

**MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Cheryl Durgans, Mural Arts Program
Joseph Brenman, Mural Arts Program
Michael Wolford, Manager of Operations, Philadelphia Episcopal Cathedral
Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects
Wade Jackman, AMCD Walnut Street Associates, LP
Therese Stuhlman, Parks and Recreation Commission
Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. Mes. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, Evans, and McCoubrey joined her.

3725 AND 3727-29 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Cathedral Church of the Savior, Episcopal Diocese

Applicant: Jane Golden

History: 1889-1902, Charles M. Burns, Jr., architect

Designation: Individually designated, 5/7/1981

Project: Add mural

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the stuccoed west elevation of the three-story rectory building of the Church of the Savior. The double brownstone façades and side bay were designed and added to existing buildings by architect Charles M. Burns Jr. in 1902. In 1889, Burns extensively altered the existing mid-century church building, adding a tower and new Italian Romanesque façade. The church and rectory buildings were designated as a complex.

This project was first proposed to the Commission in October 2010. The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9, but suggested the applicant adjust the yellow bands of color to be more compatible with the streetscape and adjacent historic resources. The applicants subsequently withdrew the application. The applicant has redesigned the mural in response to the Committee's suggestions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the recommendation of the Architectural Committee on 26 October 2010.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Cheryl Durgans of the Mural Arts Program, artist Joseph Brenman, and Michael Wolford, Manager of Operations at the Philadelphia Episcopal Cathedral, represented the application.

Mr. Brenman displayed images of the current and previous proposals and discussed how the design had changed in response to the Committee's suggestions. He explained that he had "toned down" the color scheme, as the Committee had suggested. He reported that he is now using colors from the cathedral and believes that the proposed mural now better corresponds to the cathedral. He displayed a series of photographs of the building and surrounding area with the mural placed on the building. He claimed that the mural was compatible with the surrounding environment and streetscape. He displayed a sample board, showing the types of mosaic materials he would use. He pointed out that most of the mural will be paint only, but it will include sections of mosaic at the bottom left and top right corners. He explained that the mosaic would not be applied directly to the building, but would be applied to cement board that would then be attached to the building, allowing for easy removal.

Mr. Evans noted that he was not present at the last Architectural Committee review of this mural. He stated that he found the pattern "overbearing" and the scale too large. He claimed that the mural would "suck the eye in" and distract the viewer from the church. He contended that the Committee must protect the historic resources, the cathedral and rectory. Mr. Cluver agreed. He called the mural "big" and "in your face." He asserted that it detracts from the historic buildings. Mr. Evans added that the radiating circles create "volumes" that are much larger than the mural itself.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he understood the need for a large scale, which he deemed appropriate. He stated that the artist had toned the colors down as the Committee had

suggested. He stated that he approved of the mural and supported the Committee's earlier recommendation.

Ms. Gutterman said that she agreed with Messrs. Evans and Cluver that the mural is bold, but she contended that that may, in fact, be a positive, not a negative.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she approved of the large-scale radiating circles, which lead the eye between the two churches, the cathedral and the church across Chestnut Street.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance acknowledged that he did not attend the first review of this mural. However, he strongly urged the Committee to deny the mural. He stated that the color, scale, and contrast of the mural were incompatible with the historic building. He displayed photographs of a building on Girard Avenue with a mural. Looking from the west, one does not see the mural and the building retains its historic character, he claimed. However, looking from the east, the mural dominates the view of the historic building and destroys its character. He claimed that the mural had as much of an adverse impact on the building as inappropriate alterations would. He objected to the proposed mural, arguing that it is designed to be visible from automobiles travelling at 50 mph on Chestnut Street. He observed that the foreground is a garden, not something like a recreation center. The color, scale, and contrast of the mural do not fit with the contemplative nature of the garden. Mr. Gallery displayed photographs of a building with a mural of the 1200-block of Locust Street. He pointed out that the mural on this building has a frame that makes it appear that the architectural details of the façade wrap around onto the stucco party wall. With the frame, he claimed, the mural respects the building. He presented a sketch that he had done showing a mural on the Chestnut Street building with an architectural frame. He claimed that a smaller, subtler mural with a frame would be acceptable because it would promote contemplation in the garden.

