

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Arlene Matzkin, Chair  
Commission Conference Room  
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street  
29 July 199~~8~~<sub>7</sub>

Present

---

Arlene Matzkin, Chair  
Tony Atkin  
J. William Cornell  
Herbert Levy  
Daniel McCoubrey  
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer  
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner  
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

John Luciano, Jr.  
John Luciano  
Larry Gilbert  
Fritz Doerstling, Omnipoint  
Robert DeSilets  
Christian Busch  
Kiki Bolender, Shade & Bolender Architects  
Michael Greenblatt, CHH Development L.P.  
Roderick Wolfson, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects  
Mike Fasone  
Kishor Jethava, Capital Program Office  
Chuck Legradi, Fire Department  
Sue Bruce, Animation Art  
Peter Saylor, Dagit Saylor Architects  
George Wolfer, Girard Estate  
Doris Fanelli, Independence National Historic Park (INHP)  
Bill Brookover, INHP  
Hollis Provins, INHP  
Deborah Schaaf, City Planning Commission  
Nicole Westerman, Capital Program Office  
Rosella Hague, Lynch Martinez Architects  
Mike Reilly, Girard Estate  
Ellen Yin, Yin & Gang, L.P.  
Keven Hawkins, Marguerite Rodgers, Ltd.  
John Cluver, Voith & Mactavish Architects  
Jack Little, Latham Hotel  
Angelo Bucci, Latham Hotel  
Peggy MacLaren, Center City Residents Association  
Curt Kaller, C.A. Kaller, Inc.  
Rick Thorpe  
Arcangelo Guida, Dan Peter Kopple & Associates

Ms. Matzkin called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m.

729 South 9th Street

John Luciano, Jr., Owner

Larry Gilbert, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Front facade restoration; rear facade alterations

Larry Gilbert, architect for the project, and Mr. Luciano and his son presented the proposal. This property has two buildings, the main house and a garage. The public can see both the front and rear facades of the house and the rear facade of the garage. The proposal calls for patching and pointing the rear wall of the garage and replacing the original one-over-one windows in kind.

The work proposed for the front facade of the house includes installing new wood, six-over-six, true-divided light sash in existing frames; patching the marble steps; installing new wood shutters with paneled ones on the first floor and Venetian on the upper floors; restoring the wood dormer; repairing the cornice, and replacing the deteriorated fanlight transom with a transom found on the interior of the house. On the rear wall of the house, a previous owner put an addition without a permit or Commission approval. The present owner wishes to install wood windows and stucco the wall. The rail of the roof-top deck would be altered to a solid stuccoed surface instead of the extant patterned cinder block.

The Committee discussed all aspects of the proposal. The roof is relatively new and the owner does not plan to replace it at this time, except for the dormer. However, the Committee noted that a metal roof should be installed on the dormer instead of shingles because the shingles cannot follow the curve of the roof. Mr. Gilbert agreed.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval on condition that the dormer roof is metal, with staff to review details of the windows, dormer and cornice, and pointing and patching samples.*

2101 South College Avenue, Girard College Chapel

Fritz Doerstling/Omnipoint, Applicant

DATE: c. 1930

PROPOSAL: Antennae on roof

Fritz Doerstling of Omnipoint presented the proposal. He noted that the company had picked the site before he started working for them. The Committee stated that the building has a unique roof configuration which precludes hiding any equipment. Since the roofline adds significance to the building and all of the equipment would be highly visible the Committee voted to recommend denial.

