

**THE MINUTES OF THE 522<sup>ND</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
10 FEBRUARY 2006**

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

**PRESENT**

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

James Brown IV

Warren Huff, Deputy Director, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce

Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to Council President Verna

David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Denise Smyler, Esq.

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Scott Wilds, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist

Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, City Law Department

**ALSO PRESENT**

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance

Jody Della Barba, Girard Estates Area Residents

Joseph Loonstyn, Owner, 532 N. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street

Gerry Gutierrez, Group G, Inc

Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects

James Garrison, Hillier

J.P. Donohue, Loomis McAfee Architects

Daniel Collins, FESPP

Barry Jacobson, Mattress Giant

Larry Link, PennDOT

Monica Harrower, PennDOT

George Lyons, Chestnut Hill Historical Society

Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development Inc.

Elizabeth Amisson, A.D. Marble & Co.

Harry Laspee, Pennoni Associates

Larry Link, PennDOT

Nathan Dobbs, Pennoni Associates

Frances Jones, Assistant General Manager for Governmental Affairs, SEPTA

David Waxman, Rector Street Associates, C.P.

Michael Shannon, Michael Shannon Designs

Devin Bates, Michael Shannon Designs

Jamar Kelly, State Representative Rosita Youngblood

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

John Mascaro, Mascaro Construction  
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison  
Audrey Jaros, 421 Catharine Street  
Joseph G. Brin, 746 E. Passyunk Avenue  
Robert Powers, Powers & Company  
Gregory Dudzek, 515-517 S. Juniper Street  
Jayant Goyle, 515-517 S. Juniper Street  
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council  
Tiffany Strother, J.K. Roller Architects  
Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects  
Geoff Flournay, BRP Development Group  
Mark Wieand, Bowers Lewis Thrower  
John Bower, Bower Lewis Thrower  
Neale Quenzel, John Milner Associates, Inc.  
Allison Fritch, Tackett & Company  
Sheldon Bell, Bower Lewis Thrower  
Gail Harrity, Philadelphia Museum of Art  
Richard Thom, Yaron Properties  
Andrew McGinnis, Northwest Coalition  
Reverend Neale, Church of the Holy Trinity  
Peter Ryker, Church of the Holy Trinity

#### **522<sup>ND</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 522<sup>nd</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

#### **MINUTES OF THE 521<sup>ST</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the corrected minutes of the 521<sup>st</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held January 13, 2006, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

#### **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 31 JANUARY 2006**

Vincent Rivera, Chair

**WITHDRAWALS AND CONTINUANCES:** Mr. Farnham announced that the applications for 2403 Panama Street and 223-225 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Street had been withdrawn at the requests of the applicants. He also informed the Commission that the applicants for 244 S. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, a.k.a. 2400 Rittenhouse Square Street, were not in attendance, but requested in writing that the Commission continue their application, which appears under old business on today's agenda. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the chair or historic preservation officer should have the power to grant extended continuances. Mr. Farnham explained that the granting of continuances is governed by the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the power to grant extended continuances be conferred upon the chair and the preservation officer. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that any policy change regarding continuances should be implemented with an amendment to the *Rules & Regulations*.

**ACTION:** Mr. Sugrue resolved that the Commission should amend its continuance policy in the *Rules & Regulations* and confer the power to grant extended continuances for permit applications to the chair and historic preservation officer without referral to the Commission. Mr. Rivera seconded the resolution, which passed unanimously.

**ACTION:** Mr. Sugrue moved to table the application for 244 S. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, a.k.a. 2400 Rittenhouse Square Street, for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Rivera seconded the resolution, which passed with a vote of 9 to 0. Ms. Smyler abstained.

### **1723 PORTER STREET**

Owner: Louis and Mary Lou Accivatti

Applicant: William Schwartz, Esq.

History: 1906, John Windrim, architect

Project: legalize rear addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standard 9

**OVERVIEW:** This application seeks to legalize a rear addition that is taller than that approved by the Commission. The twin stands on the north side of Porter Street; the rear is entirely visible from Roseberry Street. This property has a long and complicated history with the Commission.

In September 2003, the current owner purchased the property. Soon thereafter, he demolished the historic rear porch without a permit or Commission approval. In November 2003, he submitted an application to the Commission for the construction of a two-story rear addition and numerous other alterations to the building. The Commission legalized the demolition and approved the addition on 12 December 2003. On 16 December, a staff member met with the owner at the site to discuss the project, the Commission's approval, and the processing of the application. That meeting is summarized in a letter to the owner dated 17 December. The Commission's staff placed the approval stamp on the drawings and permit application on 18 December. A side elevation included as part of those approved drawings clearly showed the roof of the addition aligning with the roof of the historic building; the elevation drawing dimensioned the height of the addition as 23'-5". A section drawing included with the plans dimensioned the height of the addition as 25'-8 5/8". The location of the section was not indicated on any of the plans or elevations; without a context, the dimension is therefore ambiguous.

In 2004, as the addition was under construction, neighbors and representatives of the local civic association called the Commission to report that the work was not complying with approved plans. A subsequent inspection showed that the owner did not comply with conditions related to staff reviews of windows, pointing, and painting removal for the historic portion of the building. Moreover, several aspects of the rear addition did not comply with the approved plans. The rear façade under construction differed significantly from the approved plans. In July 2004, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations because the owner failed to obtain Commission approval and permits for the revisions to the plans. In August 2004, during the construction, the owner submitted an

application to the Commission to legalize the new design for the addition that included a deck, balcony, and basement entrance. The additional height of the building was not addressed with this application. On 10 September 2004, the Commission approved the balcony, deck, and basement steps as well as some modifications to a rear fence. The Commission's staff placed the approval stamp on the drawings and permit application on 4 October 2004.

In late 2004 and early 2005, the owner continued to work on the building, exceeding the Commission's approvals and the Department's permits. An approved window was not included in the side façade of the addition. Most importantly, the addition was erected more than 2 feet above the approved level, the roofline of the historic building. On the original addition plans approved on 18 December 2003, the height of the rear addition is dimensioned on the side elevation as 23'-5". A side elevation is not included and the height of the rear addition is not dimensioned on the revised plans approved on 4 October 2004. On the current plans, the height of the rear addition is dimensioned on the side elevation as 25'-9"; it is 2'-4" taller than originally approved. The Department issued additional violations including a stop work-cease operations order effective 9 February 2005.

The owner and his legal counsel appealed the order to the Board of License & Inspection Review. City Council President Verna and the Girard Estate Area Residents, the neighborhood's civic association, opposed the legalization of the rear addition as built. The Board heard the appeal on 24 May 2005 and rejected it, affirming the City. The owner has appealed the Board's decision to the Court of Common Pleas; that appeal is pending.

The current application describes the proposed work as:

Amendment of Plan #3698-C-03 and Building Permit #162555 issued 12-29-03 to conform to as built plan for rear wall of two (2) story addition.

The proposal as presented in the description appears flawed. A representative of the applicant's counsel has stated that the applicant is seeking to legalize all aspects of the addition, not merely its "rear wall." Also, the submitted architectural drawing, which includes side and rear elevations, depicts the basement vinyl slider windows in the historic portion of the building that were installed without the Commission's approval. A representative of the applicant's counsel has stated that the applicant is not seeking to legalize the basement windows or any work to the historic portion of the building with this application. Also a typographical error in the drawing proposes to "clean and repaint brick." Instead of "repaint," it should read "repoint."

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Neither the applicant nor the owner attended the meeting to represent the application before the Commission.

Ms. Murray asked if it would be prudent for the Commission to consider this application with the case pending before the Court of Common Pleas. Mr. Wilds stated that the staff did not have the authority to reject the application and concluded that the Commission must consider it. Mr. Sklaroff noted the Zoning Board's one-year rule, which disallows subsequent reviews of a denied plan within one year. He requested that Mr. Farnham and Mr. Reuter investigate the rules regarding the acceptance of applications for projects already reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Smyler opined that the Commission

may lack authority owing to the case now pending in court.

Jody Della Barba, the president of the Girard Estate Area Residents, which represents 1500 families in the area, voiced her group's continued opposition to this project. She asserted that an approval of this application would signal to other property owners in district that they need not comply with the Commission. She asserted that the illegal addition is an eyesore. Ms. Della Barba requested that the Commission deny the application. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the construction significantly exceeded the Commission's approval. Mr. Sklaroff thanked the neighborhood association for its participation.

