

**THE MINUTES OF THE 532ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**8 DECEMBER 2006
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Kathleen Murray, Office of the City Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers, LLP
Lee Dennis
Geoff Dennis
Richard Thom, R.W. Thom Architects
Laura Spina, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Scott Craven, Scott Craven Studio

532ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 532nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:20 a.m. Commissioners Sklaroff, Merriman, Murray, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 531ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Rivera and seconded by Mr. Schaaf, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes as corrected of the 531st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 November 2006.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 4 DECEMBER 2006

Michael Sklaroff, Chair

8217-19 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: VFW Post 5205

Applicant: John P. Gilligan

History: 1859, designated 11/29/1966

Project: Legalize vinyl windows and panning

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the Commission table the matter for 90 days to allow the applicant to study his options and respond to the Committee's suggestion that all of the front windows be replaced with the historically appropriate windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows installed without the Commission's approval or a building permit. The windows lack the proportions of the originals and cover or replace the original wood with a dissimilar material. The Commission denied the approval of these windows on 11 August 2006. At that time, the Commission requested that the applicant seek a solution with Matus Windows, the window vendor and installer. Matus has worked on numerous historically designated buildings and is familiar with the Commission's procedures and requirements. The applicant and Matus reached a settlement; Matus has agreed to split the cost of the replacement of the two first-floor, front windows. The Post proposes the replacement of these two windows and the legalization of the remaining 43 windows.

The financial information provided by the applicant indicates that the Post does not have the funds to replace the windows immediately. However, it may be able to replace them over a long period of time. When the Post is able to rent out all spaces to their commercial tenants, it has an annual surplus of approximately \$4,000 to \$6,000. If it devoted the entire surplus to historic windows, it could install them at a rate of two to three per year; it could replace the windows in 15 to 25 years.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff reviewed the case for the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Financial Hardship and table the matter for 90 days to allow the applicant to study his options and respond to the Committee's suggestion that all of the front windows be replaced with the historically appropriate windows. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

48 AND 50 S. FRONT STREET, 103, 107, AND 111 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Centra Associates, Robert & Harvey Spear, Cheswal Associates

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Klehr Harrison, Harvey, Branzberg & Ellers

History: 48 & 50 S. Front, 103 and 107 Chestnut Street built separately c.1835

All individually designated, all contributing to Old City Historic District

Project: Complete demolition

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommended that the Commission table the matter for 60 days to allow the applicant to amend his incomplete application and submit a complete application for review by the Committee and Commission.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the four buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 and 107 Chestnut Street. It claims that the reuse of the buildings is financially infeasible. The Department of Licenses & Inspections has issued a violation for an Unsafe Condition at the building at 48 S. Front Street. The applicant has submitted several reports on the condition of the three structures at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 Chestnut Street. Engineer Joseph Graci and engineer Albert Tantala each authored two reports. Historic preservationist Robert Powers authored a fifth report. The reports assert that the three buildings are in poor but repairable condition. Mr. Graci asserts that it would be expensive and potentially dangerous to attempt repairs; he recommends demolition. Mr. Tantala asserts that there is localized imminent danger and that the north and east walls should be either demolished and rebuilt or immediately and extensively restrained. The applicant has provided no information on the condition of the building at 107 Chestnut Street.

The Historical Commission hired an independent engineering firm, Keast & Hood, to assess the conditions and the possibility of repairs to all four buildings. The Keast & Hood report states that the properties are not immediately dangerous. It also states that not only are the buildings repairable, but that many of the repairs have already been undertaken. The report also states that, with some infill of the openings between the buildings, each could stand on its own. The north wall at 48 S. Front, where other engineers noted a crack, is in fact two walls. One is the remainder of the building that once stood at 46 S. Front; the other is the north wall of 48 S. Front. These buildings were erected separately; joint and cavity has always existed between them. The walls have now been sewn together with numerous Hilti bolts, which are exposed in the interior of 48 S. Front. The Keast & Hood report did not note the bowing of the walls cited by others, but it does suggest tying the east or front wall of 48 S. Front to the side walls.