*The Committee voted to recommend denial.*

1218 Arch Street

Corporate Realty Management Co., Owner  
Fritz Doerstling/Omnipoint, Applicant  
DATE: 1902  
PROPOSAL: Antennae on roof

The Committee noted that the building already has antennae attached to the penthouse. The antennae should be set back from the edge of the roof and painted to match the background structure. The Committee recommended approval.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval on the conditions that the staff approve details; the antennae are pushed back as far as possible, painted to match the background, and removed when obsolete.*

7500 Germantown Avenue

New Covenant Church, Owner  
Fritz Doerstling/Omnipoint, Applicant  
DATE: 1890  
PROPOSAL: Antennae on smokestack

The proposal has changed since the last month. Omnipoint has received permission from the Church to remove the maintenance ladder which proved obsolete and to run their cable tray in its place. The cable tray will not be visible from Germantown Avenue. Omnipoint also plans to install the equipment boxes hidden behind a niche of a neighboring building, running the cables underground from the smokestack. The Committee recommends approval with the standard conditions of painting to match the background and removal on occasion of obsolescence.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval with antennae and cable tray painted to match background and the equipment removed when obsolete.*

4313-17 Main Street, Masonic Lodge

Mason-on-Main, Owner  
Fritz Doerstling/Omnipoint, Applicant  
DATE: 1860  
PROPOSAL: Antennae on roof-top deck

The building has a gambrel roof with a roof-top deck at the pinnacle. The proposal includes installing antennae on the railing of the deck with some equipment resting on the deck itself. The cables would enter the roof at the deck, exit at the eave and run down the rear wall, on the exterior, to equipment in the basement. The attic cannot accommodate all of the equipment. The Committee noted that the public can see the rear of the building and the cables would obscure the detailing of the stone corner. If the company can run the cables on the interior of the building, the Committee would recommend approval. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the equipment on the deck should be pushed to the

north side to ensure invisibility from the street.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval on several conditions: the cables run on the interior of the building; all equipment on roof deck is pushed to the north side; antennae are even with the top of the deck railings and painted to match; staff approves a roof penetration detail, all equipment is removed when obsolete.*

**109 Bainbridge Street**

Ann Moyer and Martin Burke, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: New front steps

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. The owner wishes to remove the concrete steps and install marble ones. The Committee voted to recommend approval but noted that to meet code the steps may require a railing. Staff can approve railing details.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve railing details.*

**925 Chestnut Street, 10th Street Building of Federal Reserve Bank**

Jefferson Hospital/Rothman Institute, Owner

Robert DeSilets, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Cut front door; drive through; addition on alleyway - in concept

Robert DeSilets and Christian Busch presented the concept of the proposal. The Federal Reserve Bank had several buildings in its complex. The original building stood on the corner of 10th and Chestnut Streets. The bank added a building, designed by Bunting and Shrigley, to the rear on the corner of 10th and Latimer Streets and a building on the northeast corner of the lot. Subsequently the bank demolished the building at 10th and Chestnut Streets and erected the one designed by Paul Cret. This proposal includes alterations to the Bunting and Shrigley building on 10th and Latimer Streets.

The Bunting and Shrigley building has three bays on the 10th Street facade. The proposal includes cutting the window in the middle bay down for a door. The original design highlighted this middle bay, emphasizing the symmetry of the facade. Some Committee members questioned the necessity of cutting a front door on 10th Street; however, they agreed that it provided a pedestrian entrance and presence for a major institution that would benefit the public.

An alleyway exists between the Bunting and Shrigley building and the Cret building. Originally armored trucks entered the alleyway and into the Cret building to move money. This proposal calls for an entrance for a drive-through off the alley into the

Bunting and Shrigley building. The cars would then exit the building through an opening on Latimer Street.

The proposal also calls for an addition at the end of the alleyway, alongside the addition built on the northeast corner of the property, and a skywalk connecting the Bunting and Shrigley building to the Cret building on the upper floors. Most of the lower floors of the Cret building have Blue Cross/Blue Shield as a tenant; the Rothman Institute will occupy the upper floors. The Institute wishes to connect its offices in the Cret building to their offices in the Bunting and Shrigley building. The first floor, along the alleyway, originally had a loading dock. This proposal includes making that area part of the entrance doors to the main lobby.