Mr. Wolford, the manager of the cathedral, stated that the Episcopal Diocese is 100% supportive of the design. He stated that the mural will advance the mission of the church as a house of faith and a place for interfaith dialogue. He contended that the mural would provide beauty and would be compatible with the historic buildings and garden setting.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial of the application, based on the color and scale of the mural. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 4. Ms. Gutterman, Hawkins, and Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey dissented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, pursuant to its recommendation of 26 October 2010. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4 to 2. Messrs. Cluver and Evans dissented.

1201 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Odd Fellows of America

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: 1906, Watson & Huckel, architects

Designation: Individually designated, 12/12/2008

Project: Replace storefront windows and doors

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of storefront windows and doors.

The existing windows are non-historic four-light metal fixed windows and wood four-light casements with transoms. The applicant proposes to replace the existing storefront windows with four single-light wood casements with three-light transoms in line with three-part windows on the upper levels.

The existing doors are non-historic. They are a three-part metal system with transoms and sidelights and a three-part wood system with transoms and sidelights. The applicant proposes to replace the door openings with a three-part wood system with transoms and sidelights.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the window frames and mullions are painted a color compatible with the terracotta façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephan Potts represented the application.

Mr. Potts noted that, in addition to the proposed work at the storefronts, the application also proposes the restoration of the facades at the upper stories including terracotta cleaning and repair. Mr. Cluver clarified that the staff can review and approve the masonry restoration; it does not need to be discussed at the Committee meeting.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any historic photographs other than the 1908 photograph included in the packet. Ms. Sell responded that she could not locate a clearer or earlier photograph. Mr. Evans asked to see the original copy of the photograph. Mr. Potts explained that the 1908 photograph predates the opening of the building and was part of a promotional brochure. He described the photograph as heavily retouched for promotional purposes and contended that it may not precisely represent the building as constructed.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant what inspired the design of the storefront. Mr. Potts explained that the owner's intent is to find a suitable tenant for the building who will use the first floor for a restaurant. He explained that the windows would be operable and have been scaled down to make them more manageable than full height windows. He stated that the proportions and spacing of the windows at the upper floors are different than those proposed for the storefront windows. Mr. Cluver asked if the doors proposed below are 6'-8" in height. Mr. Potts stated that they are over seven feet tall and that they are drawn in accordance with the existing doorways. Mr. Cluver asked if the door frames are original. Mr. Potts responded that it is difficult to determine, but it is a thin metal frame with several layers of paint. Mr. Potts explained that he did not want to change the existing condition if there was not a compelling argument or historic information to change the configuration. Therefore, he stated that he would like to retain the existing door frames and only replace the doors.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the elevator lobby is located in the center of the building and asked if there would be two separate restaurant spaces. Mr. Potts explained that there is not a direct on-grade connection between the two first-floor spaces on either side of the elevator lobby. The restaurant spaces would connect at the basement level, where the kitchen would be located. Therefore, a tenant would have to formulate a program that would have the kitchen downstairs and have a two-part restaurant at grade with the staff using the basement for servicing both upper-level spaces. He noted that the owner has not signed a lease with anyone; therefore, it is difficult to determine if this will be the ultimate use.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the north end windows are different from the other windows. Mr. Potts stated that a former tenant recently renovated the space to make a restaurant and changed them to poorly constructed wood windows. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the existing conditions of the bases of the storefronts. Mr. Potts stated that there is a granite base that is continuous around the building and at each window there is a large metal base that he would like to retain. He added that there is a large metal frame around the opening, consistent with the 1908 photograph. He stated that they would like to construct a wood system within that metal frame to leave it intact.

