

**THE MINUTES OF THE 537TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 MAY 2007
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Acting Chair
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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

ALSO PRESENT

Norman Gutman
Sheri and Kip Waide
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Jeff Wyant, Architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Henry Lewis
Kylie Hill
Nathan Flanigan
Robert Powers, Power & Company
Jack Weiner, Esq.
Peter Wessel

CALL TO ORDER

Thomas Sugrue, Acting Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 537th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Evans, Leonard, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Smyler, Sugrue, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 536TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 536th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 April 2007.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 APRIL 2007

Herbert Levy, Acting Chair

6408 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: David Jackson

Applicant: David Jackson

History: 1884

Project: Reroof slate mansard with rubber shingles.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair a large open hole in the mansard, remove existing slate shingles, and replace the roof with a high-quality, rubber, composite shingle matching the existing in size, shape, and color.

In 1999, prior to the current ownership, this property was declared Imminently Dangerous. The applicant subsequently purchased the property and proposed a restoration project. In November 2006, the project was approved at the staff level with work to include various repairs, masonry cleaning, porch repair, window replacements, and stuccoing. This application is an amendment to the approved restoration application and will address the damaged roof, which is in urgent need of repair. Note that the staff does not have the authority to approve replacement materials for slate when on mansards and turrets.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked for additional information on the proposed roofing material. Mr. Baron responded that it was a rubber imitation slate in the appropriate shapes and colors, not an asphalt shingle. He noted that it would have been approved at the staff level if it were not on a mansard.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1702 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: Willie C. Hardy

Applicant: Willie C. Hardy

History: 1886-1887, contributing to the Diamond Street Historic District

Project: Install internally illuminated sign.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a 2'x6' acrylic-faced, internally-illuminated sign 12' above grade to cover the storefront transoms below the storefront cornice. The sign will be attached to the wood window frame.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the applicant accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Sell stated that the applicant had sought an approval of the proposed signage, but had stated that, in light of the Committee's recommendation, he would consider other signage solutions.

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

423 CATHERINE STREET

Owner: Kip and Sheri Waide

Applicant: Danielle A. Capozzi

History: Designated individual 12/31/1984

Project: Construct two-story rear addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided small segments of the walls to be demolished are retained as indicators of the historic walls.

OVERVIEW: This two-and-a-half story house, built in 1832, retains its original configuration, which includes the main section with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. This application proposes to construct a two-story addition at the rear of the property, within the void created by the historic rear ell, leaving it in place. The proposal calls for the demolition of the rear wall of the main section, the infilling of the existing rear door of the ell, and the installation of a rear entrance with a French door at the ground floor and a large casement at the second floor in the rear façade of the addition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owners Sheri and Kip Waide and architect Jeffrey Wyant represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue asked the applicants if they were amenable to the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wyant stated that they were.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided small segments of the walls to be demolished are retained as indicators of the historic walls. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

134 ELFRETH'S ALLEY

Owner/Applicant: Peter Wessel

History: c. 1793

designated individually, 6/26/1956

significant to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct two-story rear addition

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition with a roof deck at rear of the property. The non-historic CMU garden wall and wood deck at the rear would be demolished. The rear wall of the building would remain and existing openings would be utilized for access to the addition. The addition would be clad with wood clapboard siding. The new

exterior doors and windows would be wood true-divided-light units. The roof deck would be located on the addition, not the historic building. It would be constructed of a synthetic decking system with a painted metal railing on all three sides and would be accessed by a metal ship's ladder leading from an exterior second-floor door.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Peter Wessel represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the creation of the passages from the historic building to the new addition would require the removal of any historic fabric. Ms. Cote responded in the negative. She explained that the plans stipulate the use of existing doorways, which now connect the interior with the patio and deck, to link the historic building with the new addition.

Mr. Reuter asked if the legal opinion included with the application indicate that the property owner intended to build into the public right-of-way. Mr. Wilds stated that it related to an easement, not Elfreth's Alley.