**ACTION:** Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1214 ARCH STREET**

Owner: 1214 Arch Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development

History: The A.H. Mershon Building, Milligan & Webber, architects, 1907

Project: Infill windows and add light well with balconies in party wall; infill and add windows and doors in rear wall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the lightwell, provided the historic party-wall windows are retained; approval of the rear façade, provided the brick infill is recessed slightly to reveal the original brick and concrete frame; approval of the storefront alterations, provided the historic, three-light transom is retained and restored and provided the historic double-leaf doors or single-leaf doors replicating the historic doors are installed; with the staff to review the details; pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Storefronts Guideline.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes adding a light well with balconies in the east-facing party wall; removing the rear façade and adding brick infill, windows, and garage and pedestrian doors; and rebuilding the storefront on Arch Street.

The application proposes cutting a large vertical notch from the second to the eighth floors at the mid-point of the east-facing party wall and adding an aluminum and glass light well with balconies in the notch. The east party wall is highly visible from 12<sup>th</sup> and Arch Streets.

In 2002, the Commission reviewed an application to infill and add windows at the same east party wall. It approved the addition of numerous windows, but denied infilling several historic windows. The Commission required that the windows be retained, but suggested that they be blocked from the inside, if necessary, to accommodate the new interior plans. The approved work was not undertaken. Also note that the Board of Building Standards granted a variance in 1999 allowing the retention and addition of windows in the party wall, provided the openings were sprinklered and would be sealed if a building was constructed on the adjacent lot. A ramp to the parking garage to the south now runs across the adjacent lot.

The rear façade faces Cuthbert Street, a service alley bounded on the south by a large parking garage. Currently, the building's brick and concrete frame is exposed on the

exterior; the ground floor is infilled with stucco and loading dock doors; the upper floors are infilled with metal and glass panel systems. The infill is not original, but was added later, probably in the middle of the twentieth century. The non-historic infill would be removed and replaced with brick. A metal garage door and two pedestrian doors would be added at the ground floor; coupled double-hung or casement windows would be added at the upper floors.

The storefront would be rehabilitated. Initially, the application proposed new doors replicating the historic doors in the outer bays; a revised application submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting proposes non-historic single-leaf doors with sidelights. The storefront window with transom would be altered to accommodate an interior partition that divides the interior space and runs up to the storefront window. A center mullion would be added to the storefront window to hide the end of the wall; the three-light transom would be converted to a two-light transom, also to hide the wall.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff objected to the use of the word “mimicking” in the minute. Mr. Wilds requested the word “replicating” be used in its place.

The Commission discussed the Architectural Committee’s recommendation that single-leaf doors, if employed, replicate the appearance of the historic double-leaf doors at the storefront. Ms. Murray asked if the doors would be ADA compliant. Mr. Schaaban stated that he would prefer the single-leaf door with the side light, not a single-leaf door replicating the historic door. He also stated that a single-leaf door would be ADA compliant. The Commission deemed the non-historic single-leaf door with sidelight inappropriate.

William Schwartz, Esq., the attorney for 1723 Porter Street matter, which the Commission had already acted on, interrupted the proceedings and requested that his application be continued rather than denied. Mr. Sklaroff asked whether any Commissioner would move to reopen the matter. No Commissioner offered a motion. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated the Commission’s earlier decision to deny the legalization application.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee’s recommendation and approve the lightwell, provided the historic party-wall windows are retained; the rear façade, provided the brick infill is recessed slightly to reveal the original brick and concrete frame; and the storefront alterations, provided the historic, three-light transom is retained and restored and provided the historic double-leaf doors or single-leaf doors replicating the historic doors are installed; with the staff to review the details; pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10, and the Storefronts Guideline. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Brown arrived at the meeting and joined the Commission.

## **7241-7652 GERMANTOWN AVENUE**

Owner: PennDOT

Applicant: Larry Link, PennDOT

History: Germantown Avenue: first tracks for horse-drawn trolley, 1858-59, repaved with granite block around the track system, 1874, repaved with granite block, 1920

Project: Replace granite block paving in tracks with concrete

Architectural Committee Recommendation: table the application and direct the Architectural Committee to hold a special meeting on the application

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to reconstruct these blocks of Germantown Avenue, a street in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The street currently has granite block and two sets of tracks for the Route 23 Trolley line, which occasionally runs. This stretch of Germantown Avenue has a mix of materials, with one block consisting of granite block paving on the sides and concrete in the track area, another block with the reverse paving pattern and a stretch with full-width concrete. The rest of the project area has granite block from curb to curb. Recently SEPTA paved asphalt over the track area. The reconstruction will consist of relaying the granite block on the sides of the cartway, but installing concrete in the area along the tracks. The concrete will be untinted and plain concrete to match similar blocks along the Avenue and be consistent with previous approvals of the Historical Commission. One new feature will be added at 7500 Germantown Avenue in front of the New Covenant Church. At this location, Germantown Avenue has a curve and becomes much wider than other portions. The proposal includes installing a recessed granite curb along this stretch to demarcate the roadway from the parking area.

The Winston Road segment of the project has been withdrawn.

The project also includes new lighting, sidewalks and other street improvements; however, these alterations fall outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. The Street Paving Thematic District encompasses the cartways only. The curbs and everything outside the curbs are not designated.

The Historical Commission reviewed the reconstruction of the 3700-4000 blocks of Germantown Avenue in 1999 and 2000. At that time, the Commission created an AD-hoc Committee to explore the possibility of reusing the granite block within the track area. The Committee concluded that the use of the new T-rail precluded the use of the granite block in the track area. The Committee also discussed the treatment of the concrete in the track area. It was agreed that untinted, plain concrete proved to be the most maintenance-free and consistent along Germantown Avenue. The applicant has submitted a detailed report that discusses the availability of girder rails (which are currently in place) and the associated costs and problems with installing granite block in the track area. The conclusions presented in this application are consistent with those found by the Ad-hoc Committee in 2000.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Larry Link and Monica Harrower of PennDOT, Harry Laspee and Nathan Dobbs of Pennoni Associates, Elizabeth Amisson of A.D. Marble & Co., and Frances Jones, Assistant General Manager for Governmental Affairs for SEPTA, represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if 9" girder rails are available anywhere in the world. He also asked if state agencies can purchase steel outside the commonwealth. He asked if any hard

facts related to the purchase of the girder rails had been established. Mr. Farnham responded that the applicants claim that the rails are not available, but the opponents claim that they are. Mr. Laspee stated that girder rail is available, but girder rail with a 9" depth is not available. Mr. Sklaroff asked for confirmation that the extant rail is 9" girder rail. Mr. Laspee confirmed that the 9" girder rail is needed to repave with granite block. Mr. Sugrue asked if 7.5" girder rail could be used. Mr. Laspee stated that it could not be used with the block. He pointed to a section drawing in the supplemental material.

Several Commissioners asked when the trolleys last ran regularly on Germantown Avenue. The applicants responded that the trolleys ran until 1996. Mr. Laspee reported that the track reconstruction would allow the trolley to run again; he added, however, that SEPTA had no definitive plan to reinstate the trolley service.

George Lyons of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society introduced himself. He noted that SEPTA has not allocated the money to restart the trolley service. Turning to the rail question, he asserted that although they are not a stock item, the 9" girder rails could be manufactured. He also suggested the use of thinner granite blocks with the 7.5" rails. Mr. Laspee explained that thinner blocks and a shallow bed for the blocks are not viable solutions. He asserted that compromising on the depths of the blocks or bed would result in a roadway surface that would deteriorate rapidly. He also noted that some stretches of the Avenue that are currently paved curb-to-curb with concrete would have granite block restored in the outer lanes. He also highlighted the alleged safety problems with the blocks; the section at New Covenant Church has a long history of traffic accidents. Mr. Sugrue asked how much of Germantown Avenue is currently paved with granite block. Mr. Laspee explained that the Avenue is paved with concrete in the track area and block in the outer lanes from Windrim to Ashmead; curb-to-curb granite block with concrete patches from Ashmead to Church Lane; concrete in the track area and block in the outer lanes from Church to Allens Lane; concrete only from Allens Lane to Gowen; curb-to-curb granite block with concrete patches from Gowen to Mermaid; and concrete in the track area and block in the outer lanes from Mermaid to the end of the line at the top of the hill at Bethlehem Pike. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the two stretches under review are the last two with curb-to-curb granite block. Mr. Laspee agreed.

