

**THE MINUTES OF THE 558TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**13 FEBRUARY 2009
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ken Acquaviva, Municipal Consulting Group
Vera Kiselev, WRT
Antonio Fiol-Silva, WRT
Martin J. Rosenblum
Margo Todd
Charles Todd
Martin Rosenblum
Paul Thompson, BluPath Design
Gary Martin, William Proud Masonry
Ken Hayward
John Hauser
George Acosta

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Clark, Dilworth, Leonard, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 557TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 557th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 January 2009. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 6.3.C OF THE RULES & REGULATIONS

Mr. Farnham introduced the proposed revisions to the Rules & Regulations. He explained that the Commission reviewed and supported a proposal from its staff to process the nominations for the three smallest outstanding historic districts during 2009 at the October and November 2008 meetings. As part of that plan, the staff suggested that the Commission implement a series of measures to improve the efficiency of permit reviews including amending the Rules & Regulations to grant additional approval authorities to the staff. At the January 2009 Commission meeting, the staff suggested amendments to Section 6.3.c of the Rules & Regulations to achieve that goal. The Commission discussed the proposed amendments and heard testimony from the public at that meeting. Subsequently, the staff has suggested additional, very minor revisions to Sections 6.3.c.1.b and h. Mr. Farnham presented the proposed amendments with the revisions.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Farnham to explain the approval process after the Commission has voted to amend its Rules & Regulations. Mr. Farnham described the process. Once the Commission has voted to approve an amendment, the Commission first submits the revisions for approval to the Law Department. Upon receiving the approval from the Law Department, the Commission then files them with the Department of Records, where they are available for public inspection for 30 days. The Department of Records provides public notice of the proposed revisions in three daily newspapers. Any person may request a hearing before the Commission on the revisions. If a hearing is requested and held, the Commission must file a report of the hearing with the Department of Records reaffirming the regulations or modifying them with the approval of the Law Department. The regulations become effective at midnight of the 30th day after their filing when no hearing has been requested and at midnight of the 10th day after a report has been filed when a hearing was requested and held.

Mr. Sherman asked how the Commission would promulgate the new Rules & Regulations to its customers. Mr. Farnham explained that the proposed revisions have been distributed to the Commission's interested parties by email and mail. He noted that the Department of Records will advertise the proposed revisions. Once the revisions are adopted, the Commission will post the revised Rules & Regulations on its website and will distribute email hard copies of the revised Rules & Regulations to applicants and all other interested parties. Mr. Schaaf asked if the proposed revisions are subject to the review of the City Council. Mr. Farnham stated that they are not.

Mr. Thomas objected to the term "alternative energy equipment" because its definition is continually changing. Mr. Farnham agreed that the term is in flux, but contended that it was included as a symbolic indication of the Commission's support of sustainable technologies. Mr. Thomas stated that the regulation should also indicate the Commission's willingness to approve conventional mechanical technologies. Mr. Wilds reminded his fellow Commissioners that the regulation is modified by the term "minor"; the staff may only approve minor modifications. Mr. Schaaf agreed with Mr. Thomas that the term "alternative" will always be evolving. Mr. Mattioni suggested deleting the "alternative" rather than adding the term "conventional."

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to amend the proposed Section 6.3.c of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, replacing "alternative energy" with "mechanical." Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposed Section 6.3.c of the Commission's Rules & Regulations as amended. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JANUARY 2009

David Amburn, Chair

209-25 N. 18TH STREET, BASILICA OF SAINT PETER & SAINT PAUL

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Applicant: Robert Koochagian

History: 1846-64, Napoleon LeBrun and John Notman; individually designated, 5/28/1957

Project: Construct ADA ramp with canopy, and elevator addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the revised variant shown on page A-7, with the undivided glass in the entry door, with the staff to review the details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the north elevation of the Chapel of Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament. The chapel was constructed adjacent to the north elevation of the basilica in 1954-55. It replaced a mid nineteenth-century rectory that stood on the site. The chapel currently has two non-ADA-compliant access ramps.