Mr. Evans stated that it appears as though the proposed windows are proportioned for operability, making the horizontal mullion rather large and ill-proportioned. Mr. Potts agreed that the mullion is enlarged to conceal some track work. Mr. Cluver asked how one might define an appropriate design for divided-light storefronts when the original storefront windows were one large plate of glass. He also asked the applicant if the interior ceiling would be installed at the horizontal mullion between the transom and the windows or above the transom. Mr. Potts stated that the intent is to keep the ceiling above the transom. Mr. McCoubrey asked if it is necessary to have all four windows operate or could there be a fixed window in the center with two flanking operable casements to continue the tripartite configuration. Mr. Potts stated that that configuration is possible, but the proportions are off and would not match the other openings in the building. Mr. Evans asked how the windows will operate. Mr. Potts stated that he has two options: an accordion design or a design in which the two center panels fold onto the outer panels. However, he hopes to receive an approval that keeps the operational options flexible for a future tenant.

Ms. Hawkins noted that there is an existing three-part panel system below each storefront window. She opined that, given that there are three-part panels below the storefront window openings, installing a four-part storefront window with a three-part transom may look odd. She added that the storefront will read as windows in frames within a larger frame rather than a single-light glazed opening, as it may have been historically. She contended that this design decision is driven by the operation, not the appearance. Mr. Potts stated that he was proposing a window system with a more pedestrian scale that would improve the streetscape. Mr. Potts offered to develop some schemes using a three-part window configuration, but noted that he had already determined that the three-part windows would look odd because it would be evident that their proportions differed from those of the three-part windows above. Mr. Cluver agreed that three equal parts would look odd, but suggested as a possible alternative an A-B-A rhythm with a fixed center piece of glass and flanking operable casements. He added that the four-part configuration has too many divisions from the perspective of a possible non-restaurant tenant. He summarized that the preferred option would be to return the opening to full plate glass as historically rendered.

Mr. Evans asked if the applicant had considered awnings and signage and how those may work into this design. Mr. Potts stated that there has been no discussion of awnings or signage. He stated that the eventual tenant will need to design something appropriate on his own. He added that he would not deem awnings to be appropriate on the building, even though there were historically awnings on the building.

Mr. Evans stated that this design looks rather traditional in material and rendering and asked the applicant if they considered a contemporary vocabulary for a glazing system. Mr. Potts stated that a modern butt-glazed system, where the seams are transparent, is possible, but it would not be operable. He stated that restaurateurs have indicated that they want the windows to open completely like those at Tria, a restaurant across the street. The Tria has an aluminum-frame accordion storefront.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the wood system looks too heavy and that using aluminum with an operable portion would be more appropriate and would allow for the muntin between the transom and windows to be thinned. Mr. Evans agreed. Ms. Gutterman also stated that the rhythm of the existing doors and proposed windows clash. Mr. Cluver stated that he agrees with the proposed head heights of the doors and windows because other alternatives higher or lower do not work. He added that the other elements of the window should be visually lightened up so reads more as a full opening. Ms. Hawkins added that she strongly encourages a fixed center panel and with flanking operable casements. Mr. Potts stated that restaurateurs want openings that have fully operability.

Mr. Evans asked if the applicant's goal is to obtain a specific approval and build or to obtain a general approval to discuss with potential clients. Mr. Potts said the owner has financing and is ready to begin; he would like a final approval for a specific project. He has already begun the interior renovations.

Ms. Hawkins summarized the Committee's comments and stated that the applicant should attempt to design a storefront window system with thinner members. Ms. Gutterman added that the applicant should use metal as opposed to wood. Ms. Pentz stated that there is not enough information about the original design to make a strong case for replication, but the stone base, metal panels, frieze, and brackets should be articulated in the plans. Mr. Cluver recommended that the applicant provide a few options to the Committee at the next review to show his thinking during the design process and how he arrived at the ultimate design. He added that the applicant should look at a fixed center panel with flanking windows, but not necessarily with equal widths, with or without the transom, and with a thinner division between the transom and the windows.