In addition to the violation and engineering reports, the applicants have submitted some financial statements for some of the properties. The statements note that the costs have exceeded revenues. However, this would be true of any vacant properties awaiting development. The properties may make money if wisely developed. The applicants have not demonstrated that the sale of the properties is impracticable as required by the ordinance.

The applicant has stated that he bought the properties to protect and enhance the development potential of his adjacent site, which is an open parking lot. He earlier proposed a development for the entire site. Although he has stated that he is not going forward with that development now because of current market conditions, these buildings in fact add substantially to the value of that future development. Although

mothballing these properties now would cost money, an eventual development package or even sale may recover these costs.

The cost analyses provide no allowance for tax credits and the overall value of this site to the later larger development.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Richard DeMarco represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested two corrections on the minutes. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Committee members review the minutes in depth and adopt them at the next Commission meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Financial Hardship and table the matter for 60 days to allow the applicant to amend his incomplete application and submit a complete application for review by the Committee and Commission. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 NOVEMBER 2006

Vincent Rivera, Chair

48 AND 50 S. FRONT STREET, 103, 107, AND 111 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Centra Associates

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers

History: 48 & 50 S. Front Street, 103 and 107 Chestnut Street, built separately c.1835

All individually designated and contributing to Old City Historic District

111 Chestnut Street, built 1951, non-contributing to district

Project: Complete demolition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 and 107 Chestnut Street, pursuant to 14-2007 (7)(j) and Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10; and denial of the demolition of 111 Chestnut Street, pursuant to 14-2007(7)(k)(.4). The Committee suggested that the applicant stabilize the buildings immediately.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 and 107 Chestnut Street owing to financial hardship. It also proposes the complete demolition of the building at 111 Chestnut Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Richard DeMarco, the attorney for the applicants, represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked why the Architectural Committee reviewed this application in addition to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Farnham stated that the Rules & Regulations mandates the course of the review. Mr. Baron added that the two applications differ slightly; this application also proposes the demolition of the building at 111 Chestnut Street, which is non-contributing. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the duplication of effort by the two committees might not be necessary.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Demarco if he would accept a similar, 60-day continuance. Mr. Demarco replied in the affirmative.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Financial Hardship and table the application for a period not to exceed 60 days. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

417 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Richard Sparks

Applicant: David S. Traub, architect

History: built c. 1840, mansard c. 1860, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler District

Project: Add storefront cornice; stucco or rebuild storefront; add roof deck, metal railing, and balcony to rear

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided stucco, not brick, is used at the storefront and the new storefront cornice matches the historic storefront cornice on the adjacent building, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application calls for modifications to the former storefront section of this corner building. The storefront, which had once been glazed, was infilled with mismatched brick in the twentieth-century. The applicant has proposed two alternatives. The preferred alternative would entail removing the mismatched infill brick and replacing it with a better-matching brick. The second alternative would entail applying stucco to the mismatched infill brick. The applicant also proposes a storefront cornice to match the one at the roofline. He would also add a rear deck and new railing at the rear ell.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Traub represented the application.

Mr. Traub agreed with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and stated that he would install the suggested stucco. He also agreed to work with the staff on the details. He remarked that the entire block was in poor condition and he was hopeful that his project would provide the impetus to revive the block.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal provided stucco, not brick, is used at the storefront and the new storefront cornice matches the historic storefront cornice adjacent to the building, with staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

114 S. 20TH STREET

Owner/Applicant: Luigi Adamo

History: built c. 1860, storefront c. 1905, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler District

Project: Legalize café window, shutters, and brick sidewalk; add signage and railing

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the shutters, proposed railing, and projecting sign; legalization of the storefront and basement windows and brick sidewalk, provided the illegal shutters are removed; and approval of the doorway sign, a 42"-tall railing at the storefront window, and the menu box, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing work completed without a permit. After speaking with staff regarding other work, the applicant installed wood shutters on a building that did not originally have shutters. Not only are the shutters too small for the window openings, they are square-headed even though the windows are arched. The original, ornate window hoods do not allow for the installation of appropriate shutters. The applicant replaced a concrete sidewalk with brick. The sidewalk may have originally been bluestone. The applicant removed the single-pane glass storefront window and installed a four-part café window below the existing tripartite transom. The applicant installed inappropriate basement windows. All of this work was done without approvals from the Commission or the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The applicant also seeks approval for the addition of a railing at the storefront and two metal signs, one projecting and one above the doorway.

