

**THE MINUTES OF THE 603RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance
Michael McCullin, Fourth River Sign Works
Michael Black-Smith
Joseph Polkano, 1411 Walnut
Michael Merlini, Brickstone
John Connors, Brickstone
Arman Chowdhury, Stantec
Robert Powers, Power & Company
Eleanor Gesensway, Let Lits Live Coalition
Darwin Beauvais, Esq., Zarwin Baum
Stephanie Kindt, Esq., Scenic Philadelphia
Daniel Sablosky, Stonehenge Advisors, Inc.
Steven Leshner,
A. Levitt, Ayer Building
Michael Wass, Society Hill Civic Association
Alex Walker, Stonehenge Advisors, Inc.
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Co., Inc.
Frank Rapisarda, Tackett & Co., Inc.
John Loonstyn

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Palantino, Quinn, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 602ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 602nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 September 2012. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 OCTOBER 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included five applications for review and comment: 547, 549, 551 and 553 N. 23rd Street and 343 N. Front Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 547, 549, 551 and 553 N. 23rd Street and 343 N. Front Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty, LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini, Independence Center Realty LP

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes the installation of signage and lighting on the Lit Brothers Building on the 700-block of Market Street. It follows up on an in-concept application, which the Commission approved with conditions in September 2012.

The Lit Brothers Department Store was one of Philadelphia's most important department stores and, with Gimbel's, Snellenberg's, Wanamaker's, and Strawbridge & Clothier, anchored one of the most significant retail districts in the country. The Lit Brothers Building is not one building, but is a conglomeration of mid nineteenth-century to early twentieth-century buildings consolidated into one structure. The architectural firm of Collins & Authenreith constructed the building at the northeast corner of 8th and Market Streets for Lit's in 1893. The complex grew eastward, annexing earlier buildings dating to the mid and late nineteenth century. By 1907, when architect Charles Authenreith constructed the corner building at 7th and Market, the department store occupied the entire north side of the 700-block of Market Street. The last additions were completed during World War I by architects Simon & Bassett along N. 7th Street.

The sprawling building faced with brick, stone, terra cotta, and cast iron is one of the most significant examples of commercial architecture in the country.

The application proposes the reconstruction of an enormous historic sign along the roof line on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. The historic sign underwent many alterations over the years, but stood on the building in one form or another from the 1890s to the 1980s. Originally, the sign was painted wood. By 1910, it had been replaced with a metal screen with painted metal letters attached. This metal-screen sign remained in place until the building was rehabilitated in the mid 1980s.

The reconstructed sign would replicate the material, size, location, and appearance of the historic sign in most, but not all, regards. Unlike the earlier sign, the letters themselves would be lighted, employing an array of LEDs on the metal screen that would recreate the Lit's sign. Moreover, the sign would have the capacity to produce programmable, high-resolution, moving images at the two corners of the building. The sign is designed to take advantage of a recent City ordinance allowing large format signage on this section of East Market Street. The ordinance was designed to encourage investment in and activity on this stretch of Market, which has suffered in recent decades. To qualify for such a sign, a building owner must make at least \$10 million in investments in capital improvements.

The ordinance prohibits such signs on buildings designated as historic under the City's preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission "determines that the placement of the sign is consistent with historic precedent with respect to such building and the sign does not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features." The sign appears to comply with the requirements of the ordinance. The placement of the sign would be consistent with the historic precedent. The proposed sign would stand where the historic sign stood. The sign would not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features. It would wrap around the balustrades at the tops of the corner towers, but would do so in the same way that the original sign did.

The application also proposes adding facade lighting on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. The fixtures would be installed on sills at the second and top floors to provide washes of light on the building. The fixtures would not be visible from the street. During the in-concept review, the Architectural Committee and Commission expressed a preference for Option 1A of the lighting among several options. The applicant has agreed to limit his request to that option.

At its September 2012 meeting, the Historical Commission approved the application in concept, with final approval contingent on the approval of an in situ mock-up of the rooftop sign and on the approval of the timing of static and moving displays. A mock up of the signage will be installed on the building for review by the Commission, Architectural Committee, staff, and interested parties on 17 October 2012. Documentation of the mock up will be presented to the Architectural Committee and Commission at their respective meetings.

In addition to the materials submitted for the first review, the current application includes a new cover letter as well as an updated video representation of the building with the sign.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Property owners John Connors and Mark Merlini, architect Arman Chowdhury, and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the application.

The staff distributed copies of a letter regarding the application from the Center City Residents Association to the Commission. The applicants distributed copies of structural plans for the signs.

Mr. Connors introduced himself and stated that his team was prepared to discuss the conditions of the in-concept approval including the mock up and the timing and movement of the images on the signs. He stated that he hoped that everyone had had an opportunity to see the mock up. He explained that it is made up of the actual media mesh that will be used on the sign, but the structural elements of the mock up do not represent the final structural elements. He stated that the permanent structure is represented in the distributed drawings.