Mr. Farnham stated that he has significant concerns about the Committee's review of this case in particular and a trend that he has noticed in the Committee's reviews lately. He contended that, for customer service and staff capacity reasons, he would like the Committee to strive to conclude its reviews of relatively minor applications like this one on the first pass, without requiring additional rounds of review. He noted that the Committee has recently frequently recommended that applicants revise proposals and present them again to the Committee. He asked the Committee to endeavor to formulate recommendations to the Commission that will allow the Commission to conclude reviews on the first pass. He stated that the staff does not have the capacity to administer applications through the Committee and Commission process multiple times. He acknowledged that important and/or complex applications certainly warrant multiple reviews, but many other applications do not.

Mr. Farnham noted for the Committee that the Commission has a long-standing practice of approving operable windows in storefronts where the original windows are no longer extant. He stated that the Commission has approved many such applications in the last few years. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee is open to storefront windows other than those shown in the 1908 photograph, but not those that have been proposed. Mr. McCoubrey noted there are some important conditions missing from the drawing, such as the details of the storefront bases. He encouraged the applicant search for more historic evidence and photographs. He added that, with the lack of historic evidence, he would be in support of the tripartite configuration with a larger panel in the center. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff can work with the applicant to conduct additional further investigation and research.

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

2312 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: AMCD Walnut Street Associates

Applicants: John C. Lanning, Wade Jackman

History: c.1875

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

Proposal: Legalize deck, sliding door, and window

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the construction of a deck, the enlarging of a window opening for sliding doors, and the installation of the doors and a window at this rowhouse. The deck is located on the rear ell. The doors and window are located at the top floor of the rear of the main block. The roof of the ell had, apparently, been used as a deck. It had a metal railing, but no deck structure or access door. This deck, along with others on rear ells on this block, faces Fidler Square. The railings are minimally visible from the square. Although the doors and window appear to be vinyl with unusual capping and are not compatible with the historic building, it is likely that they are not visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the staff confirms that the doors and window are not visible from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Wade Jackman represented the application.

The Committee members asked why the staff would recommend approval of a deck that had public visibility, particularly from Fidler Square. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission had a history of approving visible decks, if they are on rear ells, because decks were historically on ells. He cited the example in the Independence National Historical Park on Walnut Street. The Committee members thought that this one would be particularly visible because of the park. They suggested that the deck should be pulled back from the south edge of the ell, which is closest to the park. They contended that, because the deck is supported with beams at eight-foot intervals, it should be pulled back one module or eight feet.

Mr. Jackman explained that his company had modified the window openings on the rear to install a new sliding door onto the deck where a window had been and a new vinyl window where a storm door had been. They built new wood frames around the openings. Although the

Committee members opined that the capping and wood around the door and window was inappropriate, they thought that if they would be inconspicuous from the park. The Committee asserted that, if they are conspicuous from the park, then they should be painted a darker color. They noted that the rough white mortar around the newly expanded rear openings appeared to match the white stucco repair of the cornice. They thought that the white stucco finish on the cornice should be removed and the cornice repointed correctly.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck as submitted, but approval of a deck pulled back eight feet from the south façade of the rear ell, with the door surrounds painted if conspicuous from the public right-of-way and the rear brick cornice correctly repaired and repointed, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

2000 BELMONT MANSION DRIVE, BELMONT MANSION

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

History: built before 1742, 3rd floor added in 1850, rear additions constructed in 1888, 1956, and 1996, rehabilitated in 2005

Designation: Individually designated, 6/26/1956

Proposal: Construct additions, install vestibule and gates, alter paving

OVERVIEW: This application proposes enhancing the banquet facilities at the Belmont Mansion in Fairmount Park. It proposes constructing an addition and freestanding building, adding a link between two buildings, adding gates, and altering paving and landscaping. The City owns the highly significant historic house in Fairmount Park. It is currently managed by the American Women's Heritage Society and operated as a banquet and event facility and the Underground Railroad Museum. The building is one of the country's most significant early mansions. Although many preservationists advocated for removing the third floor, which was added later and suffered from structural defects, the building was rehabilitated with the third floor to its mid nineteenth-century appearance about five years ago. The mansion is currently fully restored.