Ms. Smyler excused herself from the meeting.

Mr. Laspee explained that the projects would result in a reduction in granite block on the stretches of the Avenue of approximately 12%. He explained that some areas of concrete would be restored back to block and that large areas of the track area along the Avenue were already concrete. He concluded that the proposed projects would visually unify the Avenue. Mr. Laspee stated that he had worked very hard to find a compromise. He conceded that it would not please everyone, but that it did address all of the issues.

Mr. James asked the applicants what rail they intended to use. Mr. Laspee stated that Septa, not PennDOT, had decided to use the 7-5/8" T-rail, not the 9" girder rail. Mr. Sugrue asked if the new rail would be compatible with the old. Mr. Link stated that it would and showed a photograph of the two types linking together. Mr. Sugrue asked if it would be possible to relay the block with the new rail. Mr. Laspee displayed samples of the smaller and larger granite blocks. He stated that the smaller block does not hold up well in traffic. Mr. Wilds contended that installing the smaller blocks on the Avenue would not constitute a restoration.

Mr. Lyons asserted that the large granite block could be cut to fit the shorter track. Mr. Lyons conceded that he is not an engineer, but claimed that the applicants' supplementary report clearly states that thinner block can be used. Mr. Sklaroff asked if thinner block on a concrete base would be stable. Mr. Laspee stated that it would not be stable. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission did not have enough information to make a decision with certainty.

Mr. Lyons addressed the question of safety. He stated that the block itself was not unsafe; the dangers resulted from aggressive drivers and poor road conditions. He claimed that pavement is considered a contributing factor in what he called the Historic Germantown National Historic Landmark. He also noted that the Commission has required property owners to spend considerably on repairs and therefore should require the same of the state agency.

Monica Harrower of PennDOT stepped forward to discuss the Section 106 question. She explained that she had met with interested parties including a Commission staff member at the site to discuss the project. She also explained that PennDOT's consultant, A.D. Marble, had produced a Determination of Effects Report as part of the Section 106 process. She stated that the report concluded that the project would have no adverse effect on some resources and no effect on others. She informed the Commission that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) had concurred with the findings. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Farnham to comment on Ms. Harrower's assertions. Mr. Farnham stated that Richard Tyler, the former preservation officer, had been involved in the early stages of the process and had requested that the Commission have an opportunity to comment as a consulting party. He also noted that Laura Spina, formerly of the Commission's staff, had attended the site visit. Mr. Sklaroff asked for additional clarifications. Mr. Farnham explained that PennDOT hired a consultant to prepare the Determination of Effects Report, which is being evaluated by PHMC. The Historical Commission comments on the report to PHMC, but does not make the final determination, which is made by PHMC. He added that the Commission has not yet registered its comments. Mr. Lyons contended that because the National Historic District is a National Historic Landmark, the federal Advisory Council must make the final determination. Ms. Harrower corrected Mr. Lyons, stating that the Advisory Council becomes involved only if it is determined that the project will result in an adverse effect. She also noted that Mr. Lyons had based his testimony on outdated versions of the regulations, which had been amended twice since his were published.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance distributed a set of cross-sectional engineering drawings of proposed solutions to the rail and pavement design, which he personally prepared. He claimed that it is possible to use 7" or 7-5/8" T-rail with curb-to-curb granite block. He stated that the 5200 to 5400 block section of Germantown Avenue is bounded by properties of great historical significance. He avowed that the extra money should be spent in this area to lay curb-to-curb block to maintain the historic integrity of the area. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the Avenue was a dirt road when the important eighteenth-century houses were erected. He observed that the granite block reflects nineteenth-century Germantown, not colonial Germantown. Mr. Gallery countered that the general public associates the granite block with the historic buildings and that the block adds to the "historic ambience of the area." Mr. Laspee stated that, as a professional engineer, he must note some deficiencies in Mr. Gallery's proposal. He stated that the proposed 3"-deep block would not remain secure under traffic loads. Mr. Sklaroff asked if 5"-deep block within the rails would be sufficient. Mr. Laspee stated that it would require extra

formwork, increasing the cost, and that it would not be stable because the setting bed would be too shallow. He added that any engineering decisions for the track area were not his, but SEPTA's. Mr. Perri stated that he is not a transit engineer, but he is a professional engineer. He remarked that the matter would need to be thoroughly evaluated before any conclusions could be reached. Mr. Laspee concluded that the solution offered in the application is a reasonable compromise that accounts for many concerns. Mr. Wilds agreed, stating that he was a member of the Commission's special committee. He opined that the evidence presented is not sufficient to cause him to change his mind about the findings of that committee.

Andrew McGuiness, a former employee of both PennDOT and SEPTA and a member of the Northwest Transportation Committee, addressed the Commission. He provided a thorough overview of the historic system for paving with granite block around trolley rails. He stated that the use of a mastic sealer is essential for paving with granite block in the track area. He noted that it was used on Old York Road and opined that it will last a very long time, provided it is patched properly after all utility work. He concluded that a long-established engineering system exists for paving the track area on Germantown Avenue with granite block.

Mr. Laspee stated that using mastic would create dark joints between the granite blocks, which would not provide a historic appearance. Mr. Link added that visual continuity is a key issue. He could not guarantee continuity if mastic was used because SEPTA, PennDOT, and private utility workers would all be working in the street. He stated that he would like the Commission to approve this project and allow it to move forward.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that it would be appropriate to table these proposals for a month to allow an independent engineer to review the technical issues. Mr. Link responded that one month is not nearly enough time for an engineer to provide a report. He added that this project has already experienced delays. Mr. Wilds asked when the Section 106 review would be complete. Ms. Harrower responded that she has requested that all comments be forwarded to PHMC by March 6; PHMC will render a decision within 30 days.

Mr. James stated that owing to community interest and the testimony of Mr. McGuiness, which offered historical perspective, the applications should be tabled to allow for further review. Ms. Merriman stated that she is more concerned with the two sections under review and the historic fabric than she is with visual continuity along the entire Avenue.

Mr. McGuiness asked if the sections with concrete currently in the track area had been treated with any weatherproofing. Mr. Laspee stated that the concrete had been treated with linseed oil.

The Commission appointed Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Perri, James, and Rivera to a committee to investigate the matter and commission an engineer's report.

**ACTION:** Mr. Sugrue moved to table the application for a period not to exceed four months. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff recused from the review of 3 Rector Street because an employee is a client of his firm.

### **3 RECTOR STREET**

Owner: Raymond Labov

Applicants: David Waxman & Alon Barzilay

Project: Demolish roof, add 4-story addition and parking

History: bet. 1876 and 1879 as the office for Archibald Campbell & Co. textile mills

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial, pursuant to Property Maintenance Code 704.2.3 [Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed.]; and 704.2.7 [Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.].

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes in concept the conversion of an industrial building to residential use. In the spring of 2005, the current applicants applied to the Commission to demolish the historic building and erect an entirely new residential building. The Commission denied the demolition application in June 2005. The applicants appealed the denial to the Board of Building Standards, which upheld the Commission's decision. The applicants appealed to the Board of Building Standards decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review; that appeal is pending.

The conversion of the historic industrial building to residential use would entail the removal of most of the historic roof and the erection of a new structure inside the historic walls. The new structure would stand four stories above the historic building and have a contemporary design with banks of industrial-looking, multi-light windows. The east and west facades would have balconies. The project also stipulates parking at the lower level, with the garage entrance on the main façade and a ramp in the interior along the towpath façade of the building.

The building has three highly visible façades: the front, pedimented façade that faces Rector Street and is visible from Main Street; the east façade, also visible from Rector and Main Streets; and the two-story west façade that faces the towpath.

The application includes information on an advertising campaign for Manayunk that highlights the canal and towpath; several articles that emphasize the importance of the canal; financial information and an affidavit from the owner supporting demolition of the property; and support letters for the project.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Developer David Waxman, architect Jonathan Broh, and attorney Brett Feldman represented the project.