The proposed alterations include the removal of the two non-compliant ramps and the removal of the original steps leading up to the side entrance of the chapel. The side entrance would be transformed into a window and the steps relocated to the new entrance four bays to the west. At this new entrance, the applicant would construct an elevator addition. The elevator addition would stand in front of the western most bay of the chapel. The elevator would only be accessible from the interior corridor and it would present a blank brick exterior. A new ramp with canopy would be constructed, which would end at a landing adjacent to the elevator addition. This ramp would run the entire length of the side or north elevation. The applicant would replace all the windows on the chapel, however that change is not included in this application and would be included in a comprehensive window replacement project for the entire cathedral complex.

The applicant presents two variations on the proposed canopy over the ramp and entrance. These variations are presented on pages A-6 and A-7. The variant on page A-6 presents an entrance door comprised of a single door with divided side lights. The canopy presented on this variant would be supported by rods that would attach to new pedestals which would extend beyond the original parapet. The canopy would extend the entire length of the ramp. The variant on page A-7 presents an entrance door comprised of a single door and undivided side lights. The canopy on this option would also extend the entire length of the ramp and it would be supported by three slender columns. Both variants propose a glass roof on the canopy. Both variants meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation; however, the variant presented in page A-7 would be more compatible and less visually intrusive.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architects Vera Kiselev and Antonio Fiol-Silva represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked why the Committee had recommended single-light windows for the entry door. He asserted that multi-light windows would be more compatible with the existing windows on the façade. Mr. Danta answered that the applicant had informed the Architectural Committee that they could not match the proportions of the existing panes; therefore a multi-light door would look awkward adjacent to the windows with different proportions.

Mr. Schaaf noted that the relationship of the canopy to the columns was inappropriate in Option 2. He noted that the canopy would extend beyond the columns by several feet. He suggested reducing the extension of the canopy beyond the columns. Mr. Amburn stated that the overhang is necessary on the north façade to completely protect the ramp from the elements. He noted that this would be a primary entrance. Mr. Thomas agreed, noting that because the canopy is high above the ramp it must have a large overhang. Otherwise, the north-facing ramp would not be protected from rain and snow. He stated that the projecting canopy would not be intrusive because the elevator tower, which is closer to the street, projects out beyond the canopy. He stated that the proposed solution would work well.

The architects did not object to the conditions in the recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the revised variant shown on page A-7, with the undivided glass in the entry door, with the staff to review the details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2025 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner / Applicant: Patrick J. Keenan & Mary Schaheen

History: c. 1865; individually designated, 1/6/1972; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct rear addition, install roof deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck and pilot house, provided both are invisible from Delancey Place; approval of the rear addition, provided the parapet is reduced to the minimum height; and approval of the rear wall with roll-down gate, provided the gate is see-through, not solid; with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the rear of the property facing Cypress Street. This block of Cypress is a service street. This block of Cypress Street is characterized by a profusion of garages and garden walls on both sides. The applicant proposes to demolish the ground floor portion of a two-story bay. The two-story bay is an original feature of the building and the only unaltered bay on this row of three townhouses. In its place, an addition would be constructed that would enlarge the floor plan of the residence and create a family room. The addition is presented as a simple cubic mass with a balcony and decorative pergola. The addition would be finished in stucco with metal railings. The basement of the property would be excavated to create a garage. The most visible alteration would be the construction of a rear wall with a roll-down gate and person door that would enclose the rear yard.

The other proposed alteration is the construction of a pilot house and roof deck on the roof of the main block of the residence. The location of the pilot house is predicated on the interior staircase. The pilot house would provide access to a roof deck. The deck would be located towards the front façade of the residence facing Delancey Place. The applicant submitted a sight-line study. The study shows that, as proposed, the deck would be visible from Delancey

Place. A mock up should be constructed to gauge the visibility of the proposed deck. Roof decks should be inconspicuous when located along secondary facades, but they should, in nearly all cases, be invisible from the main façade of the property. Owing to the location of this property within a historic district, the protection of the streetscape is an important factor of the review. This block of Delancey Place is one of the most significant streetscapes in the district and a visible roof deck along this prominent street wall would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Rosenblum distributed a revised set of plans that depicted the parapet reduced in height by eight inches, exposing the paneling at the bottom of the bay, and the deck set back the recommended six feet, reducing its public visibility.