A concrete pad was installed to the south of the mansion several years ago to support a tent that is used for catered events like weddings and corporate affairs. The concrete pad and tent would be removed and a new freestanding pavilion would be constructed to the south of the house. It would be set back slightly from the current location of the concrete pad to allow better views of the house.

A second structure would be built at the rear of the large outbuilding that stands to the southwest of the house. The outbuilding was constructed in several campaigns from the eighteenth century to the 1980s. The proposed addition would house a banquet room, kitchen, and storage. It would be much larger than any of the extant sections of the outbuilding.

The application proposes a glazed vestibule that would connect the main house to the even older cottage building and its additions. It would connect to the house under a corner of the porch and extend out from the porch to the rear building. Although there had been a non-historic vestibule at this location at one time, it was removed as part of the recent restoration of the mansion.

The application also proposes a series of changes to the grounds including repaving the parking area, adding a gate with pillars at the driveway, adding a pedestrian gate and walkway to additional parking to the north, and replacing sidewalk paving.

The architectural plans provided with the application lack detailed information, especially regarding the vestibule, which would attach to eighteenth-century buildings. The drawings do not provide adequate information about materials, colors, textures, profiles, etc. of the new construction or the impact of that construction on the historic buildings.

The proposed construction of a freestanding pavilion for a banquet facility on the lawn of this highly significant historic house does not meet historic preservation standards. Any new construction should be located at the rear of the site, where it would be inconspicuous to the viewing public. New construction should not disturb important historic settings.

Although the application proposes significant earth disturbing activities for foundations for the new construction, it does not address the question of archaeology. The historical significance of this site warrants archaeological protections. Before any earth is disturbed, a Phase 1A archaeology study should be undertaken to determine the potential impact to archaeological resources. If the study indicates that important resources will be impacted, then additional archaeological investigations should be undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear addition, gates, paving, and landscaping, provided archaeological resources are protected, with the staff to review details and all archaeological studies and conclusions; denial of the freestanding pavilion and vestibule; pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, and 10 and the Site and Setting Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joseph Jancuska represented the application.

Mr. Jancuska stated that he was confused by the staff recommendation. He explained that he had met with a member of the Commission's staff as well as a member of the Fairmount Park staff several months ago and had been given some suggestions to improve the design. He stated that he made the suggested revisions and now assumed that, because he had followed the directions, he would receive an approval. He reported that the suggestions included a recommendation to move the banquet facility and kitchen to the rear of the rear additions. He contended that he satisfied that recommendation and moved the large addition from the side to the rear. Mr. Baron agreed that that was a good idea and noted that the current staff recommendation supports the location of the rear addition. Ms. Pentz stated that she was confused because the applicant appeared to state that he had received direction from the Committee and Commission regarding revising the design. Mr. Evans agreed that he was also confused. He asked Mr. Farnham if the Commission had already reviewed this proposal. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had not reviewed the proposal. A Commission staff member, who is currently on maternity leave, and a Fairmount Park staff member met with the architect several months ago and provided some suggestions for improving the design. Neither the Committee nor Commission has reviewed this proposal previously.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the women's society that operates the site as a banquet facility needs two banquet rooms, the new one at the rear and the new freestanding one on the lawn. Mr. Jancuska replied that the event operator sometimes hosts multiple events at once. He stated that the operator wants the freestanding pavilion on the lawn of the historic house

because it would offer very nice views of the downtown skyline. Currently, a concrete pad for an event tent is located to the south of the main house, where the pavilion would be built. Events are held in the tent during warmer months. Mr. Jancuska stated that the Commission and Park staff had objected to the pavilion as originally proposed because it blocked views of the historic mansion. Therefore, he revised the plans and is now proposing a pavilion shifted toward the rear slightly, to avoid blocking some views of the historic house from the street. He stated that the event operator wants a permanent building on the lawn of the historic house because it offers exceptional views. There is a great demand for the facility on the lawn because of its views of the city. When asked whether the pavilion could be moved further to the rear, Mr. Jancuska replied that he did not want to obstruct the downtown views from an existing all-glass portion of a modern addition at the rear building. He stated that the views of the city are very important to the business that is operated at the house. He noted that the event operator is seeking a banquet facility on the lawn that can be used all year. The tent currently on the site is seasonal. Ms. Pentz asked why the operator wants to replace the tent. Mr. Jancuska replied that Audrey Johnson Thorton, the operator, would like to replace the tent because it is ugly and because she received a large grant for a new building.