Mr. Feldman provided an overview of the project including its involvement with the Commission. He explained that the property housed a plumbing and heating supply company for many years until 2001. Since 2001, it has been vacant. The owner is incurring approximately \$34,000 per year in carrying costs including taxes and insurance. Mr. Feldman stated the building covers 100% of the lot, constricting any possible additions. Many efforts have been made to market this property. In 2005, his client submitted an application to the Commission to demolish the building. The Commission denied the demolition. He appealed the denial to the Board of Building Standards. He stated that the Board of Building Standards was unsure how to review the appeal because of its lack of experience with the historical properties. It voted to uphold

the denial with a vote of 2 to 1. Owing to the lack of parking and loading zones, this building is obsolete and not suited for industrial use. Mr. Feldman noted the significance of the building is related to Manayunk's industrial past. He displayed the latest proposal to add to the building. Mr. Feldman lamented the deteriorating conditions of the building, but Mr. Sugrue pointing out that the current owner is responsible for its continued maintenance. Mr. Feldman requested that the Commission approve in concept the proposed massing diagram. Mr. Sugrue questioned the fenestration on the canal façade. Mr. Broh provided an overview of the basement parking. The parking entrance will be located on the Rector Street facade. A ramp will run down from the entrance to the basement along the canal façade. The basement, which will be expanded 10 feet under the sidewalk, will provide approximately 18 parking spaces. Mr. Broh stated that screens would be installed in the window openings for ventilation. Mr. Sugrue felt the most significant issue is the relationship of the building to the canal. He stated that the canal is an important but underutilized asset. Mr. Feldman assured him that the team is dedicated to making the development as attractive as possible. He also noted the importance of parking for the project. Mr. Wilds questioned the design of the parking opening and asked if its impact on the façade could be reduced. Mr. Broh stated the ramp is very aggressively pitched at 16%-18%.

Ms. Merriman asked about the flood levels at this property. Mr. Feldman remarked that they had consulted with the City Planning Commission. He also noted that parking is a good use for the lower level. He also stated that there would be a single entrance in and out of the garage to keep the opening as small as possible. It would use a red and green-light traffic control system. Mr. James, who felt that the front façade must retain as much of its original fabric as possible, expressed his opposition to a large opening for the parking. Mr. Feldman reiterated that the building is too small for parking entrances anywhere else. The rear wall is on the property line.

Ms. Murray asked if the appeal would be withdrawn if the concept is approved. Mr. Feldman replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Sugrue opined that the proposal appeared, essentially, to be a "facadectomy." He suggested that it was no better than the complete demolition. Mr. James also expressed concerns.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission is operating under the Manayunk ordinance, not the historic preservation ordinance. Under the preservation ordinance, a finding of financial hardship would be necessary for an approval of the proposed project. There is no means to resolve this question under the Manayunk ordinance. It has no hardship provision. He stated that, if the Commission denies the proposal, the developers have no options. He recommended that the Commission approve a proposal for this site, but one with a better and more interesting design. Mr. Reuter responded, stating that there is an option. The applicants could appeal to the Board of Building Standards for a variance based on financial hardship. He remarked that the Commission should not decide this case based on a perceived hardship; the Manayunk ordinance has no hardship provision.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that it would be premature to accept this design; a better design should be demanded. The Council contends that reuse is the best use of the building. He rejected the proposal, which would require major changes to a historical building, and asked for a more stringent application of the

rules.

Councilman Michael Nutter spoke to the Commission in support of this project. He requested that the Commission be flexible and give this developer an opportunity to work with the staff to develop an appropriate design. He recognized that this property is challenging and unique. He noted the significant efforts already expended by the applicants in search of an appropriate solution.

Mr. James suggested that the developers retain the historic weathering of the building and respond to its history.

Mr. Huff stated that the towpath frontage is very important. He suggested that the landscaping treatment be sensitive at this location. He also suggested creating a pedestrian and bicycle access to the building from the towpath.

Mr. Sugrue emphasized that great care must be taken with the design due to the context and the visual impact it would have on the views from Main and Rector Streets and the towpath. Mr. Brown stressed that the parking entrance design must be thoroughly considered. Mr. Gallery stated that four stories may be too many for the addition. Mr. Wilds responded that four is acceptable, but he would also consider five. Mr. Huff suggested that the garage entrance, which will be within the historic building, should not be modern in style, but should be compatible with the historic structure.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal in concept with a four-story addition set back at least ten feet from the Rector Street facade and a garage opening no more than ten feet wide. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Ms. Merriman recused from the review of 421 Catharine Street owing to a personal relationship with the applicant.

#### **421 CATHARINE STREET**

Owners/Applicants: Audrey Jaros and Piers Merchants

History: 1832

Project: Demolish rear, add 3-story addition and deck in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of Scheme B without the elevated walkway, associated door, and alterations to the garage including the deck

**OVERVIEW:** This 2½-story house dates to 1832 and retains its original configuration, which includes a main section with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. The house has an arch-head dormer on the front and a pedimented dormer on the rear, typical of the Greek Revival period. A one-story garage sits at the rear of the property along Fulton Street. The upper stories of the rear of the house are visible from the Fulton Street. In November 2005, the Historical Commission approved in concept a three-story addition on the rear of the house that would engulf the rear ell and shift the rear dormer upward toward the ridge line.

The applicants now propose three schemes for the stucco-faced, three-story rear addition. All include a second-floor, elevated walkway that leads to a roof deck on the

garage. The garage would be enlarged to the full width of the property and simulated-divided light windows would be installed on the rear facade.

Scheme A, the first of the three rear addition designs, proposes a three-story addition that would be built in the void beside the extant rear ell, leaving the ell in place. At the third floor, the new addition would have a curved wall at the joint with the main block of the rowhouse, allowing the rear dormer to remain in place.

Scheme B proposes a three-story addition in the void beside the extant rear ell, leaving the ell in place. This scheme does not include a notch at the third floor to accommodate the historic dormer, requiring the dormer to be shifted to a point above the historic rear ell.

Scheme C proposes for the complete demolition of the historic rear ell, rear wall of the main block, rear roof, and rear dormer and the construction of a three-story rear addition as wide as the main block of the house.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Audrey Jaros, the owner, and Joseph Brin, her architect, represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicants if they accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Jaros responded she was agreeable to the Committee's recommendation of Plan B. However, she would like the Commission to approve the walkway, garage, and deck alterations. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the Committee did not recommend approval of those modifications. Mr. Farnham informed the Commission that the Committee had not reviewed the walkway, garage, and deck alterations because the applicant had unilaterally withdrawn them from her application at the Committee meeting. Ms. Jaros offered at the Committee to submit a subsequent application to the Commission for the walkway, garage, and deck alterations. Ms. Jaros acknowledged that that had occurred at the Committee meeting and agreed to accept the Committee recommendation.

**ACTION:** Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve Scheme B without the elevated walkway, associated door, and alterations to the garage including the deck. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Ms. Merriman recused.

### **239 CHESTNUT STREET**

Owner: Fresher Start Corporation

Applicant: Noelle Parris Huie

History: 1852, Stephen D. Button, architect; cast-iron by Daniel D. Bader of Architectural Iron Works, New York – significant in Old City Historic District

Project: Add roof deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roof Guideline

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install a roof deck on the southern portion of the building for use by the condominium owner who owns the uppermost floors of both 239 and 241 Chestnut Street. A hatch at the rear of the building would provide access to the roof and concrete pavers along the roof would connect the hatch and deck. The deck,

which would measures approximately 24 feet square, would have a metal-rimmed glass railing. It would be situated 18 feet back from the front face of the building. The owner has stated in writing that he will not build a deck on 241 Chestnut Street.

In August 2005, the current applicant proposed a similar, but larger deck located at the front of this building. The Architectural Committee struck a compromise and recommended approval of a smaller deck, which would have been set back 18 feet from the front façade to avoid visibility. At the Commission's September 2005 meeting, a motion to approve the compromise deck failed; a motion to deny the application carried. The applicant was not present at the Commission meeting to state her case. The applicant appealed the Commission's denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board affirmed the City, but suggested that the applicant resubmit the proposal for the smaller, set-back deck to the Commission for a new review.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. John Wagner, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Reuter clarified that the Board of License & Inspection Review had affirmed the City in the appeal related to the earlier proposal for a larger deck. Mr. Sugrue noted that the vote on the previous application was 2 to 7. This application proposes a similar, but smaller deck.