Across the alleyway a wrought-iron gate stands. The gate, originally designed by Cret, has suffered from various changes, but remains relatively intact. The proposal calls for restoring the metal, reinforcing the structure with wider posts and slightly changing the configuration. The Rothman Institute wishes to install a blue, rounded, projecting sign that says "Jefferson". The Committee noted that the sign should not project and asked that it remain a dark color, in keeping with the gate. Also as a means of identification, the proposal includes a clock mounted on the corner of the building at Latimer Street. The Committee asked for more details of the clock's design and attachment before it makes a recommendation. The Commission viewed the changes as alterations to the secondary and tertiary facades of the complex.

*The Committee voted to recommend conceptual approval of the front door, drive through, addition on alleyway, and skywalk.*

**1401-07 East Bristol Street, Carl Mackley Apartments**

Canus Corporation, Owner

John Tucker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1933

PROPOSAL: Complete rehabilitation; landscape changes

Roderick Wolfson, architect for the project, described the proposed changes. The Commission had previously approved, in concept, the new windows and enclosure of the recessed balconies with windows. This proposal, for final approval, included the details of the enclosed balconies. The architect planned to have white frames on the new windows. The Committee objected, saying that the original recessed balconies should maintain the recessed look. Glass reads as black; therefore, the frames should have a dark color. The architect agreed.

This proposal includes blue, matte-canvas awnings for the doors, free-standing enameled metal panel signs for each building, restoring the windows at the stairtowers on the ends of the buildings, and the removal of the non-historic flagpole which is causing stress on the masonry structure. Also, the proposal

calls for regrading paths within the complex with a change in grade to comply with ADA regulations.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval on condition that the frames of the windows installed in the former balconies have a dark color instead of the proposed white.*

**147-149 North 2nd Street, Fire Museum**

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Christine Bolender, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1898

PROPOSAL: New windows

Kiki Bolender, architect for the project, presented the proposal to replace the wood windows with aluminum frames and sash. The aluminum frames resemble the original profiles, but do not match exactly. Also the new sash and frames would have different overall dimensions from the originals. The Committee noted that the new frames and sash reduced the glass width by more than three inches per window. Ms. Bolender explained that the window company could not make windows that have thinner frames. She called the window company to see if they could widen the glass opening by at least one inch on each side. They could not. The Committee decided that the differences proved too great and asked the applicant to return with a different window proposal.

The Committee stated that the details required could be found in wood windows. Chuck Legradi of the Fire Department stated that wood windows need to be painted and the City did not want the burden of maintenance. He had only asked the architect to look at Traco windows because he had a good experience with their product in the past. He also liked their feature of tilt-in for cleaning. Mr. Baron noted that most new wood windows tilt inward for cleaning and Committee members said the building has other wood elements that require painting as well. The Committee stated that it would not recommend approval of these windows if a private citizen proposed them and they will not recommend approval simply because the proposal comes from a City agency. The building, a museum, sits adjacent to Elfreth's Alley.

*The Committee voted to recommend denial.*

**715 Walnut Street**

Joan Pileggi, Owner

Christine Bolender, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1805; c. 1960 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Awnings; 1st floor alterations; facade lighting

Ms. Bolender described the proposal for rehabilitating the storefront. This is the first project that will receive funds from the new Center City District facade rehabilitation assistance program. The proposal includes a new enlarged

storefront window, new stone base, awnings in matte fabric, new single-leaf door and painting the trim of the building. The first floor has non-historic fabric.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval.*

#### 220 Market Street

Michael Fasone, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; c. 1930 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Legalize new storefront

Michael Fasone, owner of the store and tenant of the building, installed a double-leaf door in the storefront without a permit or Commission approval on a weekend. The original storefront had a center window which was in the same plane as the front facade, flanked by two recessed doors. The door to the left entered into the store and the door on the right led to the floors above. The new storefront has four doors all recessed to the same plane and no window. Mr. Fasone stated that he hired a carpenter to remove the window and install the double-leaf door; however, the wood surround was too damaged to remain and the carpenter removed the entire projection. He noted that the store needs the double-leaf door because he sells furniture and could not move it through the extant door.