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

Mr. Sklaroff observed that this case is similar to a recent Manayunk case, in which the Architectural Committee recommended the legalization of inappropriate alterations to a café storefront.

Mr. Rivera stated that the café window in the photograph shows the building in its present condition. Mr. Baron pointed to the designation photograph, which shows a single large-pane storefront window. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the storefront window in the designation photograph is original. Mr. Baron replied that the building, which was constructed about 1860, was originally a traditional rowhouse. The storefront with large window and three transoms was added about 1905. Mr. Wilds observed that the Commission has allowed café windows in other storefronts. Mr. Rivera stated that the Architectural Committee recommended the legalization of the café window because it is reversible. Mr. Baron noted that the applicant included photographs of café windows in other neighborhood storefronts.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the applicant remove the shutters and revise the railing. Mr. Baron stated that the building code requires a railing with operable windows. He also suggested that the staff could review the railing and refer it to the Commission if not appropriate.

Action: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the shutters, proposed railing, and projecting sign; legalize the storefront and basement windows and brick sidewalk, provided the illegal shutters are removed; and approve the doorway sign, a 42"-tall railing at the

storefront window, and the menu box, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

316 S. 21ST STREET (A.K.A. 2100 CYPRESS STREET)

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm AIA

History: Built c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Project: Construct two-story rear addition, alter side façade, enlarge garage.

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

OVERVIEW: This is the fourth permit application submitted for this project. The applicant submitted the first in March 2006. The Historical Commission reviewed that application in April 2006 and tabled it for a period not to exceed six months to allow for the correction of an error in the inventory regarding the classification of this property. In June 2006, the Commission reviewed the inventory classification and classified the property as Contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The applicant withdrew the permit application tabled by the Commission in April 2006 and submitted an application in July 2006, which was subsequently withdrawn and not reviewed by the Historical Commission. In October 2006, the applicant submitted a proposal, which was withdrawn at the Architectural Committee meeting. At that meeting the applicant presented a revised but not officially submitted proposal, which was favorably received by the Committee members.

The applicant now returns with the revised application informally presented at the Committee meeting. The current proposal retains the north wall of the rear ell with the addition of a new register of French doors and balconies. A non-historic bay would be removed and replaced with a multi-light double hung window and decorative balcony. An Ionic colonnade would accentuate the ground floor. A service door would be relocated farther west on that plane. The applicant also proposes a two-story addition at the rear of the ell. This addition would be constructed of wood with multi-light wood windows and balcony. A wood decorative parapet would be place atop the ell and rear addition, connecting the two. The existing garage facing Cypress Street would be enlarged and refaced with brick and wood doors and roof deck. Lastly, a new dormer is proposed for the mansard over the main block. This dormer would not align with the historic dormers and would be located along the western end of the mansard.

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

Mr. Rivera stated that a neighbor present at the Architectural Committee meeting deemed the design "too busy." Mr. Rivera suggested that the only design feature that was "too busy" was the curvilinear railings, which should be straight and not so decorative. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the Architectural Committee recommended approval. Mr. Rivera responded that it had. Mr. Wilds opined that this design is much better than the earlier iterations.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2001 LOCUST STREET (AKA 238 S. 20TH STREET)

Owner/ Applicant: Phyllis G. Gutman

History: Built c. 1860, shop front added c. 1960.

Project: legalize windows

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the inappropriate windows. The building had six-over-six windows at the time of designation. The owner hired Lowe's Home Centers, Inc. to install eight-over-one and nine-over-one vinyl windows with simulated muntins. Some of the windows present at the time of designation remain. The owner submitted a cover letter in which he states that the building was constructed by his wife's parents in the 1950s. However, fire-insurance atlases and stylistic characteristics demonstrate that this building was constructed in the mid- nineteenth century. In addition, the owner claims that he has not been informed of the buildings designation or its inclusion on a historic district. The file for this property contains the notice letters addressed to the applicant for the proposed district in December 1994 and the designation of the district in August 1995.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta informed the Commission that the applicant, who will be in Florida for the winter, had requested a six-month continuance in writing.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