Mr. Sklaroff remarked that this building is without a rear ell, the appropriate location for decks on historic buildings. He added that, even on rear ells, decks should not to be visible from the public street.

Mr. James asked if Commission had reviewed numerous applications for this property in the recent past. Mr. Sugrue volunteered that the Commission had reviewed several for the property to the west, but not this one.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the deck would be visible. Mr. Wagner stated that it would not.

Mr. Wilds asked why the deck was not located at the rear of the building. Mr. Wagner stated that the rear was not feasible owing to mechanical equipment and a skylight.

Mr. Wagner explained that his client, the owner of the top floor at 239, also owns the top floor at 241. In a letter, the owner stated he would not seek to erect a deck at 241. Ms. Murray noted that the letter was not in the application file and asked that a copy be presented. Mr. Wagner produced a copy of the letter. Mr. Sklaroff observed that the letter is not binding.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stated that his group had not reviewed the proposal, but that the Association does not object to decks that are not visible.

Mr. Wilds asked if a six-foot tall person standing at the front of the deck would be visible from the street. Mr. Wagner stated that he would not be visible.

**ACTION:** Ms. Murray moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roof Guideline. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Sugrue dissented.

### **515 & 517 S. JUNIPER STREET**

Owners/Applicants: Jayant Goyle & Gregory Dudzek

History: c. 1846

Project: Legalize stucco, new doors/frames

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approve the stucco at the rears and paint at the bases of the buildings, provided the incorrect doors and frames are replaced with historically appropriate doors and frames, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6

**OVERVIEW:** This application seeks to legalize the removal of the original door frames and the installation of non-historic frames and doors at two adjacent rowhouses. It also seeks to legalize rough stucco applied to the rear facades and paint to the bases of the front facades. Mr. Baron spoke with the contractor and the owner shortly before the work was undertaken and explained that any proposals for exterior work required the Commission's review. The applicant has explained that he based the doorway designs on other buildings in the area. The Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations for the illegal alterations at these and other buildings in the area at the same time.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Developers Jayant Goyle and Gregory Dudzek represented the application.

Mr. Goyle stated that the doors in place when they began their renovations were not historic, but were replacement doors. They installed six-panel wood doors based on the doors of neighboring homes. Mr. Goyle explained that at least 80% of the doors in the neighborhood were similar six-panel wood doors. Mr. Sklaroff inquired whether they had obtained a building permit prior to the replacement. Mr. Goyle replied that they initially planned to undertake interior work only; they had no intention of replacing the doors or windows. They obtained a permit for the interior work, but then decided to replace the doors and door frames. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri if a permit is required for this type of exterior work. Mr. Perri stated that a permit is required only when the building is designated as historic. A permit is not required to replace a door at a single-family dwelling that is not designated as historic. Referring to the minutes of the Architectural Committee meeting, Mr. Wilds noted that a staff member had advised the developers and their contractor before the work was undertaken that all exterior work would require permits. Mr. Goyle replied they were issued permits for the windows they installed, but had not sought permits for doors and door frames. Mr. Goyle stated that they had replicated the door and door frame of a nearby residence. The owner of the neighboring building had informed him that the Commission had approved his alterations.

Mr. Farnham explained to the Commission that the two buildings in question had retained their original door frames until the applicants began working, although not their original four-panel doors. At the time the work was undertaken, the entireties of the original Greek Revival door frames with transoms were removed. The applicants replaced the original frames with inappropriate Colonial revival door frames. He also noted that the door and frames on the nearby building that served as the model had been altered without the Commission approval. Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the buildings in question and the building used as a model to the Commission.

Mr. Wilds stated that if the applicants had heeded the staff's advice to seek permits for all exterior work, they would not now be in violation.

Mr. James asked if the application proposed the approval or the legalization of the stucco. Mr. Sklaroff responded that it is a legalization application and that the Committee is recommending the legalization of the stucco. Mr. James suggested that the legalizations be contingent upon the correct doors and frames being installed.

**ACTION:** Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the stucco at the rears and paint at the bases of the buildings, provided the incorrect doors and frames are replaced with historically appropriate doors and frames, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 3. Ms. Murray and Messrs. James and Huff dissented.

### **20-30 N. FRONT STREET**

Owner: 20-30 N Front Street, LLC

Applicant: Mark Wieand

History: built for Girard Estate 1830, additions c. 1850, All significant to district

Project: Demolish rear additions, construct five-story addition on 30 N Front Street, reconfigure roofline on 28 and 30 N. Front Street, Rehabilitate facades in concept  
Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the demolition of the original gabled roof structures at 28 and 30 N. Front but approval of fifth-floor additions if designed as full-width dormers leaving the gables intact; denial of the installation of the HVAC equipment at the peaks of the roofs but approval of the HVAC equipment if installed on the rear roof slopes and screened; approval of the remainder of the proposal including the rear demolition; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**OVERVIEW:** This proposal calls for the conversion of six brick warehouses into residential units with parking at the rear. They were constructed in 1830 for the Girard Estate. The five warehouses to the north were originally four-story buildings with very tall gable roofs. About twenty years after they were constructed, the tall gables at 22-26 N. Front were converted to a fifth floors by extending the brick walls at the front and rear and flattening the roof trusses creating a shallower gabled roof with a lower ridgepole. The buildings at 28 and 30 N. Front retain their original taller roof configuration, but front dormer additions have been added.

This application proposes the demolition of the rear ell of 30 N. Front and the gabled roof structures on 28 and 30 N. Front. A five-story addition would be constructed at the rear of 30 N. Front. New fifth floors would be added at 28 and 30 N. Front in place of the gabled roofs. HVAC units would be added at the peaks of the roofs behind a screen structure at 22-30 N. Front. New storefront windows as well as casement windows at the second through fifth floors of 22-30 N. Front would be installed, but no details have been provided.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. He noted that the developer was amenable to the suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee. He added that they planned to use old photographs to guide their redesign of the additions on the buildings at the north. Developer Geoff Flournay, architects John Bower and Mark Weiland, and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the application.

After Mr. Baron's introduction, Mr. Sklaroff turned the gavel over to Mr. Sugrue and excused himself from the meeting.

Mr. Bower displayed revised drawings of the project. The revised design included full-width dormers at 28 and 30 N. Front. The new design also included decks with stair towers on the main sections of the buildings at 22 to 26 N. Front. Mr. Bower explained that he would replace the stair towers with skylights that would open for access to the decks. The skylights would not be visible. Mr. Bower stated that he would move the decks to the rear and screen the mechanical units. The air-conditioning unit is about three feet square and will sit on a rack on the roof behind a screen wall. Mr. Bower asks that a roof deck be considered for 20 N. Front as well. Mr. Sugrue suggested that Mr. Bower refrain from presenting the decks, which were not included as part of the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the proposal was a great solution for the site.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stated that he was pleased with the proposal, but would prefer no new rooftop construction.

Mr. Fluornoy asked the Commission to grant approval for the decks at the rear of the buildings. Mr. Farnham stated that the Architectural Committee recommendation did not address the decks. He added that the Committee had stated clearly that its recommendation did not include the decks because they were not included with the initial application. They were first presented at the Architectural Committee meeting, without a staff recommendation or an opportunity for public review prior to the meeting.

Mr. Sugrue suggested that the applicants submit a new application to the Architectural Committee for a review of the decks.

Mr. Thom, representing the Old City Civic Association, remarked that his group is eager to have these building rehabilitated.

Shawn Evans, an architect and representative of Christ Church and the Elfreth's Alley Association, addressed the Commission. He requested that the Commission require the retention of the historic painted signs on the buildings. Messrs. Fluornoy and Powers stated that they have not yet prepared their masonry restoration plan. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission should grant an approval to remove the painted signs at this time. The applicant replied that he understood that he had not applied to nor would he be granted approval to remove the signs at this time.