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

509 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Henry and Talya Lewis

Applicant: Henry Lewis

History: c. 1965, Bower & Fradley, architects
contributing in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Enclose existing roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the notches are infilled with metal rather than brick.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an existing roof deck facing Lombard Street. The roof deck has side walls and a parapet and is accessed from an existing third floor. The proposed enclosure will follow the slope of the side walls and would not be higher than the existing parapet, which would make it invisible or almost invisible from Lombard Street. The applicant proposes to install a standing-seam metal roof with shallow skylights. The Historical Commission approved an identical application for another property within the same complex, located at 505 Addison Court. The applicant has submitted a cover letter in which he states the need for an extra bedroom to accommodate his growing family.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Henry Lewis represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the notches are infilled with metal rather than brick. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Mr. Lewis stated that he concurred with the Committee's recommendation in all but one regard; he objected to the requirement that he fill the notches with metal. He stated that he preferred brick. He explained that the notches are very narrow, about four inches, and very deep, about nine inches. He stated that the notch-filling material would not be visible from the street. Mr.

Sugrue asked if the notches were functional or decorative. Mr. Lewis stated that they are decorative. Mr. Wilds suggested that the notches should be retained, not infilled. Mr. Lewis offered to leave the front sections of the notches open and fill the backs of them with brick. He stated that his neighbor had received approval from the Commission to infill the notches in that way.

AMENDMENT OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman amended their motion to approve the proposal with the rears of the notches infilled with brick, with the staff to review details.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposal with the rears of the notches infilled with brick, with the staff to review details.

22 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: 22 South Third Street Associates

Applicant: Nathan Flanigan

History: 1837, William Strickland, architect

alterations and additions by John T. Windrim in 1897

two-story rear addition by Edwards & Green

individually designated, 26 June 1956

designated as Significant in the Old City Historic District, 12 December 2003

Project: Install signage and construct rear balcony (balcony in concept)

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the banners; approval in-concept of the balcony, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage on the end pilasters of the former Mechanic's Bank building. The building had illegal banner signs installed by the previous tenant. The upper poles and the banners have been removed; the bottom poles remain. The pilasters have several holes and bolts. The applicant proposes to reinstall the upper pole utilizing one of the existing holes and hang a banner sign. The sign would advertise the restaurant occupying the ground-floor commercial space.

The applicant also proposes in concept to install a balcony on the rear, west-facing façade of the rear wing of the building. The staff conducted fire-insurance atlas research and established that the rear wing is not an original feature of the Strickland design, but was built between 1860 and 1900. The balcony proposal would involve cutting a new opening in the masonry wall. The rear wing is visible from Franklin Court, where the upper portion of the façade can be seen. Standing in Franklin Court, the public would be able to see the upper most section of the doors, but not the balcony structure itself.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Kylie Hill represented the application.

Mr. Wilds noted the great significance of the building as well as its poor treatment in the past. He suggested that the Commission promote the success of the building, which has suffered greatly. He opined that the banners may be acceptable if they allow the businesses to succeed and the building to be rehabilitated.

Mr. Danta stated that the Committee had discussed the restoration of the facade with the applicant. The Committee suggested that the lanterns that once flanked the side walls at the

steps could be replicated and signage hung from them. Mr. Danta also reported that the Committee expressed concern about the numerous stray bolts and fasteners in the marble façade. As they corrode, they will further damage the fragile façade; they should be removed. Any fasteners installed in the façade should be stainless steel. He also noted that the electrical conduit running across the façade was installed illegally by a former owner.

Ms. Hill explained that she owns the property, which houses a bar and restaurant on the first floor and an internet software company on the second floor. She noted that the businesses employ 32 people. She offered to remove the conduit. She also offered to use only stainless steel fasteners in the façade. Mr. Sugrue asked if she would remove the stray fasteners and repair the façade. She stated that it was her long-term goal to repair the façade. She is currently seeking estimates for the work. Mr. Sugrue again asked if she would repair the façade. Ms. Hill again stated that it was her long-term goal to repair the façade.

Mr. Baron reported that the former owners removed the lanterns at the entrance without a permit; consequently a violation was issued. He displayed photographs of the historic lanterns and suggested that they would be appropriate locations for signage. Mr. Baron opined that the banners on the columns would not be appropriate because they would obstruct views of the historic building. Mr. Wilds rejected Mr. Baron's assertion. Mr. Wilds asked the applicant about the current signage. Ms. Hill stated a chalkboard is placed on the sidewalk when the restaurant and bar are open.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the need for the balcony. Ms. Hill explained that the balcony would provide an amenity to a conference room.

Mr. Reuter reported to the Commission about a court settlement with the previous owner requiring the restoration of the building. He noted this agreement is binding on all future owners of the property. He stated the current owner is required to restore the building. Ms. Hill replied that she intends to restore the building.