Mr. Chowdhury projected digital photographs of the mock up. He explained that it is 7.5 feet wide and 15 feet tall. He stated that the mesh on the mock up is the media mesh that will be used in the actual sign. He also noted that samples of that high-resolution media mesh as well as the low-resolution media are being passed around the Commission's conference table for Commissioners and the public to examine. He pointed out the various aspects of the mock up as seen in the photographs. He showed photographs of the mock up taken at different times of day and from different locations. He contended that the mock up proves that the mesh is transparent. The sky and clouds can be seen through it. Mr. Mattioni observed that the Preservation Alliance has submitted a photograph that shows that the mesh is opaque. Mr. Chowdhury responded that that photograph shows glare from the sun reflecting off the sign. He stated that the glare is visible from different locations at different times of sunny days. He stated that, at any one time, the glare can only be seen from one limited, small location. He asserted that the Alliance's photograph does not accurately portray the typical condition at the site. One must carefully seek out the location where the glare can be seen and that location is very limited and moves as the sun moves. Ms. Jones stated that she could see the glare when she reviewed the mock up. Mr. Mattioni stated that he found the mock up to be very transparent from the south side of Market Street, but less transparent as one approached the building and viewed the mock up at a sharper angle. It was nearly opaque when looking up at the mock up from directly below it. Mr. Chowdhury showed a close up photograph of the mesh.

Mr. Chowdhury then presented the structural design for the signs. He stated that the vertical steel members would be 4 inches by 4 inches in profile. The horizontal members would be 3 inches by 3 inches. He contended that they would be slim. He added that they would also use 1-inch diameter tie rods, which would not be visible from the ground. The panels would be 12 feet wide, center to center. The sign would be 15 feet tall. He then showed historic photographs of the original signs. He displayed a plan of the building with the signs depicted. He stated that the media mesh, high-resolution portion of the signs would only a small percentage of the total sign. He contended that the signs would be small in scale when viewed in the context of the entire building, which is 400 feet wide along Market Street. Mr. Chowdhury showed a video demonstrating the types of advertising images and animation that would be displayed on the sign.

Mr. Connors asked if the Commissioners had any questions of his application team. Mr. Mattioni asked if the structural system had been designed to withstand significant wind loads. Mr. Chowdhury stated that, although the structural design will be refined, it has already been designed to withstand a 90 mile-per-hour wind as required by the building code. He stated that the design will be verified if the Commission approves it. Mr. Mattioni asked if designing to a 90 mile-per-hour wind was sufficient. Mr. Chowdhury responded that the final design will withstand a 110 mile-per-hour wind, even the code only requires designing to 90.

Mr. Connors addressed the timing and motion of the displays. He stated that they limited the vertical motion in the video just shown in response to the Commission's rejection of it as seen in the earlier version of the video at the September 2012 meeting. He reported that they had originally proposed to display animated advertising from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., but are now proposing to limit the animated advertising from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. From 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., they would light only the historic Lit's sign. He stated that the advertising will be sold in 8 second blocks. He stated that they are proposing to display the historic Lit's sign 12.5% of the time during the operating hours of 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., or 114 minutes in total. The display of the historic sign would mark the quarter hours. He noted that there are 68 quarter hours in an operating day. He also proposed to dedicate 5% of the 12.5% of the time to civic or public-service messaging. He concluded that his proposal for the timing is reasonable.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the photographs of the mock up showed that the sign would be "extremely appealing." He asked the applicants to speak about the potential for glare. Mr. Connors responded that the glare is visible from very limited locations at any one time. He asserted that a pedestrian would need to walk the block looking for the point where the glare was visible. He reported that he walked the block at least three times daily while the mock up was in place and rarely noticed any glare. He commented that one needs to look hard to find the points where the glare is visible. He conceded that one could photograph the glare if one searched for it, but maintained that 98% of the time no glare is visible.

Mr. Thomas stated that he looked at the mock up on a cloudy day. He remembered the original sign, which he saw many times, and claimed that the proposed sign would be less transparent than the historic chain-link sign. He asserted that the proposed sign does not satisfy the Standards and is not "in keeping" with the historic sign. Mr. Sherman referenced the video display in the lobby of the Comcast Building and asked if this sign could be programmed to mirror its background, thereby essentially disappearing. Mr. Connors stated that he thought that the sign could be programmed to blend with the background when it is not otherwise operating. Mr. Chowdhury agreed.

Mr. Mattioni asked about the relevant review criteria and questioned whether they require the precise replication of the historic sign. Mr. Mattioni remembered the old Lit's sign looked "very modern" for its day. He suggested that the proposed sign would replicate that concept, if not the precise appearance of the old sign. He stated that the ideal sign would be true to the old sign, but would also have a cutting-edge appearance for today. He contended that the meaning and significance of the old sign was not solely captured by its appearance, but in its appearance relative to its context. The old sign was striking in its time because it looked so modern. A new sign should be striking in that way to a contemporary observer. Mr. Mattioni opined that the proposed sign is much more appropriate than the sign on the PECO building. He asserted that it has the appropriate blend of historic sign and current technology to provide the viewer with the experience that she would have had when she saw the old Lit's sign in the 1930s, when it appeared very modern. Ms. Turner added that the Commission should also consider the positive economic impact of this sign. Mr. Dilworth contended that the Commission is not bound to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards strictly. Mr. Farnham clarified that the Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulate that the Commission shall be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Dilworth opined that the Commission should not "fetishize" the Standards. He contended that the Commission should seek to preserve the historic resource, not blindly follow the Standards regardless of their relevance in this matter. He claimed that the Standards do not provide the Commission with a definition of the acceptable transparency of the proposed sign. Mr. Thomas used roof decks as an example to point out that the Commission routinely considers transparency in its deliberations. He stated that the