**ACTION:** Mr. James moved to approve a revised proposal, which includes the demolition of the rear portions of the buildings, construction of a rear addition at 30 N. Front Street, installation of rooftop HVAC on the rear slopes, construction of full-width dormer additions on 28-30 North Front Street, the retention of the original roof structures at 20-30 North Front Street, and restoration of the facades, but does not include decks, windows, or the removal of painted signs, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1904 WALNUT STREET**

Owner: Church of the Holy Trinity

Applicant: Jessica Zeigler-Cihlar

History: John Notman, architect, built 1857-59

Project: Construct stair and elevator tower at southwest corner of building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes adding a stair and elevator tower to the south side of the church. It will be set back substantially from both the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Street facades. The tower will attach to an existing two-story appendage to the church and will be faced with brown brick. The addition with arched windows is meant to complement but also distinguishing itself from the historic church.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Neale Quenzel of John Milner Associates, Inc. represented the application.

**ACTION:** Ms. Murray moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1215 SPRUCE STREET**

Owner 1215 Associated L.P.

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: built c. 1825

Project: Legalize windows, add roof decks

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of three decks, provided the dormer access to the deck is replaced with a stair house on the rear ell, the illegal alterations to the dormer are reversed, the lower deck door is removed and replaced with the appropriate door, all visible vinyl windows at the front and rear are removed and replaced with appropriate wood windows, and the sign on the front façade is removed and the brick is repaired; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes constructing three decks on the rear of the property facing Manning Street, two on the rear ell and one on a garage structure. The dormer window would be converted to a door to access the upper deck. A window would be cut down to a door to access the garage deck. The former owner changed the windows to vinyl and received a violation. The current application proposes changing the front windows to wood, but leaving the back windows as vinyl except for those being converted to doors.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. J. Tackett and Allison Fritch, the architects, represented the application.

Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman asked the applicants to explain the visibility from Camac Street. Mr. Baron and Mr. Tackett stated that the decks will be visible from Camac Street. Mr. Tackett also explained that the windows on the side of the rear ell are visible over the Venture Inn, which stands on Camac Street.

Mr. Wilds asked if the illegal deck will be removed. Mr. Tackett said that it would be removed. Mr. James noted that the illegal deck was shown as part of the proposed deck. Mr. Tackett explained that it would be removed before the new deck was constructed. He added that the illegal deck was positioned in the wrong place and could not be incorporated into the new deck. He also stated that an aggressive contractor installed the illegal deck. He explained that the deck as well as the sign would be removed shortly.

Mr. Baron stated that Mr. Tackett had agreed to replace the illegally altered dormer window with the appropriate arch-head window.

Mr. Wilds asked if a stair tower exists at the building currently. Mr. Tackett replied that the building currently has a stair tower, which will be extended to access the rear deck. The Commission members agreed that the revised plan complying with the Architectural Committee's recommendation would be acceptable provided the illegal deck was deleted. Mr. Tackett crossed the illegal deck off the plan and presented it to Mr. Baron for the official record.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brown moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve three decks, provided the dormer access to the deck is replaced with a stair house on the rear ell, the illegal alterations to the dormer are reversed, the lower deck door is removed and replaced with the appropriate door, all visible vinyl windows at the front and rear are removed and replaced with appropriate wood windows, and the sign on the front façade is removed and the brick is repaired, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **416 S. CAMAC STREET**

Owner: William Marsh

Applicant: John Mascaro

History: built 1830

Project: Legalize dormer and front parapet gutter

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the legalization of the dormer and gutter-parapet

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the legalization of the reconstruction of the dormer and the gutter/parapet. The rebuilt dormer matches the former, but non-historic dormer, which was in place before designation. The gutter has been reconstructed into a tall parapet covered in copper. It is much taller than the cornices of the adjacent houses.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Contractor John Mascaro represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue questioned the height of the parapet, which appears to be very tall. Mr. Mascaro disagreed that it was too tall. He remarked it was built to replicate one that is three doors to the north of this building. Mr. Mascaro opined that the brightness and shine of the new copper makes it appear taller than it is in actuality. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Rivera if the Architectural Committee accepted the alteration. Mr. Rivera stated that, given the conditions of the roof drainage, the alterations were acceptable.

**ACTION:** Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the legalization of the dormer and gutter-parapet. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**116-118 S. 20<sup>TH</sup> STREET, 2007 SANSOM STREET**

Owner: Jason Nusbaum

Applicant: Sheldon Joe Bell

History: c. 1855

Project: Demolish non-contributing structure, construct stair tower and fourth-floor addition, alter façade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the non-contributing structure and its replacement with a stair-tower; approval of the appropriate wood windows and the cutting down of the front doors; but denial of the rooftop additions;

**OVERVIEW:** This application seeks to combine three structures into a mixed-use residential and commercial building. It proposes the demolition of a small single-story non-contributing structure at 2007 Sansom Street and the construction of a stair tower in its place. It proposes the addition of a fourth story onto the visible rear ells and a fifth-story mansard onto the front portion of the corner building at 118 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Street. The other building, at 116 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Street, has an historic mansard. The corner building is the exception in a row of Italianate buildings. Fourth-floor mansards were added in the 1880s to all buildings in the row except the building at the corner. The application also proposes the cutting down of the entry doors to create ADA accessible retail spaces and the closing of the basement windows. The current owner purchased the building with a violation that was issued when the former owner installed vinyl windows without a permit. The current owner proposes to install the appropriate wood windows.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Sheldon Bell, preservation consultant Robert Powers, and developer Jason Nusbaum represented the application. Mr. Bell presented an overview of the application to the Commission. He explained that they planned to combine the two buildings into a mixed used residential and commercial development.

Mr. Sugrue asked if the applicants accepted the terms of the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Powers responded that they agreed with parts but not all of it. They disagreed with the recommendation of denial of the rooftop additions.

Mr. Bell spoke on behalf of the owner, stating that he would like to combine the two buildings into one. They would like to lower the first floor to make the retail spaces ADA accessible. The upper floors would be converted to residential units. They would like to demolish the small rear non-contributing building and add an elevator and stair tower in the back to access all floors. For financial reasons, they would like to add a mansard addition on the corner building, which is one story shorter than the neighboring rowhouses to the north, and mansard additions on both rear ells. Without the additional mansard space, it would not be economically feasible to undertake the other alterations, especially the tower at the rear. Mr. Bell stated that the residences would be luxury units.

Mr. Wilds remarked that the applicants were proffering a financial hardship argument; he

suggested that the Commission should not accept that argument and approve the proposal at this time. Ms. Murray stated that she was not opposed to the mansard, which would complement the nearby historic mansards.

Mr. Powers stated that the design team had considered a number of approaches, some of which were presented to the Committee. Some were historic; others were contemporary. He stated that they had decided that the best approach involved coupling the historic massing and form of a mansard with contemporary materials. They sought a compatible, yet different addition.

Mr. Bell noted that he was proposing a contrasting brick for the rear stair tower. He would use contemporary windows in the addition, but historic windows in the lower building. He contended that he was not claiming a financial hardship, but was only stating that it would not make financial sense to invest in the elevator and stair tower without the income from the mansard unit. He intended to develop this project as an upscale complex suitable to the Rittenhouse area. Mr. Wilds opined that the public will receive nothing in exchange for the approval of the non-historic alterations. Mr. Rivera noted the historic mansards and asserted that this new mansard would be no different. Mr. Sugrue agreed, stating there was precedence for the approval of a contemporary rooftop addition with the carriage house addition on Chancellor Street.

Mr. Nusbaum, the developer, stated that one of the reasons for the fourth-floor addition is that the corner building has a very narrow stair that makes the upper floors difficult to rent. The stair tower would overcome that liability. The tower also makes the interior layouts easier.

Mr. Huff questioned the material and color choices. Mr. Bell replied that he would use a flat seam, zinc colored roof material. It would not be reflective.

Mr. Sugrue asked if the applicants were seeking conceptual or final approval. The applicants stated that they were seeking final approval. Mr. Powers clarified that they had prepared several schemes, one more contemporary with a glazed side wall, one that featured a more traditional front mansard, which was placed on top of the existing sloped roof and retained the chimneys, and a third design that removed the chimneys, flattened the roof and added a mansard with a copy of the historic cornice that wrapped around the side facade. Mr. Bell displayed drawings of all three schemes.

Several Commission members expressed a preference for the third scheme with mansard and the wrap-around cornice.

Mr. Wilds noted the removal of the historic fabric and objected to the extension of the historic cornice.

Mr. Baron asked that the applicants to provide a copy of the drawing of third scheme to the staff.