Mr. Wilds commented that the lanterns discussed earlier may not be appropriate for signage. He stated that this is a commercial building that was intended to have signage. He stated that the banners might be appropriate if attached properly to the columns as part of the façade restoration.

Mr. Schaaf posited that the railings at the front steps to the building are not original. Mr. Danta responded they are an existing condition, which the applicant is not proposing to alter.

Ms. Smyler asked Mr. Reuter to provide a copy of the court settlement to Ms. Hill.

Mr. Schaaf suggested the removal of the non-historic railings. Mr. Danta reminded him that the Commission cannot compel property owners to undertake work outside their defined scopes.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the balcony in concept; and to approve the banners, provided all metal fasteners are removed and all holes appropriately patched in the façade, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

314 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Peggy and Christian Lane

Applicant: Todd Curry

History: Built c. 1967; Designed by J.J. Fish; contributing in Society Hill Historic District, 10 March 1999.

Project: Install windows with simulated-divided-lights

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install Trimline wood double-hung replacement sash with simulated-divided-lights and sandwich bars. The replacement sash have the same dimensions as the existing sash. The building was constructed in 1967.

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

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

337 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: Carl Geiger

Applicant: Richard Stange

History: c. 1830

Project: Alter roof deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to extend an existing roof deck forward so that it would overhang the front wall of the building. Currently, the edge of the deck sits about 4' back from the front wall. The revised deck would mirror the deck on the adjacent building. The adjacent deck predates the designations of the buildings. The deck in question is already visible from the public right-of-way. Extending it forward would make it more conspicuous.

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

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

Owner/ Applicant: Phyllis G. Gutman

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

Project: legalize windows

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

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Norman Gutman represented the application.

Mr. Gutman reported that his wife inherited the building. He explained that the windows were replaced because they were highly deteriorated. Pieces of the windows had fallen onto the street. He stated that he purchased the windows from Lowe's; they were installed by Miller Construction. Mr. Gutman claimed that he did not know that he needed a permit to replace the windows. He stated that he was never advised that the property was designated historic.

Ms. Leonard asked Mr. Gutman how many windows he had replaced. Mr. Gutman stated that he replaced the windows in stages. He first replaced 20 and then, one year later, 10 more. He said that he could not afford to replace them again.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Gutman if he was making a claim of hardship. Mr. Gutman replied that he did not fully understand the hardship process, but that he could not afford to replace all of the windows again. He conceded that the building is rented and produces an income.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

EDWARD G. BUDD MANUFACTURING COMPANY, 2450 W. HUNTING PARK AVENUE

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has requested that the Philadelphia Historical Commission comment on the nomination of the Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Company site at 2450 W. Hunting Park Avenue to the National Register. Kise Straw & Kolodner prepared the nomination for Preferred Real Estate Investments. Seventeen buildings, twelve of which are classified as contributing, stand on the 70-acre site at the intersections of Hunting Park Avenue and the R7 and R8 Septa Regional Rail lines in the Nicetown-Tioga section of Philadelphia. The nomination contends that the site satisfies National Register criterion A: the property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The nomination explains that the Budd Company, which produced stamped metal products, occupies an extremely significant place in the history of transportation. The Budd Company developed the world's first all-steel automobile bodies, radically changing the industry, which had relied on wooden bodies. It also revolutionized the railroad industry with its development of light and therefore fast stainless steel railroad cars in the 1930s. The company developed numerous other important technologies and processes, forever changing transportation and industrial production. The staff recommends that the Commission recommend that, owing to its primary significance in transportation history, the Budd Manufacturing Company site satisfies National Register criterion A and should be placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission.

Mr. Sugrue, a native of Detroit, noted that prominent Detroit architect Albert Kahn had designed buildings at the site. He asked if other Albert Kahn buildings stood in Philadelphia. Mr. Farnham stated he was unaware of others, but he did acknowledge Albert Kahn's importance. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the nomination could be updated to note that the site satisfied criterion C owing to Kahn's involvement.