Mr. Rosenblum discussed the roll-down gate. He introduced photographs of the area around the intersection of 21st and Van Pelt Streets and claimed that the Commission had previously approved a roll-down gate for the area like the one he is proposing. He reported that his clients object to the Architectural Committee's recommendation that the gate must be transparent. He contended that no one else in the area has a see-through gate. He asserted that requiring one would prevent his clients from enjoying privacy. He offered to install a roll-down gate factory-coated to any color requested. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Amburn to provide the rationale for the Architectural Committee's recommendation on the gate design. Mr. Amburn replied that the Commission required a transparent roll-down gate at the rear of a house to the house on the 1300-block of Spruce Street; he stated that the Committee was endeavoring to be consistent. Mr. Amburn stated that he deemed the gate proposed today to be acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised application with the parapet reduced eight inches in height, the deck set back six feet, and the rear gate as described, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

332-334 S. 4TH STREET

Owner: Charles and Margo Todd

Applicant: Paul Thompson, AIA

History: 1811, altered 1880, rehabilitated 1960

individually designated 4/30/1957; contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize exterior alterations and install solar panels

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the Option B solar panel installation and the double windows at the two-story rear ell, provided the structure to support the solar panels on the two-story rear ell is redesigned as a porch with a 4/12 pitch roof rather than a trellis, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: An earlier version of this application was presented to the Historical Commission in November 2008. That application proposed to legalize a series of alterations to the rear ell, including the demolition and reconstruction of the two-story section of the rear ell with paired, double-hung windows at the second story and installation of stucco on wire mesh over the entire rear ell. That application was in response to violations and a stop work order for illegal work issued in July 2008. The application also proposed to install windows and doors on the façade

and rear ell and solar panels on the roof of the main block and rear ell. The Historical Commission voted to deny that application, pursuant to Standard 9.

After the denial and meeting with the Historical Commission staff, the applicant revised the design to address concerns raised at the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission meetings. The applicant now proposes the following:

1. Three options for installation of the photovoltaic solar collectors:
Option A: Installation of solar panels on the rear of the main block and rear ell per the original proposal.
Option B: Installation of a painted wood trellis to raise and support the photovoltaic solar collectors in lieu of installing them on the main block.
Option C: Installation of a combination of both Option A and B.
2. Installation of exposed gutters and barge boards at the three phases of construction at the rear ell, as suggested by staff.
3. Installation of barge board and coping cover at the roofline of the main block as part of the roof replacement.
4. Installation of brick with slate topped chimney dampers in the historic design rather than leaving the chimney caps exposed as initially proposed.
5. Infill of one of the double windows created in the rear. The applicant would prefer to retain the double window, but would concede to the infill if the Commission requires it.

The remainder of the work is unchanged from the original application. The applicant proposes to install previously approved windows in the façade and rear ell, replace wooden gate on 4th Street, replace roofing materials, flashing, and gutters, install a HVAC and unit solar hot water and photovoltaic panels on the roof of the rear ell, and infill an existing swimming pool.

The rear first story is not visible from the public right-of-way. The second story and above are visible. The pitches of the roofs of the rear ell are very low. The rear of the roof of the main block is visible from the far end of a greenway leading to Green's Court. The full extent of the visibility of the proposed equipment from the public walkway remains unknown.

After a meeting onsite with the solar panel contractor, applicant, owners, and Commission staff, it was determined that there are two options for a successful solar panel installation:

1. construct a rear trellis to raise the panels and gather the necessary sunlight, thereby eliminating the solar panels on the rear of the main block; or
2. the initial proposal, install the solar panels on the roofs of the rear ell and rear of the main block.

The trellis with solar panels elevated on top would be highly visible from 4th Street, a highly trafficked public-right-of-way. Panel installation directly on the low roofs and rear of the main block would have a much lower impact on visibility from 4th Street, isolating the most visible portions to a vantage point along the greenway.

Removing the new stucco and mesh may do more damage to the building than leaving it in place.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application the Historical Commission. Architect Paul Thompson and property owners Charles and Margo Todd represented the application.

Mr. Wilds disagreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation to require the construction of a false porch or trellis on the rear ell to support the solar panels. Mr. Wilds

contended that mounting the panels on the rear pitch of the main block as proposed would be much less intrusive and visible than mounting them on the false porch on the rear ell as suggested by Mr. Baron. He stated that no historic fabric would be destroyed if they were mounted on the rear roof of the front block. He added that he would certainly oppose any installation on the front slope of the main block roof. He concluded that the installation on the rear slope of the main roof would be the simplest, least visible, most appropriate solution. Mr. Thomas concurred with Mr. Wilds and added that the installation would be reversible.