The Committee emphasized that the carpenter performed work without a permit and Commission approval. It voted to recommend denial. Four Committee members suggested to Mr. Fasone the replacement of the original storefront door with a larger single-leaf door to accommodate furniture and to rebuild the projecting display window. Two other Committee members suggested building the projecting storefront with the double-door, with the hardware removed. The Committee asked Mr. Fasone to return with a different proposal, including appropriate drawings.

*The Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial.*

#### 118 North 3rd Street

Susan Spiegel, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Banner

Susan Bruce presented the application. Animation Art, a gallery on the first floor, wishes to install a banner to advertize the gallery. The original proposal included hanging the banner between the windows at the second floor, over the show window. Now the gallery wishes to have the banner to the right of the windows, over the door. The Committee noted that the new position sits too close to the next building and may confuse pedestrians. Also, if the building next door erects a banner over its front door, the gallery's banner would not be visible from one side. The Committee also suggested installing a blade sign instead of a banner. The blade sign is more appropriate

historically for the building and more cost effective.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval of banner to hang between the windows and secured in the mortar joints.*

**3700 Chestnut Street, United Tabernacle Theater**

University of Pennsylvania, Tenant

David Searles, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1884-86

PROPOSAL: Ramp, terrace, retaining wall

Peter Saylor, architect, explained the proposal. The University of Pennsylvania is renting the church to use as a theatre. The building needs two modes of egress for handicap visitors to meet ADA requirements. The University wishes to build a retaining wall alongside the church so that the exit at the rear of the building links with the ramp at the front of the church. The retaining wall would reuse the extant iron railing. Along the west elevation toward the front of the church the railing would become a concrete wall with a mounted handrail. The architect proposes concrete for several reasons: the original railing is not long enough to reach to the new ramp, the concrete will blend with the stone of the church, and recessed lighting can be installed to aid visibility. Mr. Tyler objected to the change in railing material because it did not provide the transparency of the metal railing. The Committee noted that the concrete railing will be visible by the public, but did not share Mr. Tyler's objections.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval.*

**20-30 North Front Street and 103-107 Church Street**

George Wolfer/Girard Estate, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Rear demolition; new windows

Ms. Pentz recused herself from the discussion and vote.

George Wolfer of Girard Estate presented the two aspects of the proposal. As requested, Girard Estate returned with a window proposal. Originally the buildings had double-hung windows. Later in the 19th Century, the Estate changed the windows to casement windows in the buildings on Front Street. Mr. Wolfer proposes to install new aluminum-clad wood sash and frames in all of the windows. Mr. Baron noted that the window frames in the buildings on Church Street are original and perhaps the Committee and Commission should require wood sash with true-divided lights in those frames. The Committee disagreed and voted to recommend approval.

Mr. Wolfer also proposes to demolish the rear ells of the buildings on Front Street. He stated that they are in disrepair and would not be a part of the development plan for the complex.

The Committee agreed that it would recommend approval of demolition if they proved dangerous; however, it would not recommend approval simply because they proved inconvenient. Before it would make a recommendation, the Committee asked to see an engineering report of the condition of the buildings and a development plan for the site.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval of the windows with staff to review and approve details; denial of the demolition until the Committee receives more information.*

**500-530 Chestnut Street, Independence Hall Complex**

Doris Fanelli/INHP, Applicant

DATE: 1729

PROPOSAL: Security bollards

Doris Fanelli, Hollis Provins and Bill Brookover presented a proposal to install security bollards around Independence Square. Currently in front of Independence Hall, wood bollards, eight inches in diameter, stand 91 inches apart. The proposal includes installing wood encased steel bollards, ten inches in diameter, 54 inches apart. Mr. Provins explained that the multitude of bollards should prevent people from using Chestnut Street as a drop-off area and try to prevent a terrorist attack. Ms. Fanelli noted that the number of bollards should signal to the public that the building is protected. The Committee members expressed concern that the wood would deteriorate quickly, allowing the steel to corrode. Ms. Fanelli stated that in the 1960s the Park re-landscaped the front of the building to recreate the 18th century design, which included wood bollards.