Ms. Smyler asked if the designation would hinder or promote redevelopment. Mr. Sugrue responded that the designation would render the site eligible for federal historic preservation tax credits. Mr. Wilds noted that, unless federal money was involved in the redevelopment, the federal designation would not place restrictions on the rehabilitation of the buildings.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board that the Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Company at 2450 W. Hunting Park Avenue in Philadelphia satisfies criteria A and C and is therefore is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

BIBERMAN BUILDING, 611-619 N. 15TH STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has requested that the Philadelphia Historical Commission comment on the nomination of the Biberman Building at 611-619 N. 15th Street in the Spring Garden neighborhood. Powers & Company prepared the nomination for EB Realty Management. This request for comment is unusual. The PHMC staff has recommended that this site is not eligible for the National Register due to a lack of significance and a loss of integrity. The nominator is

appealing that decision to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board. The state has requested that the Philadelphia Historical Commission comment as part of that appeal process.

The nomination contends that the site satisfies National Register criterion A: the property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Biberman Brothers, which would become a large and important manufacturer of women's dresses, was founded in Philadelphia in 1898. In 1920, the company moved into the newly completed Biberman Building, which was designed by architect Leroy Rothschild. Biberman Brothers, which manufactured enormous numbers of everyday dresses for the working and middle classes, occupied the building at 15th and Mt. Vernon Streets until its demise in 1968. Since that time, the building has been extensively but not irrevocably altered. The top floor has been demolished, window openings have been infilled, and a series of ramps were added to the south façade during its conversion to a parking garage. These integrity problems could be reversed with rehabilitation. Disagreeing with the PHMC staff, the PHC staff recommends that the Commission recommend that, owing to the company's prominence in the garment manufacturing industry, the Biberman Building satisfies National Register criterion A and should be placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission. Historic preservation consultant Robert Powers and attorney Jack Wiener represented the nomination.

Mr. Wiener and Mr. Powers addressed the Commission. Mr. Wiener stated they disagree with the State's decision that this building is not eligible for the National Register. He contended that the State employees who reviewed the nomination had committed errors of fact and judgment. He asked the Philadelphia Historical Commission to recommend to the Board that the building meets the National Register Criteria.

Mr. Wiener presented a rendering of the subject property, which had been Wilke Buick. He pointed out the proposed alterations and new construction at the property. He stated that the project would include 280 units of housing. He asserted this project is a key in the revitalization of this section of Broad Street. He stated that the historic tax credit is necessary for this project to be feasible.

Ms. Smyler asked the applicant to explain his comment about errors of fact and judgment. Mr. Wiener asserted that the Biberman Company was more important historically than the State has acknowledged.

Mr. Powers explained the National Register nomination process.

Mr. Wilds noted the nomination form claimed that the property satisfied Criterion A, but not C. He asked why C was not included. Mr. Wiener responded that the building suffered from some integrity problems. Therefore, they had decided to assert its historical, but not architectural significance. He noted that, at the time the nomination was prepared, they had not discovered historic photographs that could guide the restoration of the building; they have since discovered those photographs and could restore the building, especially the missing top floor. Mr. Wilds opined that the nomination should be revised to include Criterion C along with Criterion A.

Mr. Powers presented the history of the building and garment manufacturing company. He noted that the company occupied the building from 1920 to 1968. Mr. Schaaf observed that the construction of two additional factories outside Philadelphia was not a reason to discount the significance of this building, but instead was evidence of the importance of the company.

Mr. Sugrue noted the economic significance of this company and remarked that the building was eligible for the National Register.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance voiced his support for designation of the building to the National Register. He stated that the historical information is more persuasive than architectural. He noted that many ordinary buildings have been placed on the National Register for their extraordinary places in history. He cited the New Century Guild building in Philadelphia, a fairly ordinary rowhouse which has an important social history, as a good example. He opined that industrial manufacturing is a critical part of the city's history; buildings like this should be recognized for their importance.

Mr. Sugrue commented that so much of this type of architecture that represents the city's prominent place in economic history is disappearing. He expressed hope that adaptive reuse would save this building from that fate. Mr. Gallery agreed and suggested that the Commission send a very strong message to the State that these types of buildings and structures should be recognized for their historic significance and preserved.

Mr. Powers remarked that the State is interested in architectural excellence, not social, economic, or industrial history. He pointed to another project in which he is involved. The State is balking at designating a building at 22nd and Arch Street by Magaziner & Eberhart because it is not the most prominent of the firm's production. In doing so, the State is ignoring the important history that is manifest in the building, but is not necessarily apparent on the facades. The Commission unanimously agreed and voiced its approval of the nomination and of the preservation of Philadelphia's industrial history in general.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board that the Biberman Building at 611-619 N. 15th Street in Philadelphia satisfies criteria A and C and is therefore is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF FOR APRIL 2007

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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