Mr. Wilds asked the staff if the Committee and applicant were in agreement regarding the other aspects of the application. Ms. Sell answered that they were in agreement. She stated that the removal of the stucco would result in more damage to the underlying brick. She also stated that the Committee deemed the paired windows acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application with the Option A solar panel installation and the double windows at the two-story rear ell, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

274 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Lee & Geoff Dennis

Applicant: Jason Thompson

History: 1813, James Lundall, house carpenter; alterations, 1964; individually designated 4/30/1957, contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Enlarge rear window into a French door with balcony, replace front dormer window.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the French door with balcony, provided the glass is undivided, with a 36"-inch railing and simplified transom; and approval of the simulated-divided-light dormer sash replacement, provided it is an arched-top window fits within the historic opening and replicates the appearance of the historic sash, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge a double window on the rear façade of this townhouse and convert it into a French door with balcony. The application also proposes to replace the window in the front dormer with either a wood true-divided-light, or a simulated-divided-light window.

The rear facade shows evidence of masonry alterations around the window openings. The double window is not a typical Federal window type and it most likely dates from an early twentieth-century alteration or perhaps as part of the 1964 restoration of the property. This is not a character defining feature of the property and its removal is consistent with the Standards.

The applicant proposes two options for the replacement window in the front dormer facing 3rd Street. Both units are manufactured by Marvin windows and both are constructed of wood. The units have identical light patterns and dimensions. The true-divided light sash would be singled glazed, and the simulated-divided light sash would have insulated glass. The replacement sash would be installed within the existing frame of the window. However, it should be noted that dormer windows were not historically installed in the same manner as windows in masonry walls. The window frame in a dormer opening usually serves as the structural armature for the dormer cladding. This makes the weight pocket very small and leaves very little room for the addition of a sub frame. The staff should work with the applicant to ensure that the proposed

installation would not build-down the opening and that it would be compatible for this location. Furthermore, the window must be arched-top as per the historic photographic evidence.

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

Mr. Danta informed the Commission that he had spoken with the applicant, who agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the French door with balcony, provided the glass is undivided, with a 36"-inch railing and simplified transom; and approve the simulated-divided-light dormer sash replacement, provided it is an arched-top window fits within the historic opening and replicates the appearance of the historic sash, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2506 S. 22ND STREET

Owner: Greg Tenuto

Applicant: Anthony Miksitz

History: c. 1912; contributing to GEHD, 11/10/1999

Project: Demolish rear dormer, construct rear addition

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear dormer and construct a second-floor addition atop a non-historic first-floor addition. Both additions would be parged in stucco. A false dormer clad in fiber cement siding is proposed for the rear of the second-floor addition. The addition would be minimally visible from 22nd Street, through the gap between the twins. It would not be visible from a public right-of-way from the rear. Please note that there is no record of approval for the white vinyl fence seen in the photographs.

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

The Commissioners agreed that addition proposed in the application was appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

52 N. 2ND STREET

Applicant: William Proud

Owner: Ken Hayward

History: c. 1840, storefront added circa 1875

individually designated 1/6/1977, contributing to Old City Historic District 12/12/2003

Project: Demolish and rebuild rear façade, cut new window openings in side façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of window replacement for the front façade; approval of new window cuts on the side elevation, provided the windows closest to the front façade are pulled back four to five feet from the edge; and approval of the reconstruction of the rear facade, provided the proposed fourth-story window and door are flipped and a door is installed in the northern bay to maintain the historic appearance of the elevator shaft; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install six-over-six wood windows in the front façade, cut five new window openings with stone sills and install six-over-six windows in the side facade, and demolish and rebuild the rear façade in brick. The rear facade is in poor condition and an engineer's report states that it is pulling away from the building. It has one door and one window opening at each of the three floors. Several of the openings have been significantly altered. The new façade would reflect the new interior program of the building. It would have French door with railing at the second floor and a balcony at the fourth floor.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Ken Haywood and mason Gary Martin represented the application.

