucco to be historic fabric. He stated that such a distinction is correct and it was something that had not occurred to him or to the Committee.

Mr. Lazin stated that he had indeed contacted his neighbors and no one had objected. He also stated that, from his point of view, this was not a significant part of the building. Mr. Wilds noted that, had the applicant called the Commission's office prior to undertaking the alteration, he would have informed that this mosaic constituted an alteration to the exterior of the building and required the Commission's review.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the attachment method of the mosaic would damage the wall beyond repair if it is removed. Mr. Wilds clarified that stucco can be easily repaired. Mr. Lazin stated that he did not know how the mosaic was attached to the wall. Mr. Thomas asserted that the removal of the mosaic would likely destroy the stucco. He stated that he is very concerned with the visibility of the mosaic. He further stated that the question is not whether the artist is talented or if the mosaic has artistic merit, but whether this alteration meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He asserted that it did not. Mr. Dilworth asked why the Commission would deny this application for a Redevelopment Era house in Society Hill because it does not satisfy the Secretary's Standards when it has approved many applications for Redevelopment Era houses in Society Hill that have not satisfied the Secretary's Standards. Mr. Thomas disputed Mr. Dilworth's claim that the Commission had approved projects that do not meet the Standards.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the legalization of the mosaic, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 11. Commissioners Benoliel, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Sherman, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, and Wilds dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the legalization of the mosaic. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 2. Messrs. Dilworth and Mattioni dissented.

135 S. 17TH STREET

Owner: Ocean Properties, LTD

Applicant: Stanley Tang, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects

History: 1907, Latham Apartments

Designation: Significant to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Proposal: Replace storefronts, remove fire balconies, infill openings

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the Option 3 storefront, provided the skirt on the entrance canopy is canvas, the fire stair openings are infilled with brick, and the Option 3 storefront design is modified with a solid metal spandrel as seen in the historic photograph.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove late twentieth-century stone and aluminum storefronts and install glass and metal storefronts on the 17th and Walnut Street facades of this hotel. The applicants have provided three storefront options, which show different materials for the spandrel area and designs for the transoms.

Originally, the building had small residential windows at the ground floor. Later, the ground floor was converted for retail use. Two different stores with different storefront designs occupied the retail space historically. This space will now be consolidated into one store.

The applicants will retain the Art-Deco stone piers between the windows, which were added during the original retail conversion. Option 3 shows a storefront design using the small transom lights of the historic ornate design of the easternmost shop front on Walnut Street. Option 3 is preferred because it maintains a scale of detail consistent with the upper floors of the building and has a basis in the historic photos. Adding the decorative metal spandrel from Option 2 to Option 3 would make Option 3 even closer to the historic design as seen in the photographic evidence.

The plans show the removal of a non-historic green marble door surround at the main door and its replacement with a glass and metal system. The metal marquee over the door will be maintained. Two options for the skirt below the marquee are provided. One is canvas and the other glass. The staff recommends the canvas option as it is a less permanent intervention.

Black up-lights on the façade would be replaced with new lights that will match the color of the limestone.

The applicants propose to remove the balconies of the Philadelphia fire stair on the visible east façade of the building. These balconies are in very poor condition and would be very expensive to make safe. They propose to create an internal fire stair and close up the old door openings with either brick or metal panels.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Juliette Lee represented the application.

Ms. Lee presented a new architectural drawing to the Commission. The new drawing showed that the applicant had implemented the Committee's recommendation and combined Option 3 with the decorative spandrel panels. Mr. Baron asked that the Commission include "the staff to review of details" condition with any approval because the spandrel panels may need adjustment to accommodate any signage or venting issues. Ms. Lee stated that her client is in accord with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Schaaf questioned the design of the pilasters and columns, but was informed that the pilasters and columns are existing and would remain.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 10 December 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Hawkins seconded the application, which passed unanimously.

1508 GREEN STREET

Owner: C Tescher L.L.C.