**ACTION:** Mr. James moved to approve the third scheme design with the mansard facing both 20<sup>th</sup> and Sansom Streets and the wrap-around cornice, with the staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Wilds dissented.

### **1833 PINE STREET**

Owner: Devin Aronstam

Applicant: Larry Kozlowski

History: built c. 1855, front bay c 1895, Individually designated, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Demolish rear wall, add garage, 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition and roof decks

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of all aspects of the proposal except the second-floor addition; it split on the addition

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes alterations to the rear of this rowhouse, which is visible from 19<sup>th</sup> Street. The alterations include the construction of two decks, the demolition of the original rear second-floor wall and the construction of a shed addition, and the cutting of the brick garden wall and the construction of a garage behind it.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. He noted that the proposed work would be visible from 19<sup>th</sup> Street. He also noted the loss of historic fabric at the rear. Devin Aronstam, the owner, and James Garrison, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Garrison explained that the owner would like to expand the kitchen. He stated that the dining room is a magnificent room and this expansion to the rear will allow the dining room to be preserved. He noted that this block of Panama Street is a service alley. Mr. Aronstam elaborated on the restrictions of the building and his desire for a larger kitchen on the second floor. Mr. Wilds asked him if he could remove an interior stair to gain the needed space. He answered that he could, but did not want to. It provides direct access to the kitchen from the first floor and the rear alley.

Ms. Merriman opined that the addition is “tasteful” and noted that she will vote for approval.

Mr. Wilds asked about the 19<sup>th</sup> Street façade of the addition, which is not delineated in a drawing. Mr. Garrison stated that it would have a window.

**ACTION:** Mr. Rivera moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **532 N 22<sup>ND</sup> STREET**

Owner: Loonstyn Brothers

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez

History: built c. 1855

Project: Rebuild side and rear walls

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, with the staff to review details

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes demolishing the side and rear walls of this house. The Commission had previously approved rebuilding the badly bowing front wall and covering the side wall in stucco. The community organization and neighbors strongly objected to the stucco. The owner attempted to save and restore the brick wall by removing the existing stucco. He found the brick damaged from the stucco and, more importantly, leaning significantly. He now seeks to rebuild the wall in brick including the rear wood portion of the structure.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Joseph Loonstyn represented the application.

**ACTION:** Mr. James moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **2044 SPRUCE STREET**

Owner: David Nazarian

Applicant: Rachel Schade

History: c. 1885, attributed to G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Project: Build roof decks & HVAC on main roof of house

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the addition of a roof deck on this large house at the southeast corner of 21<sup>st</sup> and Spruce Streets. The ornate house is topped by a complicated mansard roof. At its February 2005 meeting, the Commission denied an application for a larger roof deck and other alterations.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the project to the Commission. Architect Kiki Bolender represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked how this design differs from the one that was denied. Ms. Bolender explained that it is much smaller and will be accessed through a hatch, not from an elevator. She also noted that it would have a cable rail system.

Mr. Baron noted that the house already has a large outdoor space.

Ms. Bolender reported that the neighbors support the project. Lenore Millhollen of the Preservation Alliance and the Center City Residents Association countered that the neighbors are opposed. She stated that the building is very important and that it includes a large terrace already. She also noted the importance of the group of four buildings at the corners of 21<sup>st</sup> and Spruce Streets. She stated that she is very opposed to any roof deck on this building because it would be totally inappropriate. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance applauded the reduction of the size of the deck, but cautioned that the Commission should review this application very carefully.

Ms. Bolender explained that this would be a small private deck, not a party deck. Mr. Rivera noted this is a very large house with mechanical systems already on the roof. Ms. Bolender explained that the air conditioning units would be moved further away from the line of sight in order to facilitate the smaller deck.

**FAILED MOTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to deny the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 4 to 4. Ms. Murray, Ms. Merriman, Mr. Huff, and Mr. Rivera dissented.

**FAILED MOTION:** Mr. Rivera moved to approve the proposal. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 4 to 4. Messrs. Wilds, James, Perri, and Sugrue dissented.

### **320 CHESTNUT STREET**

Owner: Carpenter's Company

Applicant: F. Neale Quinzel

History: 1770-1774, Robert Smith, architect

Project: Install ADA Ramp

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install an ADA accessible ramp to the south entrance of the Carpenter's Company Hall. The ramp would wrap around the eastern side of the building, but would not touch the building. The only point of contact with the building would be at the south entrance. The steps leading up the entrance are not the historic steps. The proposed ramp would be a masonry ramp faced in brick and paved with bluestone. The proposed railing would be black-painted steel posts with a bronze cap. The ramp would not be visible from Chestnut Street and the perimeter fence around the Hall would be raised slightly to further shield the ramp on the eastern side.

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

**ACTION:** Mr. James moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **227 S 6<sup>TH</sup> STREET, LIPPINCOTT BUILDING – UNIT 3 NE**

Owners: Joye & Bruce Lesser

Applicant: Michael Shannon

History: Built 1900, William B. Prichett, architect; contributing to the district

Project: Cut down window on Randolph Street side façade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to cut down a third-story window which faces the rear of the property. Prior to the conversion of the building into condominiums, this register of windows held vents. The windows on the lower two floors were cut down to accommodate larger vents. However, the upper floors, including this window on the third floor, were never cut down. The window retains its original sill and lintel.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Designer Michael Shannon represented the application.

**ACTION:** Mr. James moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1906 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE**

Owner: Philadelphia Ethical Society

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: Built c. 1870

Project: Install ADA ramp on rear

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the originally proposed design with either a solid or mesh ramp

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp on the rear of the property facing Manning Street. The ramp would be four feet wide and thirty feet long. The location of the ramp would require modifications to an existing door. The original proposal would block three basement windows; the revised proposal would not. The applicant originally proposed to face the ramp with bluestone and pave it with concrete. The revised proposal stipulates a concrete knee wall and a metal mesh ramp. Unlike the originally proposed ramp, the revised ramp would have only a minor impact on the historic building. The proposed railing would be steel.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect J.P. Donahue attended the meeting on behalf of the applicant. He advocated for the approval of the revised proposal presented at the Architectural Committee meeting instead of the original proposal preferred by the Committee. The Commissioners agreed that the revised proposal was more appropriate from a preservation perspective.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised proposal. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **2401 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE, EASTERN STATE PENITENTIARY**

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Friends of Eastern State Penitentiary

History: Built c. 1831, John Haviland, architect, National Historic Landmark

Project: Install playground at 22<sup>nd</sup> Street and Brown Street

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install a playground at the corner of Brown and 22<sup>nd</sup> Streets. The Commission granted approval in concept to this playground proposal in April 2005. The applicant now returns for final approval. The design of the playground has not changed significantly. The only change is the addition of a concrete plinth on which the playground would sit. Previously, the application proposed a grassy knoll. The grade slopes down away from the wall of the Penitentiary at this location.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. He noted the change from the grassy knoll to the concrete plinth. No one attended to represent the application.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **26<sup>TH</sup> STREET AND BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PARKWAY, PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART**

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Schade

History: Horace Trumbauer and Borie, Medary & Zantzinger, architects

Project: Install underground parking garage with sculpture garden - in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a parking garage for the Philadelphia Museum of Art. It would be located partially underground on the north side of the Fairmount. Currently, this area is landscaped with rocky outcroppings and mature plantings. The garage would include four levels and would be largely underground. Entrance and exit openings, vents, a glassy elevator house, and walls facing east, north, and west would be visible above ground. The entrance to the garage would be faced in masonry based on the surrounding geological formations as well as the rusticated museum cladding. A series of terraces and a sculpture garden would be set into the reconstructed hill over the garage. The landscape design would include the reconstruction of the rocky outcroppings as well as curtains of trees and shrubbery along the perimeter of the garage, which would screen it from Kelly Drive. In addition, the existing parking lot between the grounds of the museum and the Azalea Garden would be eliminated and landscaped.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Gail Harrity, the Chief Operating Officer of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, landscape architect Susan Weiler, and architect Michael Schade represented the project.

Ms. Harrity introduced the project to the Commission. She spoke about the master plan and said that the landscaped parking facility and sculpture garden will fill essential needs for the museum. The parking garage will address the museum's intractable problem of parking. The terrace around the museum building provides 300 spaces; the garage will provide 450 additional spaces. Ms. Harrity said that the plan will allow for the better utilization of the current park space. The new plazas will allow the Museum to extend the reach of its collection to the park. Ms. Harrity stated that initial feedback from the neighborhood has been positive.