Mr. Wilds stated that the new windows proposed for the side façade were not appropriate. He observed that they would be highly visible to the public and noted that the existing window pattern is a character-defining feature of this type of building. Mr. Wilds claimed that the windows would create a false sense of history. Mr. Schaaf agreed. He suggested a compromise that would allow the proposed windows in the middle bay, but not the windows at the east bay, nearest the front façade.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Haywood to explain the interior program and the need for the windows. Mr. Haywood stated that the building is only 14 feet wide. The extra windows would provide better light to the interior. Mr. Wilds asked about the interior plan. Mr. Haywood stated that it is an open plan. Mr. Wilds noted that, if the two windows nearest to the front façade were eliminated, the interior spaces would all still have windows. Mr. Haywood stated that he could accept the deletion of the two windows nearest the front facade.

Mr. Martin told the Commission that he is currently working at 45 N. 3rd Street, where he is cutting 22 new windows into a party wall. He asked the Commission to explain the difference between the two projects. Mr. Thomas stated the façade in question at this property is a principal façade; the other is not.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the window replacement for the front façade; approve the new window cuts and windows in the center bay, but deny those proposed for the front bay of the side elevation; and approve the reconstruction of the rear facade, provided the proposed fourth-story window and door are flipped and a door is installed in the northern bay to maintain the historic appearance of the elevator shaft; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

4130 CHERRY LANE, HASSERICK HOUSE

Owner: Earthstar Bank

Nominator: Laura Vanaskie, intern, Philadelphia Historical Commission

Proposal: Designate to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that 4130 Cherry Lane satisfies designation criteria d and e and should therefore be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Hasserick House of the late 1950s is the best example of the style known as Mid-Century Modernism in Philadelphia. The house was designed by Richard Neutra, the world renowned architect who brought the International Style to the United States from Europe with Rudolf Schindler in the 1920s and then developed the Mid-Century Modernism style with Charles and Ray Eames and others after World War II in Los Angeles. He trained and worked with famous architects Adolf Loos and Eric Mendelsohn in Europe and Frank Lloyd Wright in the U.S. His Lovell House in Los Angeles of 1927-29 and Kaufmann Desert House in Palm Springs of 1946 are icons of Modern architecture. Neutra, who was featured on the cover of Time Magazine in 1949, is considered one of the most influential architects of the twentieth century. Although the Hasserick House is an excellent example of the Mid-Century Modernist style, it also evidences the influence of the regional materials, climate, and landscape. The Hasserick House satisfies Designation Criteria d and e. It embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style and is the work of an architect whose production has significantly influenced the architectural development of the nation and world.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the nomination to the Commission. Property owners John Hauser and George Acosta attended the meeting.

Mr. Acosta explained that their mortgage agreement with Earthstar Bank requires that they oppose any historic designation of the property. Mr. Wilds observed that they had satisfied their obligation with their letter to the Commission opposing the designation. Messrs. Acosta and Hauser detailed their efforts to restore the property. They stated that they have researched Neutra's other projects including the Kaufman House in Palm Springs and have investigated archived records. Mr. Sherman asked if the other Commissioners had ever encountered such a stipulation in a mortgage. The Commissioners responded that they had not. Mr. Hauser noted that the house is located next to the Philadelphia University, which offered a much higher price for the property with the condition that the house was demolished. He stated that, if he defaulted on his mortgage, the bank would sell the property to the University, which would attempt to demolish the building. Mr. Acosta again stated that the bank would consider them in default of the agreement if they did not object to the designation. He noted that the bank might lift the stipulation once the rehabilitation is completed. Mr. Wilds assured Mr. Acosta that the record would reflect their objections to the designation.

Mr. Sherman asked his fellow Commissioners if they would consent to tabling the nomination. Ms. Merriman asserted that the Commission should act on the nomination at this meeting. The other Commissioners agreed, noting that the house should be protected from Philadelphia University, which has a history of demolishing historic buildings.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and to find that 4130 Cherry Lane satisfies designation criteria d and e and

to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 10:15 a.m. Mr. Schaaf 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 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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Not Recommended: Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration

based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and installing additional entrances or porches on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e. limiting such alteration to such non-character-defining elevations.

Setting Guidelines: Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character.

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

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guidelines: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

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