Applicant: Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1852-3, architect Samuel Sloan

Designation: Significant to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Proposal: Legalize vinyl windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the installation of vinyl windows in this rowhouse, which is classified as Significant in the Spring Garden Historic District. As mitigation, the applicant proposes to install the correct wood brick molding around the windows. The applicant has supplied some economic data regarding the operation of this rental property to support his application, but has not provided a financial hardship application. The limited, incomplete information submitted does not demonstrate that replacing the vinyl windows with the appropriate windows would result in an economic or unnecessary hardship.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Agata Reister and owner's representative Miriam Gross represented the application.

Ms. Reister explained the proposed compromise to repair and/or replace the brickmolds. Ms. Gross stated that the building was purchased in February 2007 and then renovated. She contended that the current income from the property does not allow for the replacement of the windows. She explained that the taxes are increasing and the building has only six units. She stated that she understands and respects the need for historic preservation. She stated that she would replace the windows, but would need to do so over a period of two or three years as the funds become available. She claimed, however, that the illegally installed replacement windows "blend" with the nearby houses.

Mr. Wilds pointed out the fact that the owner installed the windows even though he had obtained a building permit that specifically prohibited any exterior work. He suggested that the Commission should not approve windows after the fact that it would not have approved originally, especially since the owner was aware of the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Wilds remarked that the illegal windows were installed while a registered architect was overseeing the renovations. He also stated that he deemed the financial numbers in Mr. Lichtenstein's letter for management fees to be unrealistic. Mr. Sherman found the amount for operating expenses for a six-unit building to be excessive. Mr. Sherman instructed the applicant that, if she wanted the Commission to consider the building's finances and potentially relax its standards because of a hardship, then she would need to submit a complete financial hardship application. Ms. Gross again stated that she would replace the windows, but would need some time to accumulate the funds to make the replacement. Messrs. Sherman and Wilds indicated that they would accept a two-year period within which the applicant would replace the windows. They asked Ms. Gross if

she could replace them within two years. She stated that she thought she could replace them within this period.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to deny the application to legalize the windows, pursuant to Standard 6, but to postpone full enforcement of the violation for two years from 10 December 2010 to allow for the replacement of the illegal vinyl windows with approved windows during that time. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

617 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Ludwig Fontalvo

Applicant: Cuong Tran

History: c. 1990

Designation: Non-contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Cut new window openings, add windows, bay and balconies, replace front and garage doors

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the exterior of this building. The building is classified as Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to add a third bay of windows between the two extant bays at the second and third floors. The extant window openings would be enlarged. The cornice would be altered. Glass garage and front doors would be installed. A three-story, multi-light, angled bay window would be cut into the side elevation. The plans show balconies for the rear. However, no elevations or renderings have been provided for the rear elevation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Expediter Cuong Tran, contractor Joseph Valasca, and designer Robert Pisani represented the application.

Ms. Sell clarified that the applicant submitted revised drawings that replace the projecting side bay with punched windows. The balconies are still proposed for rear.

Mr. Tran explained that the owner wished to make revisions to the design based on Architectural Committee comments. He explained that the owner no longer requests approval for the side bay, but would like side windows as a means of getting more light into the building. He affirmed that the owner also wants rear balconies. He stated that he submitted revised plans to the staff and presented a photographic survey of precedents for triple window configurations in the Spring Garden Historic District. He opined that the triple window configuration would be in harmony within the historic neighborhood and that the new proposal would not detract from the historic district.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if the new punched window openings on the front façade would fit between the existing paired windows or if the existing paired windows would be altered to accommodate the additional window. Mr. Tran responded that he believes there is enough space between the existing windows to add a third window. Mr. Valasca stated that there is enough space and the third window would be the same width as the existing windows.

Mr. Wilds stated that it appears as though the applicants addressed some significant issues that were raised at the Architectural Committee hearing, but that the Committee should review the application again.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the architectural details seem vague and noted a lack in detail of the door rendering. She stated that she has concerns about the drawings because they lack dimensions. She suggested that the Architectural Committee should review the application again. She suggested the applicant submit drawings of both the existing conditions and the proposed elevations, noting the areas of change with dimensions.