Commission often approves decks for buildings that did not historically have decks, but always ensures that the railings will be transparent so that they do not change the massing of the buildings. Decks are approved to make houses more livable and valuable, thereby meeting modern requirements, as long as those decks are compatible with the historic buildings. Mr. Dilworth objected to the example offered by Mr. Thomas. He stated that the roof decks offered as examples are proposed for buildings that did not historically have roof decks. In this situation, this building had a sign historically. With roof decks, the Commission looks to “minimize their presence,” Mr. Dilworth argued, because they did not exist historically. In the case of this sign, the goal is not to “minimize its presence”; the historic sign had a great presence. It was meant to be seen. The issue here is not presence or absence, but instead whether the proposed sign is reflective of the historic sign. Mr. Thomas disagreed. He stated that the question is: How does one add a twenty-first-century sign to this building that does not overwhelm the historic building in a way that the historic sign did not? Mr. Thomas stated that the animation will distract viewers from the building. Mr. Dilworth commented that there appear to be two opinions among Commissioners, those of the strict constructionists who interpret the Standards narrowly and those who interpret them more liberally and seek to preserve experience as much as appearance. He advocated for allowing the building to be a living structure, not one frozen in time. He stated that, historically, this was a busy commercial strip with many signs. He claimed that the sign would recreate an aspect of that historical experience that has been lost in a way that a precise replication of the historic sign would not. He asked the Commissioners to reconsider their notions of preservation and move beyond the orthodox notion that mandates the precise material replication of historic artifacts to a notion that is more experiential. Mr. Thomas objected that the proposed sign would “overwhelm” the historic building. Mr. Thomas posited that Frederick Gowen, the president of the Reading Railroad, is turning over in his grave every time the Hard Rock Café guitar sign rotates on the façade of the historic Reading Terminal, yet the sign is appropriate to the building. The currently proposed sign is not appropriate to the historic Lit’s Building. Mr. Mattioni contended that the claims of Mr. Thomas are subjective and based on personal taste. He observed that Mr. Thomas perceives the proposed sign as inappropriate and overwhelming, yet he himself finds it appropriate and compatible with the historic building. He claimed that the proposed sign would add to the vibrancy of the historic department store building and the neighborhood. He noted that it is a historically commercial area; it was not a residential area. Historically, this area was bustling with activity. It is not today. This sign will help restore some of that lost vitality, thereby preserving this historic neighborhood.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission. He stated that he has two questions. First, is the application complete? Second, if it is complete, should it be approved? He observed that the Architectural Committee requested that the applicants provide a structural plan for the sign, but the plan was not completed until the day before the Commission meeting. Therefore, the Committee has not had an opportunity to review it. Final approval should not be granted without a review. He also claimed that the structural drawings are incomplete. He pointed out that they document the appearance of the sign along the main facades, but not at the corner turrets. He stated that the application should be remanded to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Gallery then asserted that, even if the plans are deemed complete, the design should not be approved. He claimed that the Architectural Committee recommended denial after reviewing the mock up, thereby recommending retraction of the approval in concept. Mr. Gallery objected to the timing of the sign as proposed by Mr. Connors. He stated that the historic sign would be illuminated only 12.5% of every hour on the quarter hour or 1-7/8 minutes every 15 minutes. He claimed that that was a negligible amount of time. No one will see the historic sign. He claimed that the timing that was proposed in “wholly inadequate.” Regarding the transparency of the mesh, he asserted that there are some times of day and some locations

from which it appears transparent; there are other times of day and locations from which it appears opaque. He stated that large segments of the sign will not be lighted 52.5 minutes of every hour. He noted that that portion of the sign has not been mocked up and claimed that no one knows how it will appear. He acknowledged that its mesh will be less dense than the media mesh, but asserted that its appearance is unknown. He claimed that the height of the mock up seems taller than the historic sign, even though it is not. He contended that that appearance of height comes from the lack of transparency. He also noted that the lettering on the historic sign did not extend to the top of the chain link, but the digital images will occupy the entire area of this new sign. The new sign will be “visually higher” than the old sign. Mr. Gallery claimed that the transparency of the proposed sign as seen in the mock up is irrelevant because the sign will not be transparent when it is displaying advertising. The sign will create a “solid wall of light.” He conceded that the Commission is not required to “follow” the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, but asserted that it should follow the Standards for this building because of its great significance. He noted that the superintendent of Independence National Historical Park had opined in writing that this sign would not comply with the Standards. Mr. Gallery supported the tabling of the application as well as the recommendation of the Architectural Committee to deny the application. Mr. Palantino disagreed with Mr. Gallery’s claim that the new sign would not mirror the old sign because it would have a solid appearance. Mr. Palantino pointed to a photograph in the application of the original sign on the roof of the Lit’s building, which was a solid wood sign. He remarked that the original sign was not transparent at all, but was solid. Later, the solid sign was removed and replaced with the chain link sign. For 12 years, the original sign was a painted wood sign with no transparency.