Mr. Evans stated that he is confused by the application. He noted that the mansion was carefully restored recently, but now the tenant at the mansion, the event operator, not the owner, wants to undertake major work including redoing something that was undone by the restoration. He asked if there was a long-range plan for the important historic site. He observed that there may be conflicts between its use as a banquet facility and its interpretation as a historic site. Mr. Jancuska replied that the operator has a very large grant to enlarge the facility and would like to expand her business. He stated that there is a very large demand for the facility; the operator actually turns away potential customers. Mr. McCoubrey noted that this expansion would more than double the size of the banquet facility. Mr. Jancuska reported that they would install a new catering kitchen to accommodate the expanded business. He also reported that he will create a new link to an existing parking lot that supports other park facilities. With this additional parking, the operator will be able to handle much larger events.

Mr. Jancuska summarized the proposal for the rear addition, at the back of the rear building. He displayed photographs of the rear of the rear building and stated that the addition would be inconspicuous from the street. The area between the entrance to the new rear addition and the parking lot would be enhanced with new brick paving. He explained that the new rear addition would have a flat roof and would be hidden from the street. The new section would be clad in materials like those that clad the other rear areas.

Mr. Jancuska discussed the proposal for the vestibule that would connect the historic mansion to the back building. He stated that he had revised the design since he had showed it to the staff member several months ago. The vestibule was now simple and plain with large windows and wood detailing. It was noted that a non-historic vestibule had stood in this location until recently, but had been removed during the restoration.

Mr. Jancuska summarized the proposal for the freestanding pavilion. He stated that it has pitched roofs and uses the same materials and detailing as the vestibule. He stated that it is as simple as possible so as not to compete with the historic house. Mr. Evans asked about the note on the drawing that says that the proposed door with flat arch will match an existing historic door. Mr. Jancuska replied that he found the precedent for the door to be replicated somewhere in the complex, but he did not remember precisely where in the complex the door was located.

Mr. Jancuska explained that they operator would remove some trash containers, a freestanding trailer, and other undesirable elements now at the site.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee members to comment on the proposal. Ms. Pentz stated that she objected to the freestanding pavilion. She contended that the construction of the pavilion would constitute a major change to a very important historic site. She stated that the replacement of a temporary structure with a permanent structure was a step in the wrong direction. Mr. Jancuska asked her to defend her position. She stated that this pavilion would not replicate any of the outbuildings that stood over time in this area. It cannot be considered a reconstruction and does not meet the Standards. Mr. Baron added that the tent is easily reversible, but a building is not; the Standards mandate reversibility. Mr. Evans agreed. He stated that this historic mansion comes out of the grand, symmetrical, Palladian tradition. It had symmetrical wings to either side of the main building that are now lost. The proposed pavilion would not replicate that symmetry. Mr. Jancuska stated that he could set the pavilion back slightly, but not too far because of the property line. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that this is public property and is within Fairmount Park. Theresa Stuhlman, a staff member at Fairmount Park, clarified that the tenant is leasing a particular piece of park land and cannot use the land beyond the boundary of the lease. Mr. Jancuska stated that the land drops off to the side and rear and cannot be built upon. He again stated that the operator wants the pavilion located in this spot to take advantage of the views. The views draw the customers. Ms. Pentz stated that a pavilion on the lawn does not satisfy the Standards. Mr. Jancuska insisted that the business requires the construction of a pavilion in this area. He stated that he is willing to move it slightly or reduce it in size slightly, but the business requires it. Mr. Evans stated that the business plan cannot dictate the historic preservation decisions. Mr. Jancuska stated that the operator is not willing to give up a banquet room in this spot. The skyline view is essential to the business; the locations toward the rear of the property do not have the views.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance supports the staff recommendation of denial of the freestanding pavilion and vestibule.

Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that this property is public property; it is owned by the City of Philadelphia. He asked if the City's goal was to maximize the commercial potential of this site or to preserve and interpret the historic resource at this site. He stated that he was concerned that this proposal would convert an important historic mansion with a banquet facility into a banquet facility with a historic mansion appended to it. He acknowledged that these questions may exceed the Commission's authority, but they may not. He asked the applicant if this project would provide a public benefit that would offset the adverse effects to the historic resource. Ms. Gutterman asked if the proceeds of the event business fund the preservation of the site. Mr. Evans asked if the expansion of the catering business is necessary to the stewardship of the historic mansion. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Hawkins remarked that they had not seen any evidence that this expansion was necessary for the financial viability of the historic house. Mr. Cluver stated that the scale of the proposal is "huge." He acknowledged that there is a history of additions and appendages at the site, but the proposed additions would rival the house in scale. Mr. Evans added that the quality of the proposed design is not sufficient for a historic house of this importance. Mr. Jancuska stated that the additions will match the existing additions. He offered to adjust the window and door details.

Mr. Jancuska introduced a photograph of a gazebo that once stood on the lawn to the south of the historic house. He stated that the new pavilion would echo the gazebo. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey stated that the new pavilion and old gazebo have very little in common. They

have different locations, sizes, materials, openness, etc. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed pavilion should not be located beside the historic mansion, but should be located behind it. She stated that she understood that the rear location would not provide the desired views for the catering facility, but she asserted that the Committee's goals were to protect historic resources and uphold preservation standards, not maximize the business potential of the site. She stated that the existing tent is more appropriate than the proposed pavilion.

Mr. Evans stated that he and Ms. Gutterman had quickly reviewed the historic structure report (HSR) for Belmont as the project was discussed. He noted that there had been several structures on the south lawn at varying times during the building's history. He stated that the proposed pavilion would not be a reconstruction of any of those structures. He stated that he might support a true reconstruction if the reconstructed structure fell within the period of significance of the site and promoted the interpretation of the historic resource. Ms. Hawkins observed that a faithful reconstruction is very different than the building proposed. Mr. Evans asserted that Belmont Mansion is incredibly historically significant. He warned that the Commission should not allow a pavilion to be erected without significant study. He stated that the architect could not justify the current proposal as a reconstruction of a historic structure. Ms. Pentz added that there have been battles over the period of significance of this site. She stated that a clear period of significance should be identified before any reconstruction is considered.

Ms. Stuhlman, the Fairmount Park historic preservationist, explained that the City funded the restoration of the mansion three or four years ago. She reported that the vestibule linking the house and the rear building had been removed before the restoration because it was not historic and because Fairmount Park wanted the catering facilities separate from the house. She stated that the event operator now wants to reconnect the house and rear building for programmatic reasons, even though the Park removed the vestibule. Ms. Pentz stated that there should be a comprehensive public discussion regarding the expansion of the catering facilities. She stated that she does not understand the philosophy behind allowing the expansion of the events facility at this important historic site. Ms. Stuhlman stated that vestibule was in place from about 1930 to the 1990s. It was not historic. Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Stuhlman if the Park considered this large expansion when it planned the restoration a few years ago. Ms. Stuhlman stated that the expansion was not considered. She informed the Committee that the expansion plan was proposed recently by the tenant after she received a Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program (RACP) grant from the state. Ms. Pentz asked Ms. Stuhlman if the Park supports the application. She responded that the Park has not yet granted final approval to the project.

Mr. Jancuska showed a photograph of a very large, open structure that stood on the site and claimed that it provided a basis for his proposal. Ms. Stuhlman stated that that building was erected for the Centennial Exposition and stood for a very short time. Ms. Stuhlman displayed a series of site plans from the HSR showing the evolution of the site. Mr. Evans asked about the period of significance of the mansion that was adopted for the recent restoration. Ms. Stuhlman explained that the Park had originally intended to restore the house to its eighteenth-century appearance, which would have necessitated removing the 1850 third floor. However, the tenant convinced the City to retain the third floor and the building was therefore restored to its 1870s appearance.