Mr. Dilworth asked Commission members the significance of a non-contributing classification of this property in the district. Mr. Wilds responded that the Commission has full jurisdictional over the property. He explained that if this were a vacant lot, the Commission would only have review and comment jurisdiction. Mr. Dilworth asked if this proposal is in keeping with the regulation that any new addition or alteration to a historic property be "compatible but differentiated" from the historic resource. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission would apply Standard 9, which states that any new work be differentiated but compatible. He explained that, in this case, this means compatible with the district, not the building because the building is non-contributing. He added that the Commission is not charged with protecting any historic fabric at this property, but rather is charged with protecting the district as a whole. He explained that the staff has the authority to approve any proposal including demolition for a non-contributing building. He stated that the staff chose not to approve this application because there were some aspects in the proposal that were not compatible with the district, primarily the projecting side bay. He stated that, in his opinion, the revisions remove any adverse affect or negative impact on the district.

Ms. Sell stated that, based on the revised drawings, the staff would have approved this application had it been the original proposal. She agreed that the revisions remove the negative impact on the district. She stated that the Commission could approve this application with the staff to review details without remanding it to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal to install a third window and lower the window sills at each floor on the front facade in a non-contributing structure would not have a negative impact on the district.

Mr. Mattioni stated that, based on the staff's comments, this is the type of proposal that the staff can review and approve. He asked Commission members if the proposal could be sent back to the staff to review the details. Mr. Thomas agreed that the staff has the capability to make the determination to review and approve the dimensions or send the proposal back to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Tran stated that he could work with the staff to review the dimensions, but does not think it is reasonable to remand the application back to the Architectural Committee. He explained that the owner lives in Florida, but is preparing to move to Philadelphia. The interior work has begun and the work needs to be completed by the spring of 2011.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee would want to see architectural drawings with dimensions and materials noted. She explained that there have been many changes made that have responded to Architectural Committee comments, but she is not convinced that it is possible to install a third window of equal width to the existing on the front façade.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the application. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

538 N. 19TH STREET

Owner: 538 N. 19th Street LLC

Applicant: Frank Lauletta

History: c. 1859; mansard added, c. 1875

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

Project: Legalize replacement of door and reroofing of mansard

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9, and the Roofs Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the replacement of a front door and the reroofing of the mansard. According to the 2001 designation photograph, the building retained the original glazed and paneled double-leaf door and fish-scale slate shingles. In April 2007, the staff observed that a contemporary single-leaf door had been installed and the shingles had been removed from the roof. The staff photographed the reroofing while it was underway. This work was done without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The staff subsequently requested violations.

At the same time, in April 2007, the staff also requested violations for the adjoining property at 540 N. 19th Street for the same illegal alterations. This application relates to 538 N. 19th Street only.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Frank Lauletta and attorney Lloyd Birnbaum represented the application.

Mr. Birnbaum stated that the applicant is willing to work with the Commission in regard to the door, but would like to legalize the mansard roofing. He explained that the mansard roofing was a danger to the public and needed to be replaced. He stated that, before the work was started, the contractor erected a tarp to abate water infiltration. He added that wind blew the tarp and loose mansard shingles were falling onto the street. Therefore, he concluded that the work needed to be done quickly. He stated that the pre-existing material was not slate, but that the contractor installed slate. He opined that this is the only mansard in the area that has slate; the rest have been roofed with asphalt.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Birnbaum if his client also owns 540 N. 19th Street. Mr. Lauletta responded that he did, but that it has since been sold. Mr. Wilds asked if Mr. Lauletta replaced the roof with slate at 540 N. 19th Street when he was the owner. Mr. Lauletta responded that he did. Mr. Wilds asked if work was done to the dormers. Mr. Lauletta responded that the dormers had been covered with a rolled asphalt material, but that he repaired them. Ms. Sell clarified that the panning is a change from the designation photograph. Ms. Hawkins explained that the faces of the dormers around the window would have been wood; they now appear to be covered in white aluminum. She added that panning is typically installed on wood pieces so that they no longer need to be painted. However, the panning ultimately causes the wood to rot.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicant if he agreed to replace the door with the appropriate historic door. Mr. Lauletta stated that he is working with Mr. Baron and his millworker to obtain the appropriate drawings in pursuit of a building permit for the door replacement.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to legalize the reroofing of the mansard, provided the door and dormers are restored to their historic appearances, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2414 PANAMA STREET