Stephanie Kindt, general counsel for Scenic Philadelphia, addressed the Commission. She stated that the Commission has not yet discussed a significant difference between the historic sign and the proposed sign. The historic sign was an accessory sign; it advertised the business that occupied the premises, the Lit Brothers Department Store. The proposed sign is not an accessory sign; it is a non-accessory sign. It will advertise goods and services that are entirely unrelated to the commercial activities taking place at the premises. She noted that the Commission had likened this application to an application for a roof deck. She noted that a roof deck on a row house is intended to be used by the occupants of the row house. It is an accessory to the house. In this case, it would be equivalent to constructing a roof deck on a house for a use that was unrelated to the house and its occupants. An example would be the construction of a roof deck on a residence to serve alcohol to paying customers or operate a casino, thereby establishing an entirely new use of the roof of the residence. She stated that the East Market signage bill prohibits signs on historic buildings unless those signs replicate historic signs. This proposal does not seek to recreate an historic sign, but to create a new sign that will occasionally look like the historic sign. She stated that allowing this significant change in use from accessory to non-accessory is a “game changer.” She also cautioned the Commission against seeking to regulate the content of the sign. She contended that this issue has been litigated numerous times and the Supreme Court has decided that a municipality cannot regulate the content of a sign, except for tobacco and alcohol. She stated that the proposed sign is “completely different in nature” from the historic sign. She also noted that there are many who oppose the sign owing to the impacts it will have on their communities. She concluded that, from a legal perspective, the proposed sign does not satisfy the requirements of the law. Mr. Mattioni asked Ms. Kindt if her objections to the sign were primarily zoning objections, and if she thought that it was appropriate for the Commission to consider them. She responded that the Commission is charged with determining whether the proposed sign is true to its historic predecessor. She asserted that the new sign would not be a replica of the historic sign because it would be a non-accessory sign, not an accessory sign. She then added that the Commission has not taken into account the light that this sign will produce. She asserted that it would add

significantly to the ambient light in the area. She suggested a study to determine the effect of that new light should be undertaken.

Attorney Darwin Beauvais, representing the owners and some residents of the St. James Apartments at 8th and Walnut Streets, stated that the Architectural Committee should have an opportunity to review the structural design. He threatened to litigate any approval, asserting that the standard review process has not been followed. He distributed a photograph taken from the St. James looking north down onto the Lit's building. He asserted that the 15-foot-tall sign would create a wall of light. He asked the Commission to table the application and remand it to the Architectural Committee for additional review. He noted the structural design is not finalized. He asked if the sign would be able to withstand a "Category 2 Hurricane or a 90 mile-per-hour" wind. Mr. Sherman responded that the question before the Historical Commission is whether this sign will be compatible with the historic building, not whether it will withstand a weather event. He explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections will conduct a separate review of the structural system. He observed that it would be inappropriate to judge the sign's ability to withstand a strong wind. Mr. Quinn, the Commission's representative of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, agreed, stating that the Department would require the applicant's engineer to demonstrate that the sign met all applicable building codes. Mr. Gallery interjected, asking why the Commission requires architectural plans if it simply defers to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Sherman stated that the Historical Commission reviews plans to ensure that the appearance of the proposed alteration is compatible with the historic resource. The Historical Commission does not determine whether an alteration satisfies technical aspects of the building code, such as the wind-load code, which are unrelated to historic preservation. He concluded that the structural details that have been provided are sufficient to determine whether the appearance of the sign will be compatible with the historic building. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Gallery if he thought that the application lacks information necessary to make a determination regarding compatibility. Mr. Gallery responded that the details for the installation of the signage at the turrets are not included. Mr. Gallery then asserted that the Architectural Committee includes two engineers who are charged with evaluating these types of structural designs to determine whether they meet all applicable codes. He contended that structural review "is never deferred to L&I. I cannot think of in 10 years where we have just said, oh, we are not going to look at something. We'll defer it to L&I." The engineers on the Architectural Committee deserve an opportunity to review the design, Mr. Gallery claimed. Mr. Beauvais agreed. Mr. Dilworth disagreed. He stated that the Historical Commission often relies heavily on the advice of engineers. For example, it relied on the advice of an engineer regarding the structural stability of the Church of the Assumption when it reviewed that application. In this case, the structural details will have no significant impact on the appearance of the sign from the public right-of-way and therefore no impact on the Commission's determination of the compatibility of the sign with the historic building. Mr. Beauvais questioned Mr. Dilworth's assertions and asked him to clarify. Mr. Dilworth stated that the Commission needed the advice of an engineer in the Church of the Assumption case to determine whether it was financially feasible to reuse the building. In this case, the Commission is charged with determining whether the sign will be compatible with the building; the determination of whether the structure holding up the sign meets the building code is outside the Commission's purview. The Commission has enough information to determine whether the appearance of the structure is compatible with the building. It does not need additional technical information that will not impact the sign's appearance to make its determination. Mr. Beauvais again disagreed and asserted that all of the structural details should be reviewed by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sherman stated that it is the task of the code enforcement officials at the Department of Licenses & Inspections to review the technical details of the structure to determine whether it meets various technical codes. Mr. Beauvais said that "there is more than

one way to skin a cat.” Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission had clarified the roles of the Department and Commission in the review and needed to move on with the discussion.