Ms. Hawkins polled the Committee members, who were unanimously opposed to the construction of the pavilion. Mr. Jancuska asked the Committee if it would approve of a reconstruction of the Centennial pavilion. The Committee members responded that they could not opine on that question without more information about the historic and proposed pavilion.

They suggested that he submit an in-concept application with requisite historical and architectural information. Mr. Jancuska stated that he does not care what he builds; he just wants something approved. He stated that he wants guidance regarding what to propose. He asked the Committee to tell him what to propose. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the applicant has the responsibility of submitting a proposal; the Committee cannot design a building for him. Ms. Hawkins informed Mr. Jancuska that the staff could guide him. He responded that he had already sought the staff's opinion many months ago. The proposal is based on the staff's opinion. The Committee members responded that the staff had offered suggestions to minimize the adverse negative impact of the proposal, but had not promised an approval. Mr. Jancuska asked where he could obtain a copy of the Secretary's Standards. The Committee directed him to the staff and the National Park Service website. Mr. Evans warned that the Standards include four very different sets of standards; the project will determine which set to apply. He stated that the Reconstruction Standards would apply if an accurate reconstruction of a historic pavilion is proposed; the Rehabilitation Standards would apply if a non-historic building is proposed.

The Committee turned its attention to the rear addition. Mr. Cluver stated that it "feels massive." He objected to the seemingly random selection of historic elements from the site and their application to this box. He suggested that it could be styled in a more contemporary way. Ms. Gutterman opined that the addition is nothing more than a big blank box. Mr. Jancuska responded that event operator needs a "big box." He claimed that it would not be visible to the public. Ms. Gutterman disagreed. Mr. Evans suggested that Mr. Jancuska review the HSR. Ms. Pentz stated that she objected to the addition; it would be too large. She again asserted that the philosophical underpinnings for this project must be addressed; she asked why the publicly-owned building should be converted to a banquet facility. Ms. Gutterman asked for information about the finances of the banquet facility. Is the preservation of the historic house reliant on the income produced by this facility? Ms. Gutterman concluded that she has seen no evidence to justify the major alterations proposed for this very important historic site. Mr. Jancuska stated that constructing the expanded catering facility would not detract from the historic site. Several Committee members disagreed and stated that the construction would "overwhelm" the historic site. Mr. Jancuska stated that the new facility would bring more people to the site. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz stated that the preservation of the historic house should be the driving factor, not the revenue for the catering facility.

The Committee members discussed the vestibule or link. Mr. Jancuska stated that the vestibule would be independent of the historic structure. It would be styled like it dated to the 1950s. It would be in the same location as the vestibule that existed in the mid twentieth century. Ms. Pentz stated that the architectural drawings of the vestibule are insufficient. Ms. Hawkins stated that the vestibule should be deleted from the proposal. All other Committee members agreed.

The Committee members asserted that archaeological resources must be protected at the site. Ms. Gutterman stated that real archaeological investigations must be conducted wherever there would be ground disturbing activities.

Mr. Cluver asked about the gate. Was there a gate in that location historically? Mr. Jancuska stated that the gate with lighting would be installed for security reasons. There was a gate in this location historically. The gate would allow the operator to control access to the site. Mr. Jancuska stated that he would replace any chain link fence with estate fencing. The gate will be open during the day, but locked at night by the caretaker. Mr. Baron asked about the stone for the piers of the gate. Mr. Jancuska stated that the stone would match stone on the historic

building. Ms. Stuhlman stated that the current entrance has no relation to the historic entrance. Ms. Pentz stated that the landscape alterations should be restudied.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, and 10 and the Site and Setting Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space, for example removing a lawn and walkway and installing a parking lot.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Surveying and documenting areas where the terrain will be altered to determine the potential impact to important landscape features or archaeological resources.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Planning and carrying out any necessary investigation using professional archaeologists and modern archaeological methods when preservation in place is not feasible.

Setting Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens, and yards, adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.