303 SPRUCE STREET

History: Built c. 1965; contributing in Society Hill Historic District

Owner: David and Sarah Rosenberg

Applicant: Scott Craven

Project: Construct roof deck on garage, alter rear shed

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial the deck, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the simulated slate shingles, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of a new standing- or flat-seam metal roof and all other proposed alterations, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a roof deck over a one-story garage at the rear of the property. The deck would measure approximately 13 by 15 feet and cover majority of the roof of the garage. A new wood garage door and trim are proposed. This application also proposes to alter the rear shed addition to the building by replacing the windows with two new wood operable low awning windows, centering the full glazed door, and placing copper sheet in the former location of the door. On the roof of the rear shed addition, the removal of one skylight and new simulated slate shingles are proposed. The original roof was standing-seam metal.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Architect Scott Craven represented the application.

Mr. Craven explained that the height of the surface of the deck would approximate that of the extant trellis on the carport. Mr. Wilds asked the applicant to explain the proposed deck on top of the garage. Mr. Craven explained that the extant carport does not have a

roof. He displayed a section through the proposed garage. He explained that the height of the proposed decking is predicated on the extant garden wall. The deck structure would bear on the garden wall. Mr. Wilds asked if the deck is set back from the street. Mr. Craven answered that it is not; it is at the sidewalk line.

Jeff Dennis, neighbor who lives at 274 S. 4th Street, reported that he had submitted a petition opposing the proposal. He noted that the Society Hill Civic Association was also opposed to this proposal. He contended that the deck would block the light and air and views to the rears of the neighboring houses. He also claimed that decks are not allowed by the zoning code in side yards.

Attorney Graham Laub asserted that the proposed deck is out of character for the historic district. He claimed that there are no other decks like it in the area.

Mr. Rivera deemed the proposed architecture too “heroic.” He stated that it was “too much.”

Sandra Moore, neighbor who lives at 309 Spruce, stated that she does not support this application because the proposed deck would be located too close to her property. She rejected the deck because it would be used for barbequing. She also objected to the proposed material, wood, which she claimed is inappropriate. She stated that it would be “intrusive.”

Mr. Wilds stated that this was a location was not suitable for both a garage and a deck. He observed that a garden would be more acceptable.

Mr. Schaaf asserted that the architectural relationship between the proposed garage door and the wall above it is unresolved. He stated that the design should include a head or lintel at the door. He also suggested that the proposal would require a zoning variance.

Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the building was designated and classified as contributing to the district because of its association with the redevelopment period of Society Hill. He noted that the building dates to 1965. He asked the Commission to consider whether this proposal would have an adverse effect on the district; he stated that the primary issue was visibility and prominence on the street. He observed that the current trellis is shabby and that applicants usually tout their projects as beautifying. Mr. Laub countered that wood decks such as this one usually become shabby over time. He claimed that the improvement would be temporary. He asserted that the neighborhood would be saddled with a large, shabby deck in the future.

Ms. Murray stated that, although she usually approves of deck applications, this proposed deck would be too visible. She suggested that the design should be revised.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the deck, pursuant to Standard 9; deny the simulated slate shingles, pursuant to Standard 6; and approve a standing- or flat-seam metal roof and all other proposed alterations, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Perri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

313 ARCH STREET

Owner: Normandy/806 S.A.R.

Applicant: Richard W. Thom

History: c. 1895, designated 4/12/1979; significant in the Old City Historic District

Project: Replace broken bluestone slab with concrete sidewalk, demolish bluestone slabs and replace with concrete

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, but approval of the replacement of the broken slab with smaller pieces of bluestone or the stamped concrete, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new concrete sidewalk vault cover slab in the place of a bluestone slate sidewalk slab that was recently destroyed by a truck delivering drywall to the property. This application also proposes to demolish the remaining bluestone slate sidewalk slabs and replace them with new concrete slabs. This bluestone and cast-iron with bullet glass sidewalk is one of the preeminent examples of historic sidewalk in the entire city.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal. Architect Richard Thom, structural engineer Bevan Lawson, and owner Leo Adomando attended the meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, but approve the replacement of the broken slab with smaller pieces of bluestone or the stamped concrete, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Murray seconded the motion.