MOTION: Ms. Jones moved to table the application and remand it back to the Architectural Committee to allow the Committee to review the structural design and the way in which the sign would be mounted at the turrets. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

Eleanor Gesensway explained that she was affiliated with the Let Lits Live Coalition in the 1980s. She accused the Commissioners of being “ingenuous” for accepting the property owner’s claim that this sign would be a replica of the historic sign. She contended that the proposed sign is a “billboard” designed “to advertise commercial commercials.” She stated that the sign would be an affront to the building, to neighbors, and to visitors. She said: “Who needs that? Who wants that? That’s not what we should be imposing on our Philadelphia’s image, and on this site, and on this building.” Mr. Schaaf disagreed with Ms. Gesensway’s comments and stated that City Council explicitly determined in Section 14-906 of the Philadelphia Code that the type of sign that is proposed is appropriate from a zoning perspective. He stated that the Commission need not make a determination as to whether the proposed sign is appropriate from a zoning perspective because City Council has already done so. The Commission’s task is solely to determine whether the sign is compatible with the historic building and the placement of the sign is consistent with historic precedent and does not block or obscure views of the historic building. Ms. Gesensway countered that Mr. Schaaf has an “ethical, moral, and aesthetic” obligation to prevent this sign from being installed. She stated that he may interpret laws to the benefit of the public and thereby deny this sign. Mr. Mattioni disagreed and asserted that the Historical Commission has an obligation to comply with the law. Ms. Gesensway stated that she had a right to express her opinion. Mr. Mattioni agreed, but also noted that the Commission cannot ignore the law.

Steven Leshner, the president of the condominium board of the Ayer Building, stated that he lives within four blocks of the proposed sign. He stated that he and his neighbors have made an investment in a quality of life and this sign will not add to that quality of life. The sign is a commercial enterprise. He advised that the Commission should not only consider the compatibility of the sign with the historic building, but should also determine whether the proposed sign is tasteful. He remarked: “I do not believe that that sign is in good taste.” He suggested that the sign should be remanded to the Architectural Committee. He stated that he is very concerned that the sign will “impact on the visual tranquility of our skyline.” He stated that Market East should not be another Las Vegas, Times Square, or Atlantic City. The area around Independence Hall should be “tasteful.” This building should be developed in such a way that it is not a “blight” on the neighborhood.

Michael Wass of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that his organization opposes the approval of the sign. He read a letter into the record. He read from Section 14-906 of the Philadelphia Code, which states that a sign may not be erected unless “the Historical Commission determines that the placement of the sign is consistent with historic precedent with respect to such building and the sign does not materially obscure the view of the building’s key architectural, historic or character-defining features.” He asserted that the City Council intended to allow for the restoration of the Lit’s sign, but not the erection of a billboard on the roof. He claimed that the proposed sign does not satisfy Standards 4, 5, 6, and 9. He also noted that the billboards will be highly visible from long distances including the National Park and residences. He claimed that the applicants argued that the sign would help overcome a financial hardship, but presented no financial data. He claimed that the applicants should have but did not provide

any information about their required \$10 million investment in the area. He asked the Commission to deny the application.

Daniel Sablosky, the property manager of the St. James for Stonehenge Advisors, Inc., asserted that the Historical Commission has a responsibility to require the owners of the Lit's building to restore the historic sign, not allow them to construct a new billboard. He threatened to litigate any approval of the sign.

Mr. Sherman reminded the Commission that it approved the sign in concept at its September 2012 meeting. Mr. Connors stated that he operated in good faith after receiving that approval in concept and spent \$40,000 building a mock up as the Commission had required. He offered to submit to any reasonable review process, but contended that the Architectural Committee had recommended denial of his project because it claimed that the sign would look like a wall of light and change the massing of the building, even though that condition was known at the time of the Commission's in concept approval. He asserted that the Committee had not reviewed the final approval application within the bounds set by the Historical Commission's approval in concept. He stated that he did not want to prepare a final structural design for review by the Architectural Committee if the Committee was simply going to reject the application on a ground that the Commission had already deemed acceptable like the massing.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham to remind the Commission of its obligations under an approval in concept. Mr. Farnham stated that, from a legal standpoint, an approval in concept is advisory to the applicant. It does not bind the Commission in any way. He read from the Rules & Regulations:

An endorsement of a review in concept of a development program shall not constitute a final review for permit purposes, shall not vest a right in a permit, and shall be subject to review of the final plans by the Commission before the Commission takes final action on a permit application and before a permit may issue.

He stated that, from a legal standpoint, an approval in concept constitutes advice only and does not bind the Commission to granting a final approval in the future, even if the final project is identical to the conceptual project. Mr. Farnham stated, however, that, from a policy standpoint, an approval in concept should be respected by the Commission. He asserted that it would represent bad policy for the Commission to forsake its in-concept approval in a capricious manner. He concluded that the Commission is not bound by its in-concept approval in this case and is still free to approve or deny this application, but should be cognizant of the implications of its actions if it abandons the earlier path that it established with the approval in concept.