The proposal also includes installing AIA bollards, iron bollards with a ball at the end, at each staircase on the east, south and west entrances to Independence Square. This bollard design was typical of the late 19th century.

The Committee also questioned the number and positioning of the bollards. Mr. Provins stated that the Park Service requires the number and position to ensure the safety of the building. Ms. Batcheler, who could not attend the meeting, called the office and offered three options for the bollards at the front of the Independence Hall: have fiberglass to mimic wood over steel; use the AIA bollards; use a modern design.

Before it would make a recommendation, the Committee asked to see samples of the bollards installed. Ms. Fanelli agreed to install samples and notify the staff when they were in place. The Committee will meet at the site to reach a decision.

*The Committee voted to table its recommendation until it has seen samples on site.*

1729 Mt. Vernon Street, Thomas Eakins House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Nicole Westerman, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New fence; facade cleaning, pointing

Rosella Hague, architect for the project, showed the Committee an historic photograph with a wood fence to the side of the building. The City wishes to recreate the fence, made of tongue and groove boards and topped by louvered panels. The fence will hide the ADA ramp and the rear of the property from the street. The City also plans to clean and point the facade and repair windows.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve fence details and cleaning and pointing samples.*

[Subsequent to the meeting of the Architectural Committee, the Department of Public Property withdrew its proposal to erect a wooden fence in order to study an alternative design and material.]

306 Market Street

Ilan Seidenwar, Owner

Ellen Yin, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Signage; lights; canopy; new door

Ellen Yin, tenant of the building, explained the various aspects of the proposal for the first floor of the building. The Commission previously approved alterations for the first floor, including a double-leaf door. The code requirements preclude a true double-leaf door in the extant opening and Ms. Yin now proposes a single-leaf door. She also wishes to install a canopy above the door. The Committee noted that the proposed canopy probably would not conform to zoning regulations. Members stated that the Committee would recommend approval of a shed-type awning over the door and suggested that the zoning regulations for awnings should guide the size and placement. The proposal also calls for lighting fixtures over the first floor to illuminate the storefront and painting the cast-iron features a dark brown with ochre trim.

The building presently has a wide signband over the first floor. Ms. Yin proposes to install a new signband. The Committee agreed, except the signband should be narrow enough to cover just the rough brick. Any courses of brick below the second floor windows should be exposed. Ms. Yin agreed.

The Committee noted that Mr. Seidenwar did not build the new first floor windows according to the plan approved by the Commission in 1995. The Committee asked the staff to contact Mr. Seidenwar and try to have the changes conform to the approved plan or apply to legalize the extant changes.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval of the single-leaf door, a more narrow sign band only wide enough to cover the rough brick; approval of the paint colors; approval of the lighting fixtures; approval of an awning over the door with staff to approve details.*

1231 Walnut Street, Empire Building

Empire Building Partners, Owner

John Cluver, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900

PROPOSAL: Storm windows, awnings; new door

John Cluver, architect for the project, presented the various aspects of the proposal. The owner wishes to restore the front entrance doors using an historic drawing to guide the work. Also on the first floor, the proposal calls for the installation of awnings. The proposal included installing the awnings under the terra cotta lintels, but the Committee stated that they should be attached to the window frames rather than the masonry. Mr. Cluver agreed.