Owner & Applicant: Gabriel Marabella

History: c. 1855

Designation: designated within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District 2/8/1995; Contributing

Project: Construct rear addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the roof of the addition is no more than 12 inches taller than the existing ridge of the main block, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition. The addition would extend from the main block and fill in the space next to the rear ell. The roofline of the addition would extend up from the ridge of the roof of the main block, continuing the roof slope of the main block. The rear is landlocked and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The side is visible from Panama Street, owing to the vacant lot adjacent to this building. The addition would be finished with stucco.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owners Lydia and Gabriel Marabella represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicants if they were amenable to the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Marabella affirmed that they agreed with the recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the roof of the addition is no more than 12 inches taller than the existing ridge of the main block, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1706 PANAMA STREET

Owner: Robert & Jessica Maxwell Nacheman

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: c. 1850

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

Project: Construct rear addition, install windows and door surround.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition with a parapet to hide mechanical equipment. The proposed parapet would rise over the ridge of the main block. The Standards suggest that the parapet should be no higher than the existing ridge. The rear of the property is landlocked and not visible from the public right-of-way. The staff will perform a site visit to determine the level of visibility of the side elevation from Panama Street.

In November 2009, the staff observed that single-light casement windows, door surround, and storm door were installed, paint was removed, and the masonry was pointed without the Historical Commission's approval or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. At that time, the previous owner and his architect approached the staff with a proposal for a rear addition and roof deck. The staff explained the illegal conditions on the façade. The architect stated he would submit an application to the Historical Commission proposing correction of some illegal conditions on the façade and construction of a rear addition. The staff agreed to

postpone violations in anticipation of the submission. The application was never submitted and the property was subsequently sold. Now, the new owner and the new architect propose to install the correct historic windows and door surround.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

3509 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: First Episcopal District AME church

Applicant: Thomas M. Holloman, AIA

History: house and carriage house c.1855, converted to school

Designation: Individually designated, 4/30/1963

Proposal: Demolish connector, build addition, alter windows and doors

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of a carriage house into residential units. The property includes an Italianate mansion house connected to the carriage house by a brick and wood structure and a large amount of green open space. The plan shows the demolition of the connector building as well as a single-story wing of the long carriage house. It shows the construction of a new single-story wing in its place of the existing one as well as several townhouse twins and a large parking lot. The façade alterations to the carriage house include closing up doors and windows and cutting new doors and windows in historic walls. It also calls for removing the slate roof and replacing it in asphalt.

The application is incomplete in that it is missing elevations for the end wall of the new addition to the carriage house and for the rear wall of the mansion house where the link building will be removed. It is also missing information about the new town houses which are only shown in the site plan. It provides little information on the parking lot's materials. The elevations that have been provided for the façade of the carriage house do not accurately reflect the existing conditions and out of scale. The application form is incomplete in that it only cites work to the interior and new addition in the description of work.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Developer Rodney Jones, owner's representative Clarence Fleming, and architects Emmanuel Kelly and Tom Holloman represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she had reviewed revised project plans and advocated for approval of the proposal.

Mr. Holloman stated that this project will be partially funded through the Redevelopment Authority (RDA). The RDA has a very short funding schedule and the project must move quickly to take advantage of those funds. He presented revised architectural drawings to the Commission. He revised the interior layout to utilize existing windows. All new doorways will be set within the existing carriage openings and doorways, except for one, which will require the cutting of a new door opening. He stated that the applicants are now proposing to retain and repair the historic slate roof. The post-1930 connector between the house and the stable will be demolished. The portico of the house will be retained and the area between the columns glazed. The bluestone paving around the house will be retained and the new parking area will be partially obscured by trees and an existing cast-iron fence.

Mr. Wilds stated that this project would provide affordable housing opportunities in a neighborhood that is experiencing development pressures.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 10 December 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 11:34 a.m. Ms. Hawkins 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 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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than constructing a new addition;
Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed;
Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.