Mr. Thom stated that, in his experience, bluestone sidewalks do not have the strength or life span of granite sidewalks. He stated that the condition and size of the bluestone slabs do not allow for their removal and reinstallation. He noted that he had contacted the George Young Company, the foremost rigging company in the area, and they had stated that the bluestone slabs would be very difficult to move without breaking them. Moving companies will not guarantee the removal and reinstallation. Mr. Thom also stated that bluestone is no longer available in sizes large enough to span the vault. He reported that the National Park Service searched for large bluestone slabs and was unable to locate any. He also noted that the main utility connections for the building including the sprinkler tree are located under the slabs in the basement vaults. The faulty slabs threaten the building's electrical, water, data, and other connections.

Mr. Lawson stated that failure of the bluestone slab occurred suddenly along an invisible vein and that it would be difficult to assess when and where the next failure might occur. He explained that the broken slab had failed easily, without much weight on it. Mr. Sklaroff asked for specifics regarding the failure. Mr. Lawson recounted that a truck delivering drywall to the site placed a stabilizing outrigger on the sidewalk, but had not yet transferred any weight to the outrigger, when the sidewalk cracked and collapsed. He stated that any sudden impact or weight may cause a failure. He posited that a car driving on the sidewalk would cause a failure. Mr. Sklaroff inquired whether the bluestone slabs could be supported from underneath in the vaults. Mr. Lawson stated that it would be highly impractical to support the slabs from below without removing and reinstalling them. He explained that the utility connections to the building would have to be relocated. Ms. Merriman suggested that a new structure could be inserted under the slabs without moving them.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicants to report on the Old City Civic Association's position on the proposal. Mr. Adomando stated that he had not presented this proposal to the civic association; he stated that it is a safety issue, not a neighborhood issue. He stated that his consultants, Richard Thomas and the George Young Company, determined that the proposed plan is the best course of action.

Mr. Sklaroff asked about insurance coverage for the damage. Mr. Adomando stated that insurance would only cover the broken slab, not the other unsafe slabs. Mr. Wilds inquired about the useful life of bluestone. Mr. Thom answered that bluestone would last between sixty and eighty years. He added that it dries out and cleaves.

Ms. Merriman inquired whether a substructure would expand the useful life of the historic slabs and address the safety issues. Mr. Lawson answered that, regardless of the substructure, the stones would continue their natural weathering process and would eventually need replacement. He stated that salt used for ice and snow hurts the stone and accelerates deterioration. A "belly" develops, allowing water to puddle on the stone.

Mr. Wilds asked about constructing a structure in the vaults, beneath the slabs, to support the weight of the historic sidewalk. Mr. Adomando replied that it would require the relocation of utilities, which would be expensive. He conceded that it would resolve the potential safety problem. Mr. Lawson outlined their proposed structural system, which would require the removal of the bluestone slabs. He stated that, even if the slabs were retained, they would still wear and pose a tripping hazard. He noted that the City requires property owners to maintain the sidewalks. Mr. Perri inquired whether a concrete sidewalk with bluestone veneer was possible. Mr. Lawson answered that it would be possible. Mr. Sklaroff asked if a veneer could be fabricated from the existing stone. Mr. Adomando replied that the stones would break during their removal.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that the damaged bluestone slab should be replaced with new matching bluestone. He added that two pieces where there is now one would be acceptable.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the staff investigate whether the Streets Department has surplus bluestone.

Mr. Baron reminded the Commission that it required an owner to replace bluestone that he had illegally removed from an alley running west off Letitia Street south of Market Street.

Mr. Schiavo suggested that any new sidewalks have metal sleeves for parking meters.

AMENDMENT OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Murray amended their motion to deny the proposal, but approve the replacement of the broken slab with substantial pieces of bluestone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to deny the proposal, but approve the replacement of the broken slab with substantial pieces of bluestone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:40 a.m., Ms. Murray moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

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

Standard 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.

Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4): In making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:

... the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.

Section 14-2007(7)(j): No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.