The applicants introduced a large model of the proposal. Ms. Weiler of Olin Partnership, the landscape architect for the project, summarized the project using the model. She said the structure will be sunk into the existing hillside. The existing boulders will be reused along the terraces. The boulders will help hide the natural ventilation system, which consists of vents hidden in a moat along the walls of the garage. The passive vents obviate the need for a mechanical venting system, which would be disruptive.

Mr. Sugrue asked whether the parking around the museum building would be retained. Ms. Harrity said the museum planned to retain that parking. Mr. Schade added that the existing 80 car lot adjacent to the Azalea Garden will be removed.

Mr. Wilds expressed concern about the jarring effect of the garage on the view from the Italian Fountain. Mr. Schade explained that their intent is to hide as much of the structure as possible. He said that the tallest portion of exposed wall is 28 feet. The exposed portions of the wall would match the terrace the Museum now sits on, using precast stone panels.

Ms. Harrity noted that the project will reconnect the Schuylkill river path to the Kelly Drive path, creating a continuous path out from Center City for the first time. The two terraces on top of the garage will be new amenities. Mr. Sugrue complimented the design.

Mr. Baron asked how much of the exposed walls are surrounded by the ventilation "moat." Mr. Schade responded that approximately 40% of the exposed walls would have the ventilation openings at their bases. Ms. Weiler stated they tried to minimize the impact of the garage on the Museum side. Speaking on the entrance and exit of the garage, Ms. Weiler noted the importance of their architectural expressions to indicate to drivers that they are entering a parking structure, not a cave.

Mr. Wilds opined that the jagged northwest side of the garage detracts from the significant site and views. He asked how many parking spaces would be lost if the garage were pulled back at the west corner near the exit. Mr. Schade explained that there are 18 spaces on three levels in that area. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance agreed with Mr. Wilds and felt that the diagonal facades intruded upon the view from the Italian Fountain and along the statuary walk.

Ms. Harrity spoke about the cost of the project and number of parking spaces needed to make it feasible. The garage will be very expensive owing to its green roof.

Mr. Sugrue asked about access to the sculpture garden. Mr. Schade stated there would be a stairway up from the main walkway to the museum.

Mr. Wilds asked if it was possible to step the structure back at the northwest to reduce its mass. Mr. Huff suggested that perhaps the stair up to the garden could be used to break up the massive appearance of the exposed wall. Mr. Riviera expressed a concern about the wall being a magnet for graffiti. Mr. James voiced his approval of the project.

**ACTION:** Mr. Huff moved to approve the proposal in concept. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Wilds dissented.

### **205-209 ARCH STREET**

Owner: Yaron Properties, Inc

Applicant: Richard Thom

History: Built c. 1925; contributing to the Old City Historic District

Project: Add roof top addition, canopy, ramp, replace windows in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of addition, ADA ramp, canopy sign and lights, but denial of removal of historic windows at second floor, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition on this two-story industrial building in Old City. The addition would consist of three glazed bays that would extend the entire width of the building. It would be approximately fourteen feet tall with a set back of approximately seventeen feet. The roof of the addition is based on early twentieth-century sawtooth industrial roofs. This addition would open onto a rooftop deck, which would set back eight feet from the front facade. This deck would be accessed through doors in the eastern and western bays of the addition. The applicant also proposes to install new windows and a new storefront. This would require the

removal of the original windows at the second floor. In addition, the applicant proposes to install an ADA ramp leading up to the main entrance, a canopy sign, and lights.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Richard Thom and owner Michael Yaron represented the application.

**MOTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the addition, ADA ramp, canopy sign and lights, but deny the removal of historic windows at second floor, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Mr. Thom explained that his client would like to request relief from the requirement for the industrial window retention at the second floor. Mr. Thom distributed information which he claimed proves that the building dates to the very end of the district's period of significance. He also stated that there are 17 examples of tapestry brick buildings in the district. The client intends to fully restore the brick façade. The client will open a sales office on the second floor and feels that the second-floor industrial windows are not conducive to a sales environment. Mr. Thom is requesting approval to change the windows to larger pane windows. Using a drawing, he showed that, if he is required to maintain the windows on the second floor of the original building, he will have three different window patterns on one façade. The client is prepared to give a deed restriction stating the industrial windows will be restored when he ceases using the building.

Mr. Sugrue suggested that the window preference is based on taste, not preservation science. Mr. Thom agreed, but also noted that the introduction of three window types on one façade would not be appropriate architecturally. Mr. Thom noted their investigation does not indicate any remnants of industrial sash on the first floor. Mr. Baron opined that this type of building usually had larger windows on the first floor for showrooms and smaller pane windows above in the factory space. Mr. Baron also noted that the third-floor addition would be set back so far back that its windows would not be seen in relation to those on the second floor. Mr. Thom said the third floor would be set back 17 feet.

Mr. Yaron spoke of his respect for history and his dedication to preserving historic properties, especially in Old City. He explained that this building would house the national headquarters for his real estate development company. He asked that the Commission grant him a variance in this one important instance, especially in light of his significant investment in saving very important buildings in the neighborhood.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance expressed his great respect for Mr. Yaron and his commitment to historic preservation, but he opposed the project. Mr. Gallery asserted that the second-floor windows are essential to the character of the historic property. Mr. Gallery agreed with Mr. Baron that the set back of the third-floor addition would limit the visual inconsistency between the new windows and the historic windows below. Mr. Gallery supported the project except for the second-floor windows. Mr. Gallery expressed concern about the Commission's capacity to monitor a deed restriction and suggested that Mr. Yaron consider an easement with the Preservation Alliance instead. Mr. Yaron stated that he would consider an easement that would commit him to restoring the second floor windows when he vacated the building.

**WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION:** Messrs. Wilds and Rivera withdrew their motion to

adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

**ACTION:** Mr. James motioned to accept the proposal as submitted. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 0. Messrs. Sugrue and Wilds abstained.

#### **1420-22 CHESTNUT STREET**

Owner: 1420 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Dorann Mathews

History: 1896-1897, Frank Miles Day & Brother, architects

Project: Install internally illuminated plastic sign

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install a plastic, internally-illuminated sign on the Chestnut Street façade of this building. Currently, the ground floor of the building has no signage. The ground floor is three bays wide; it includes an entrance to the office tower in the eastern bay and two bays of retail space at the west. A mattress store is moving into the retail space. The existing ground floor is a reconstruction based on historic photographs and documentation and it is not original.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Barry Jacobson of the sign company presented a revised plan. Stating the sign will have a metal cabinet with a continuous style frame making it appear as one piece. The wording is routed out. Clear acrylic is routed onto a web on the back creating a halo effect.

Mr. James asked if the background color could be changed to coordinate with the color of the building. Mr. Jacobson replied that Mattress Giant uses its own proprietary color. Mr. James asked whether the signs could be located inside, behind the glass windows. Mr. Jacobson stated that the client wanted signs that would be highly visible. Ms. Merriman asked whether two signs were necessary and whether displays would be placed in the window. Mr. Jacobson stated that although there would be no display allowing for visibility directly into the store. Mr. Sugrue stated that the proposed signage was excessive. Mr. Rivera commented he would rather have the revised type of sign than the larger, originally proposed one. Mr. Huff then stated that the Art Commission would also review signage for this building. Mr. Jacobson replied the Art Commission was awaiting the Historical Commission's decision.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to approve the installation of the revised sign over the entry door, but to deny the second sign over the storefront window. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 2. Mr. James and Riviera opposed.

#### **THE REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF**

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Farnham presented the report to the Commission. When asked if they had questions about the report, the Commissioners replied that they had none.

### **HARRY A. BATTEN FUND**

Mr. Farnham requested an approval of the expenditure of \$77.59 from the Harry A. Batten Fund for lunches for the Architectural Committee and Commission.

**ACTION:** Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the expenditure of \$77.59 from the Harry A. Batten Fund. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**ACTION:** At 2:40 p.m., Mr. Sugrue moved to adjourn the meeting to an executive session. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron  
Jorge Danta  
Karen Gonski  
Jonathan E. Farnham