The proposal also calls for installing exterior storm windows on floors two through seven. The Committee concluded that the exterior storms completely change the look of the building, because the windows will stand at the same plane as the facade while the original windows are recessed. Mr. Cluver stated that the owner plans to apply for the federal rehabilitation tax credits and he stated that he believed the *Standards* do not encourage interior storm windows. The Committee disagreed, noting that interior storm windows do not obscure the features of the building like exterior ones. [The *Standards* provide guidelines for both.] Mr. Cluver stated that if the State Preservation Office will allow interior storm windows and still grant the tax credits he will pursue the interior storm windows as an option.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval of awnings with attachment in the window frames; approval of paint color for trim; approval of new entrance doors; denial of exterior storm windows.*

1631 Walnut Street, Latham Hotel

Ocean Properties, Owner

Angelo Bucci, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1915

PROPOSAL: New sidewalk paving design

Angelo Bucci described the proposal for installing a granite and brick design in the sidewalk in front of the hotel's entrance. The design will feature granite engraved with an "L" surrounded by a band of brick.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval.*

**237-243 South 21st Street**

Dante Luciani, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1885

PROPOSAL: New wood windows on side and rear

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to replace the wood one-over-one windows in kind on the rear and side of the building. The replacement windows will have double-glazing, eliminating the need for the exterior storm windows.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve details.*

**237-247 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel**

Claybar Associates, Owner

Rick Thorpe, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: New windows

Curtis Kaller and Rick Thorpe presented the proposal to replace the windows of the Barclay Hotel. Last month the Commission approved a proposal from Graboyes, but the owners have not awarded the contract to either company. Mr. Kaller explained that the replacement windows on the first two floor will have wood sash and frames. On the floors three through seven, the aluminum replacements will match the exact profile of the frame and sash, including the recessed putty slope of the original windows. The putty slope may be kept because the windows will have thinner glass. This slightly reduces the R-value of the window and the sound rating; however, the Committee preferred the windows because they retain an important design element of the original windows. On floors eight and above, which are much less visible from the street, the aluminum replacements will have thicker glazing, eliminating the shadowline of the sash. All of the windows will have custom panning which will match the original windows in profile and detail. The grooved transom panel needs modification to have a single plane embossed with a grooves.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve details.*

**2021 Rittenhouse Square Street**

Fred Kroon, Owner

Arcangelo Guida, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Remove balcony; install bay window

Arcangelo Guida, architect for the project, presented the proposal. This building, one of several carriage houses on the block, has a pair of doors on the third floor. Before designation, an owner replaced the original solid wood doors with french doors and installed a small balcony. The present owner

wishes to remove the balcony and doors and install a bay window. Mr. Guida described the design of the window. The two sides of the bay window have door-like features, as if someone had flung open the doors. The Committee noted that the bay window completely replaces the doors that were a unique feature of the house and adds an element at odds with the building's design as a carriage house. The Committee voted to recommend denial.

Mr. Atkin and Mr. McCoubrey stated that they would consider recommending approval of a bay window, as long as it looked like a window and did not pretend to represent something else. The other four members of the Committee disagreed. Without the doors, the building loses the sense that it was a carriage house with a loft. They stated that the doors of the building are too unique a feature to remove; however, they would consider other balcony and door designs.

*The Committee voted to recommend denial.*

**112 South 20th Street**

Michael Goldstein, Owner

Lance Wright/Rittenhouse Management Corp., Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: New wood sash

Lance Wright explained that the building had a major fire last year and the owner wishes to replace the windows. While investigating the building, Mr. Wright discovered that the original sash had arched windows. The proposal calls for installing wood, two-over-two, true-muntin square-head windows with arched glass.

*The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve details.*

**1340-48 Arch Street, Arch Street Methodist Church**

Rudy D'Alessandro, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Cut opening; install louver on east wall

Mr. Cornell presented the proposal. The church wishes to install an HVAC system. The installation of the system requires a large opening, ten feet by twelve feet, cut on the second floor of the east wall. The church proposes simply to cover the hole with a large louvered panel. The Committee acknowledged that a hole of that dimension may be necessary to install the equipment, but questioned the need to keep the opening so large. It asked for more information about the HVAC system before it could make a recommendation.

*The Committee voted to table its recommendation until it reviews more information.*

Respectfully submitted,

*Laura M. Spina*

Laura M. Spina

Historic Preservation Planner