Mr. Farnham reminded the Commission of its obligations under the Market East sign ordinance. He read from Section 14-906 of the Philadelphia Code, which states that a sign may not be erected unless "the Historical Commission determines that the placement of the sign is consistent with historic precedent with respect to such building and the sign does not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features." He noted that the use of the word "placement" introduces some ambiguity. Does it refer to the location of the sign or the act of placing the sign on the building? He stated that the two review criteria, consistency with historic precedent and obscuring key features, should be applied by the Commission. He cautioned the Commission against applying other criteria outside the preservation and sign ordinances, such as considering the level of ambient light or the protection of a tranquil skyline. He suggested that it would be prudent for the Commission to limit its review to the application of the two criteria in the sign ordinance and the usual criteria in the preservation ordinance. Regarding the structure of the sign, Mr. Farnham advised the

Commission and the Committee, if the application is remanded, to limit its review to the appearance of the structure and its compatibility with the historic building. The Commission should not in any way be basing its decision on whether it believes that the structure will withstand a 90 or 120 mile-per-hour wind. The Commission should apply Standard 9 to the sign and determine whether it is compatible with the building. He also noted that there is only one engineer on the Committee, not two, and she has taken an extended leave of absence for medical reasons.

FAILED MOTION: By a vote of 3 to 7, the motion of Ms. Jones and Mr. Thomas to table the application and remand it back to the Architectural Committee, to allow the Committee to review the structural design including the mounting of the signs at the turrets, failed. Mses. Leonard, Merriman, and Turner and Messrs. Dilworth, Mattioni, Quinn, and Schaaf dissented. Mr. Sherman abstained.

Mr. Sherman asked for a new motion.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-906(4)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Mses. Jones and Merriman and Mr. Thomas dissented. Mr. Sherman abstained.

ADDRESS: 1701-15 LOCUST ST

Project: Replace ramp, stairs, awnings, and canopy

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AP Rad Venture, LP

Applicant: Frank Rapisarda, Tackett & Co., Inc.

History: 1925; Warwick Hotel; Frank Hahn and S. Brian Baylinson, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the main entrance to the Warwick Hotel. The entrance does not retain its original configuration; it was modified sometime in the mid 20th century. The application proposes a similar configuration to what is currently found at the building. The canopy over the main entrance would be replaced with a new stainless steel canopy. The awnings in the transom area of the windows flanking the main entrance would be removed and canopies installed. The alterations at grade would include modifications to an existing ramp, and the replacement of a ramp on the south side of the entrance with a terrace. The proposed materials are inappropriate to the style of this building. Furthermore, the proposed canopies obscure character defining features of the façade, such as pilasters and transoms.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architects Frank Rapisarda and Jay Tackett represented the application.

Mr. Rapisarda distributed revised drawings of the proposal. Mr. Danta pointed out that he had reviewed the revised drawings prior to the meeting and noticed some inconsistencies between the color rendering and the architectural elevation. He specifically pointed out that the rendering did not show canopies at the windows, yet the drawing showed them. He asked the application

to clearly identify the elements they were proposing and those that are not part of the submission. Mr. Tackett clarified that the rendering accurately represents the revised proposal. He requested that the Commissioners ignore the architectural drawing. He noted that the Architectural Committee had recommended eliminating the canopies at the windows as well as the illuminated planters. He stated that he found such a recommendation appropriate and had eliminated both of those elements. Mr. Tackett explained that the proposed canopy is indeed compatible with the historic building. He stated that stainless steel is compatible with the historic building because it does not corrupt the original fabric and design. He explained that the size of the canopy is six feet shorter than the existing and shallower. He noted that the size reflected the need to cover the bellman's stand. He pointed out that this stand would allow the bellman to be outside at all times. He described the proposal as harmonious and sleek. He pointed out that the proposal would also allow for the restoration of the two pilasters closest to the entrance.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Danta if the revisions responded to the Architectural Committee's comments, and if the issues had been addressed. Mr. Danta answered that the Committee did not speak with a single voice, and that there were many different opinions. He stated that the removal of the canopies at the windows certainly addressed one of the main concerns expressed at the Committee meeting. Mr. Danta noted, however, that the size and design of the entrance canopy was a major point of discussion at the Committee meeting. He noted that several Committee members had suggested making the canopy smaller and had also questioned the appropriateness of the material. Mr. Tackett explained that the width of the canopy matches the width of the masonry steps below. He noted that the width would also allow the bellman's stand to be covered. He pointed out that the width would be the same width as the existing canopy, which has been present for over 50 years. He stated that the Committee did not say that the material was incompatible, but was instead inappropriate. He reiterated that the material is not inappropriate at all. He described it as simple and harmonious. Ms. Merriman asked for clarification about the correlation between the steps and the canopy at the entrance. Mr. Tackett explained that the steps and bellman's stand are all part of the same design, and would both be covered by the canopy, hence the need to unify them. Ms. Leonard asked if the new canopy would be shorter than the existing. Mr. Tackett answered that it would be shorter by about six feet, and it would not extend beyond the plane of the flanking pavilions and over the sidewalk as the existing canopy does.

Mr. Baron pointed out that the rendering shows a very heavy transom bar at the arched windows. He asked if the application included any work to those windows, or if the heavy transom bar was a rendering mistake. Mr. Tackett answered that it was a rendering mistake and that no work is proposed to those historic windows.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the removal of the canopies at the windows was a beneficial revision. He noted, however, that the proposed canopy at the entrance is unnecessarily wide. He stated that, simply because the hotel wants a bellman's stand outside, it does not mean that the canopy needs to be so wide as to cover that stand. He also noted that many hotels have bellmen that do not require stands outside. He stated that the width of the canopy is being directed by the desire to cover the bellman's stand.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 4 to 6. Ms. Turner and Leonard and Messrs. Dilworth, Mattioni, Palantino, and Quinn dissented. Mr. Sherman abstained.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 9 November 2012, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Ms. Jones and Merriman and Messrs. Schaaf and Thomas dissented. Mr. Sherman abstained.

ADDRESS: 1921 DIAMOND ST

Project: Legalize alterations and undo illegal alterations

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Mansion Lofts LLC

Applicant: Shawn Bullard

History: 1889, Willis Hale, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Significant, 1/29/1986

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the bays in their original materials, restoration of the brownstone, and removal of the paint, with the staff to review details, but denial of the remainder of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This submission proposes to legalize and modify some of the work that was done to this corner building without a permit in 2006. Two staff members met with the owner at that time to discuss the plans and approve some interior fit out. Without any permits or approvals, the owner proceeded to remove three character-defining metal bays with balconies. The side two bay openings were infilled with stucco, while the bay on the front was rebuilt with a different shape and material. Small granite columns were removed. The windows throughout the house were replaced with vinyl windows with internal sandwiched "colonial" grids. The front first-floor bay window was replaced with a new vinyl bay of a different shape. The basement window and the transom above the first-floor window were infilled with and faced with tile. The brick facades were painted, doors were inappropriately replaced, and the rear yard was fenced in with a concrete block wall. The rear facade was stuccoed.

The owner proposes to restore the three bays in fiberglass with metal balcony railings. He proposes to remove the paint from the walls and repair some of the brownstone. He seeks to legalize all other work.

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

The Commissioners consider the application and concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve of the restoration of the bays in their original materials, restoration of the brownstone, and removal of the paint, with the staff to review details, but deny the remainder of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1616-26 WALNUT ST

Project: Alter exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1616 Walnut Street

Applicant: Deidre Deascanis, JKR Partners

History: 1929; 1616 Walnut Street Building; Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the front door replacement and rear ground-floor storefront installation, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the window details match the existing exterior window details and the mechanical equipment on the sixth floor is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert this 26-story office building into a 210-unit apartment building with ground floor retail and parking and a rooftop deck and trellis, cooling tower replacement, and elevator extension. All original steel windows would be replaced with aluminum windows in the original configurations on all elevations above the second story. On the front façade, original revolving doors and an early double-leaf door would be replaced with single-leaf doors. On the sixth-story west and east elevations, ten windows would be cut into doors for access to ten terraces with mechanical equipment, privacy screens and metal railings. The rear of the building faces a service alley. At the rear, ground-floor elevation, two windows would be cut to create a new storefront entrance. On the rear elevation, seven windows would be in-filled with louvers and six windows with brick. Eighteen louvered and fire-glazed windows would be restored to their original appearances. A small addition of a 27th-floor water tank room is proposed to accommodate the extension of an existing elevator shaft. The masonry exterior of the building would be cleaned and repointed. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on the building.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architects Jonathan Broh and Deidre Deascanis and owner's representative Claude Thomas represented the application.

Ms. Sell noted that the revised drawing was submitted in response to the recommendations of the Architectural Committee. She explained that the applicant now proposes to retain the double-leaf doors to the east of the revolving doors on the front façade; rebuild the masonry base beneath the existing storefront window; and replace the divided windows with an undivided window on the rear elevation.

Mr. Broh explained that the revised proposal is to replace five of the doors on the front façade including the revolving doors. He explained that the doors will be bronze and the details will match the profile of the existing double-doors. He stated that, on the rear façade, they propose to remove masonry that was in between two windows on the storefront and replace the opening with a continuous window. He explained that the storefront is a valet area and they would like to open the space to make it more visible to those coming in and out of the parking garage.

Ms. Jones asked why the Committee would recommend approval of replacement of existing steel windows with aluminum windows. Ms. Sell explained that the section drawings that were submitted in the proposal show that the exterior profiles match the existing windows and therefore the appearance from the public standpoint would not change. She added that the

windows would be painted and the exterior appearance, whether there is steel or aluminum beneath the paint, would match. She explained that the staff will be reviewing shop drawings to ensure the profiles would replicate those of the existing window profiles. Ms. Jones stated that the Commission has historically denied applications to replace wood windows with vinyl windows. She asked the staff how this case is different. Ms. Sell explained that the change from wood to vinyl is noticeable not only in material, but also in shape; it is extremely difficult to find a vinyl or clad window that would exactly match the profiles of a wood window.

Mr. Thomas asked if the replacement of the revolving doors with a single-leaf door is to provide accessibility. Mr. Broh responded that an accessibility consultant and the fire department determined that the doors must be single-leaf doors in order to meet code.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization holds an easement on the property and is in support of the revisions that were submitted to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 9 November 2012, provided the window details match the existing exterior window details, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 547, 549, 551, AND 553 N 23RD ST

Project: Construct residential building on vacant lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 23rd & Brandywine LP

Applicant: John Loonstyn, Wallace Street Construction LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed houses would be compatible with the historic district, provided the deck railings are simple, metal-picket railings.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct four four-story single-family houses with roof decks on vacant lots within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lots are considered to be undeveloped and the Commission's jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The front elevations would be clad in brick with masonry block bases and would include two-over-two windows. No information has been provided regarding the material of the windows, lintels, or sills. The fourth-story would be a mansard with double dormer windows. No information has been provided regarding roofing material. The rear elevation would be clad with stucco and one-over-one windows. A garage entrance is proposed for the first-story rear. Decks are proposed at the second and forth stories.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 343 N FRONT ST

Project: Construct residential building
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: George Lovett
Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the windows should be stacked and in similar proportions to windows found on the surrounding streetscape.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story, four-unit building with a pilot house and roof decks on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The lot is considered to be undeveloped and the Commission's jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The exterior would be clad in brick and have two projecting bays clad in vertical metal siding. The bays would have casement windows and Juliette balconies and would be topped with patios with a metal rails. The windows would be aluminum-clad casements.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1411-19 WALNUT ST

Project: Replace awning with canopy

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PMC Property Group, Inc.

Applicant: Joseph Polisano, Polisano Construction Services

History: 1912; Philadelphia Stock Exchange Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace a fabric awning with an acrylic and metal canopy at an arched entrance at the Philadelphia Stock Exchange Building. The canopy would be black with push-through lettering and accented with polished aluminum bars along the edge. LED light fixtures are proposed for the underside of the canopy to light the entrance. The photographic rendering shows the canopy fitting within the masonry opening. However, the drawing indicates that the canopy would be notched allowing it fit within the masonry opening but widening once it clears the plane of the building. The two other entrances on this façade currently have fabric arched awnings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Côté presented the application to the Commission. Joe Polisano represented the application.

Mr. Polisano discussed the suggestions of the Architectural Committee. He stated that one of the concerns of the Committee was the attachment details and the number of holes or damage to the façade that would result from the installation of the canopy. He pointed out the attachment details on the drawing submitted after the Committee meeting. He stated that there will be 12 ½

inch diameter anchors used to mount the sign in the opening; four on each side of the insides and two on either side of the arch. He showed the Commission photographs of the existing ½ inch anchors for the current awning. He indicated with the photograph that they propose to restore and repair the holes left by the removal of the existing awning. He informed the Commission that another concern of the Committee was that the bottom of the canopy should line up with the transom bars in the adjacent windows. Mr. Polisano stated that the elevation drawing shows that the canopy will align with the transom bars. He stated that the Committee also suggested that the canopy fit within the masonry opening. He stated that this was the only issue they could not address because the distance from the transom bar to the springing of the arch does not allow for the size of the lettering on the sign and that is why they are showing the canopy as notched. He stated that they propose to use the existing electrical feed.

Mr. Polisano stated that they would like to install new entry doors in stainless steel. He stated that the staff said that it could administratively approve new doors in the same bronze color to match the windows and doors in the other openings. He pointed out there is a set of stainless steel doors at an entrance on this façade to the east. Ms. Côté stated that she reviewed the door proposal and determined that she could approve a door in similar bronze color to the existing windows and doors. She stated that the windows and doors were all installed at the same time in the same material, excepting the entrance that Mr. Polisano has mentioned. Mr. Polisano stated that, in essence, they will be replacing in kind but with a new material. Mr. Schaaf stated that he was fine with the new material choice and the rest the Commissioners concurred. He asked if the staff would review the details. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff would review the details to ensure that the door matches the existing in configuration and profiles but approve the stainless steel material based on the Commission's guidance.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 9 November 2012, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2136-42 E DAUPHIN ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Federal Credit Union

Applicant: Michael McCullin, Fourth River Signworks

History: 1896; 26th District Police Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the second-story sign is shortened to allow for a minimum of three inches between the back panel and the window heads below and the brick banding above and the letters are resized accordingly; provided that only the letters of the banner sign are illuminated; provided that the brackets of the projecting sign are a minimum of one inch from the checkerboard banding; and provided that the brackets are attached within mortar joints; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage on the east elevation of this building. Built in 1896 as the 26th District Police Station, this historic building is undergoing an extensive

rehabilitation for reuse as a bank on the first floor and residential apartments on the second and third floors.

In September 2012, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application for signage that included a banner sign and pin letters. The banner sign was proposed to be seven-feet-high and mounted flush against the wall and the pin letters were to be attached by three pins per letter into the faces of brick. The Committee voted to recommend denial. The applicant withdrew the application at the Historical Commission meeting in October 2012.

This revised application now proposes to mount an aluminum backer panel with aluminum letters on the east elevation above the second-story windows. An internally-illuminated aluminum and acrylic box sign with push-through letters on steel brackets and steel backer is proposed on the first-story adjacent to the carriage entrance. The total height of the sign now measures four feet. The first-story façade is articulated with a patterned banding of dentiled bricks that horizontally wrap the elevation. The sign is now proposed to be pulled away from this feature.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Signage consultant Michael McCullin represented the application.

Mr. Sherman stated that it appears this current submission addressed the Committee's concerns offered during the previous review. Ms. Merriman asked if Mr. McCullin is in agreement with the Committee's recommendation. Mr. McCullin stated that he believes the submission reflects the recommendation and that the sign no longer covers architectural details.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application provided that the second-story sign is shortened to allow for a minimum of three inches between the back panel and the window heads below and the brick banding above and the letters are resized accordingly; provided that only the letters of the banner sign are illuminated; provided that the brackets of the projecting sign are a minimum of one inch from the checkerboard banding; and provided that the brackets are attached within mortar joints; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 11:20 a.m. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.